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JENNIFER JACOBS: -- and chat with them. Now without further ado, I'd like to turn things over to our moderator today, Shelia Lewis, workforce analyst at the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. Shelia?

MS. LEWIS: Thank you, Jen. Welcome, everyone, to our Part II webinar for Eligible Training Provider Reporting. I'm going to introduce our two colleagues that you're familiar with from the first webinar; my colleague, Christina Eckenroth. She joins us from our Boston, Massachusetts regional office. She's the executive assistant also with the Employment and Training Administration.

And here in the National Office with me is my colleague, Kellen Grode. He joins us from the Office of Workforce Investment. So they were two of your presenters for the Part I webinar a couple of weeks ago. So this webinar is part of the webinar behind the webinar. We're following up with questions that we received in the last webinar's chatroom, also questions sent to us via e-mail, and also through ETA Perform.

So we like to know how our audience is, since some of you attended the last webinar. So we have a couple of poll questions that will give us a little more information about who's attending today's webinar. As you can see on your screen, would you just complete the poll question and let us know whether you're working for a federal office, state, local, a training provider, or other. And if you have not already entered that information into the chatroom -- if you're calling from another organization -- if you would let us know what that organization is, we'd appreciate it. This will give us a better idea who our audience is today. And once you finish that whole question, we have another one following it.

All right. And that poll question, the second one, we're asking you if you were able to attend the last session of Part I of the ETP reporting webinar, or if you were able to listen to it virtually at our recording on WorkforceGPS. I'll give you just a minute to complete those two polls. It looks like it's about 50/50. A few more have attended the previous session. So it looks like we have quite a few. So far, it looks like there are about 110 of you who did not attend or were not able to attend this webinar previously.

For those who've not attended previously, I encourage you to visit WorkforceGPS, and if you haven't already, please register. And listen to the recorded version of webinar Part I. And also, there's a transcript available, as well, if you do not have time to listen the previous version. All right. Thank you. So we'll move along to today's objective. Basically, we'd like to give you a more in-depth discussion about eligible training provider reporting, specifically reporting on the ETA-9171 report template.

We received several questions in the chatrooms and again on ETA Perform. So behind the scenes, we categorize those questions into two big categories -- those submitted by providers and those submitted by States. So at first, we're going to address the provider concerns. At a very high level, we subdivided that group of questions into data submission questions, reporting responsibilities, and additional training.

With respect to reporting responsibilities, there's an attachment in the chatroom which summarizes the state and provider reporting responsibilities. This information is also found in the ETP guidance and also it's summarized in the last webinar. And you can also find that information on Workforce GPS as well. So we will not be covering that information specifically during this webinar, but you'll find an attachment that summarizes it in a slightly different format. So hopefully, that will answer additional questions that you may have about reporting responsibilities for State and for training providers.

Let's jump right into it. And as we proceed, we have questions on our slides that are the questions that were submitted. They're in a format that they were submitted. So our responses are going to be based on our interpretation of your question. So the first set of questions I'm going to ask Christina to respond to. And they're reporting questions from our training providers.

First, one of the questions is: Who does the reporting? Where do providers enter their data when reporting to the State? What data are providers required to collect? Will providers be responsible for reporting employment data? And since the ETA-9171 is due by October 1st, when are reports due from training providers? Christina, would you mind summarizing a response for those questions, please.

MS. ECKENROTH: Hi, Shelia. Thanks, everybody. Good questions, providers. And I'll tell you a little bit about it. The long and short of it is the providers are responsible for giving data to the State. And the State is responsible for reporting the ETA-9171. So the data that's required we have provided to you is outlined in several places, and that includes NTEGL 3-18 when we had the previous webinar. And there's a resource page at the end of this presentation I encourage you to take a look at.

But each State may have different approaches for leveraging that data and for preparing the report. So our guidance to you is to follow your State's instructions for which data you are responsible for submitting to them, when to submit it, and how you're supposed to submit that data. That's it. I was just going to kick it over to Kellen for a little bit more detail.

MR. GRODE: Yeah. So we got some more questions that are sort of in that same vein, which you guys can see on the slide -- so questions about what are PIRL records, are providers responsible for completing the PIRL? There's a question about the requirement that providers report the average and median wages. And then there's also a question about whether there'll be any additional in-person or virtual training. So I'll take those in order.

The PIRL question is one that is not necessarily directly relevant for providers, because PIRL is just the individual record layout, which is how States report their outcomes participants for WIOA. So they're not necessarily specific to the eligible training provider list, although, for the ETPL performance reports, the WIOA participant information will likely be coming from those same records in order to avoid duplication. So the training provider shouldn't really have to worry about the PIRL from that perspective.

Now, I will say that if they want to look at the definitions in the PIRL and more information about the PIRL, that may be helpful in understanding the different ways that we are calculating measures or how we define different elements and that sort of thing. So from that perspective, the information may be useful, but it's not something that's necessarily a responsibility for the providers to worry about.

The second question about average and median wages -- it's asking about minimizing reporting burden. And while I understand that there's a concern about having to report two different numbers, I think our thought was with this requirement is that when you have the individual records to create the median wages, you don't need to collect any more information in order to calculate the average wages. It's the same information -- it's just two different types of calculations. And so that'll help us on the reporting side, because the information that we get from the States is aggregate rather than individual records. We can't calculate it on our end, so we're asking the States to send that calculation to us for that part of the report.

And then the last question regarding if there's going to be any additional training -- in-person, virtual -- I think we don't necessarily have anything specifically planned at this point. But what I can say is that we will continue to provide and develop technical assistance as we feel it's necessary based on feedback that we get from you guys based on any issues that we may see arising in how the reporting is going or whatever questions we may be getting through ETA Performs or WIOA Feedback.

So we will look at that. But as of right now, we don't have specific trainings planned on this other than what we've put out so far in this webinar today. And then I think that gets to that set of questions. So I'll toss it back to Shelia. You can go into the next section.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you, Kellen. So again, our second batch of questions were mostly for States. We received quite a few concerns from States on data collection and on data reporting and responsibility. So I remind you to look at the attachment that's in your chatroom.

And also, going back to the PIRL, as Kellen mentioned, that information is outlined in our TEGL 10-16 Change 1. A link to that guidance is also on 7.5 in this presentation. So we'll move on now to our first set of questions from the State. And I will cut those to Christina. Basically, this set of questions is about reporting. And you see those there on your screen.

And I'll invite Christina to share her responses to those questions. Christina?

CHRISTINA ECKENROTH: Hey, Shelia. So I'll just kick this off by saying, if you're a State and you're wondering, gee, who is supposed to tell the providers to do all this? That would be you. So there is a process -- somebody in your State is responsible for the eligible training provider process. That is a requirement. So just look around in your office and find your contact person for the ETP list and get together with them and figure out how you're going to provide guidance to your providers.

If you need help, you can reach out to your regional offices in DOL and we'll be sure to give you a hand in getting that straightened out. So providers, you should hear from your States about your responsibilities regarding reporting. Now, if you're a State, you probably have some of these questions: When are we going to align the ETP data with the WIOA exit cohort periods?

OK. Excellent question. They are actually aligned. And we will give you some examples with some graphics further on in the presentation to provide you a little bit of some scenarios about what we're talking about and how those cohorts align.

All right. What about data suppression? So what do you do if a training provider really doesn't have that many WIOA enrollees or even that many enrollees, period, depending on where you are in the country? Are you supposed to exclude this outcome, this data from outcomes? Well, no. The published data should follow the established ETA protocols for data suppression. So we have rules already in place saying for identifiable information how you suppress data that's lower than a certain number. So those rules should continue to be followed. And that's referenced in the TEGL 3-18.

But in terms of what you report, the provider reports to the State and what the State reports to ETA all of the 9171 data required should be submitted to ETA. But we will only publish according information and so to the State according to the data suppression requirements.

Then the ITA question -- ITAs are used to fund training with providers, individual training accounts. So States have asked for clarity: What do we report here? Is it the total ITA funds for all expenditures? Or is it by provider program? It is by the whole period, so it's all of the expenditures for the whole period. So you don't have to worry about trying to break it out. And with that, I think we have some pop quizzes. So test your knowledge.

Here is an example: What do you guys think? So say an existing school gets added onto the State with -- ETPL with an existing program, but it's for the first time. So at the end of the program year, what data does the provider submit to the State? Does the provider have to submit the entire program year? -- because remember, this is not a new program -- they've had it going on and they had students prior to when they got on the list. Or do they only provide the data for the period that they were on the list? I'll give you guys a second to put down your answer.

OK. It looks like we are slowing down with our responses. So let's go to the answer. We're pretty closely split. I think the PY folks are winning at this point. Are you ready for the response? OK. Well, hold on to your hats, because the State must report the performance information about ETP's ETA for programs that are already on the list.

So guess what? You're not required to submit information for the period that you weren't actually approved to be on the list. The requirement is that the performance for eligible training providers on a list be reported. But if you weren't on the list -- for the period of time you weren't on the list, it wasn't a requirement. So hopefully that is good news to some of you.

All right. Get your pop quiz hats back on. Exit dates: We had a lot of questions -- very good ones -- about exit dates. So here we go. What is the exit for all students? Should it be the date that the ended the program? Or are we following the WIOA definition, which is applying a 90-day waiting period? I'll give you some seconds here to respond. OK. It seems like we're winding down. And it's again, sort of a nail biter, but we're ready for the response.

So the answer here is that we only have one definition for exit. And it is the WIOA definition of exit, which is 90 days after the last service. So what does that mean for your provider? Well, it quite actually doesn't mean very much, except that for ETA, we have to provide a space for folks to get additional services. And so the regulations require a 90-day gap. It's the only definition of exit that we have, so that's the definition that we're utilizing that also helps to align all of our reporting.

OK. Last pop quiz: What about WIOA students? What's the exit date we should be using there? Is it the date the person completed training? Or is it the WIOA exit date, meaning that person may have completed training and then went on to get job search or career services in addition, which would add time on to their exit date? What do you think?

OK. It looks like we have a run-away winner and you guys caught on to my hint in the beginning. We only have one WIOA exit date, and so this trick question was a trick question that wasn't. The correct answer: Students should be based on the WIOA exit. Great. You guys did terrific. Thanks very much for participating in our pop quiz.

So now I'm going to send it over to Kellen to talk a little bit more in-depth about that cohort question we had.

KELLEN GRODE: Yes. Thanks, Christina. Yeah. We did get a bunch of questions that tie into questions about what cohorts of students are reported when, how do we determine when the exit is. All these types of questions all sort of tie together. And so we wanted to talk through a few specific scenarios and show you a graphic that we put together that should hopefully help in understanding what groups of people are included in which annual reports.

To start it off, we have a scenario. Our first scenario is Bob, who is a WIOA participant; he enrolled and started training, both, in August of 2018. And then he complete training and exited from WIOA in December of 2018. So when we flip over to our chart here, we can show you where Bob would be reported for each one of our different indicators or elements in your annual reports.

So just to explain the chart a little bit here: We have it broken out by quarters just so that you can see the quarter that a person exits. But each color represents the annual report that somebody is reported in. So they're not going to be reported in separate quarters on, like, what you have in the WIOA PIRL reports where they're reported quarterly, because the ETP is an annual report. We only broke out the quarters so that you can see which quarter somebody exits. That way you know which person is included in which report.

If we look at the example for the scenario for Bob, we can see he is included in the WIOA participant counts and the WIOA characteristics, which includes the barriers to employment for the July through September 2018 quarter, because that was the quarter where he enrolled. He's also included in the WIOA participants served with an ITA count for that same -- he starts in that same quarter, which is again, reported in the TY 2018 report, which is due October of 2019. And then he's also included for that same time frame for the WIOA cost per participant.

Now, if you look close at this chart, you'll see that we have an asterisk here, and that's because this particular element -- which is Element 138 on the 9171 -- is not necessarily a count of participants. It's the total ITA cost for that period. But the reason why we have Bob listed here for that is that whatever ITA costs are associated with Bob are associated with this time period.

And then what you'll see on the second bottom part of the chart is all of our exit-based elements. And so everything is -- that's where things start to get lagged. Bob shows up then in the October through December quarter for the WIOA exiter with an ITA and the WIOA exiter counts starting with that period. Now, that's still in that same PY 2018 report, which you can tell because it's still in the blue boxes. But then when we start to look at some of our lagged outcomes indicators, that's where Bob actually shifts into the PY 2019 reports, because that's when the outcomes occur, plus the data availability lag.

For folks that are familiar with how the WIOA reporting works for our outcomes that occur two quarters after exit, not only is there a lag to the outcome to occur, but then there's a lag of two quarters in order for the data to become available. So really we're talking about an outcome that takes place four quarters after Bob's exit for the employment, second quarter after exit, median earning second quarter after exit. And so that's why, because of this lag, that Bob's outcomes for these measures don't actually show up until the following year's reports for the ETP.

So you can see that is evidence for the number of employees second quarter after exit indicator. You can see that for the median earnings second quarter after exit. And you can this is also the case for the number of fourth quarter after exit, the credential attainment as well. So all those ones that Bob is included in, that demonstrates not only which annual report he's included in, but it shows you which of the indicators that he's included in. Now, you'll notice there's a few that he's not included in, because those are specific to all students as opposed to the WIOA participants.

Let's jump back now and look at another scenario. Our second scenario is Sara, who is not a WIOA participant, but she is enrolled in the same program the same time as Bob. So we want to look and see, how is Sara reported differently than Bob with respect to these cohorts? So if we jump back to the chart, we'll see that, for the most part, the time frames for Sara are actually going to be the same. Now, this ties back to what Christina was just talking about. The main difference is with respect to how Sara is reported is which of the elements that she's reported in. So you'll see Sara show up in the all individuals served counts, but not in those WIOA-specific counts with the top part of the chart.

And then on the bottom part of the chart, you'll see that she's in the all individual exiter and completer counts, but not the WIOA ones. But she also is included in the same number employed second quarter after exit counts, because we have that measure for both WIOA participants as well as all individuals. For all individuals, they are not included in the median earnings. They, instead, are reporting the average earnings. That's why you see Sara being reported differently as Bob. But they are in the fourth quarter as well as the credential attainment.

You can see here that it's a similar pattern to Bob, just a few of the different elements. So this chart kind of highlights some of the differences as far as which elements we're collecting for all individuals versus WIOA participants. And we have a couple more. So let's jump back now. We'll look at a third scenario. And this is going to add a little more nuance than we had in these first two.

Our third scenario is Latha, and she is a WIOA participant. She was enrolled and started training in January of 2019. And I guess we can flip to the second scenario so we kind of tie these two together, which is why one is reference, because one is actually number 4. So maybe I'll just do both of these together, if you don't mind. So we have Latha and Juan. So they both started training in January of 2019. And they both completed training in March of 2019, but what you'll see is that Latha, the WIOA participant, didn't actually exit WIOA until May of 2019.

And so when we go over to our chart, we're going to see that there's going to be a slight difference as far as when these two are actually reported. So we can flip back to that chart real quick. What we see as far as when they start showing up in the reports as participants, they are the same because they started at the same time. So they both show up in that column for January through March of 2019, which means that they start showing up in the participant reports for the PY18 ETP reports. The difference that we see for these two is when we start looking at the exit base indicators.

And what you see -- and it looks like we may have a slight issue with one part of the chart here where we have a wrong name -- but it should be Juan all the way down. For some reason it says Doug. I guess that was from a previous iteration. But we'll get that fixed when we post the final version. But it should say Juan all the way down on the April through June of 2019.

And basically, the reason why Juan shows up in that quarter versus Latha showing up in the July through September 2019 quarter for our exit-based outcomes is because Latha, being a WIOA participant and receiving services other than the training, actually stays active longer before exiting. Whereas, for Juan, because he's only receiving training, he does exit from that program in the quarter where he completes training because he's not receiving any other services. So that ties to that 90-day rule that we have where any services that you receive within 90 days continues your participation.

So for Latha, she actually gets bumped out one quarter later, which causes her to show up in the 2020 annual reports for the employment second quarter and the median earnings second quarter. Whereas, Juan is going to have those measures reported in the 2019 ETP reports. They both will be included in the 2020 reports for the four quarter after exit outcomes. So that would be the employed fourth quarter outcome, the credential attainment outcome, and the average earnings outcome. So hopefully, this scenario is not too overwhelming for you. I think for some of our more visual learners this may help to conceptualize how these cohorts line up.

In some of our materials that we have on doleta.gov, we have actual specific date ranges for a lot of these indicator cohorts so that you can see -- if you're more of the nonvisual learner -- if you like looking at the numbers, we have those in a chart on doleta.gov/performance. If you click on our performance reporting guidance page there, you can see we have all of our information associated with our various information collection requests and relating to the PIRL. Those are included in the annual report templates. That's one of the places where, if the visual part is not working out for you, you can go check that out there.

We can come back to this if we have time at the end and there's questions, but hopefully, this is a helpful tool for you guys, because we did get a lot of questions after the last webinar about the way cohorts line up. And with that, I think we're going to move to the next section so I'll toss it back to Shelia real quick.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you, Kellen. I'm just looking at some of the questions in the chatroom just for a minute. Someone asked about acronyms. And again, we are basing this presentation on the previous webinar, which was held about two weeks ago. And so a lot of the acronyms that we are using are in our guidance or in various versions of our other presentations that we've had.

So if you're not familiar with certain acronyms that we're using, I'm more than willing to go back and review those if we have time at the end of the presentation. If you would include those in the chatroom so that we know specifically which acronyms you're referring to, we'll be happy to review those at the end.

And now we'll go back to Kellen, who will address additional questions -- some general questions that we've seen from the States, again, about reporting cut-off times and about training and reporting deadlines and notifications.

MR. GRODE: Yes. So looking at the first one is about we had mentioned on the previous webinar that for States that are wanting to test out their ability to report on eligible training providers using our workforce information performance integrated performance system, aka WIPS, we said if you are willing and able to and want to test out your reporting abilities, that you can do so right now. So I think that that's what this question is about. They're asking if there's a cut-off date when we would stop them from doing those submissions. And the short answer to that is no. There's not a cut-off date, at least not at this time.

I mean, we may decide at a later point to implement a cut-off date in order to prepare for the actual annual reports that are due October 1. But ultimately, I think our main concern as far as cut-off dates is the submission of those reports for program year 2018 being submitted by October 1 of 2019. As far as I know, on the technical side of things, there shouldn't be any issue with States that want to continue to do test submissions for, say, PY17 data, if that's what you're trying to do, or maybe it's PY16 if they want to try to upload to see if they make it through the various edit checks and that sort of thing. I believe that that should be fine.

I'll confirm with our technical folks to make sure. And if we do decide to put a cut-off date, we will definitely let folks now. But at this time we do not have one. The second question is who's responsible for notifying training providers of the reporting deadline -- the States or the local areas? This ties back, I think, to something that Christina talked about earlier on in the presentation today, which is that ultimately the responsibility for telling training providers what their responsibilities are is going to be left to the States now.

As far as how that communication goes, if the States say: All right, each of our local areas are responsible for sending this information to the providers in their area, I think that's something that they can do. But the State determines that policy. We're not, as the Department of Labor, going to tell local areas that they have to notify the providers in their area about their responsibilities. I think it's going to be up to the States to make that determination of how that communication works. So I think we're going back to Shelia for the next set of questions.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you, Kellen. And Christina, I'm going to pose these questions to you. These are additional questions that States submitted about their data collection challenges. And as everyone can see on the screen, people asked questions about gathering employment data of past students, wage data that's not available, and collecting data on non-WIOA students. So Christina, could you address those questions for us, please.

MS. ECKENROTH: Sure. I can try. So gathering employment data of past students -- I'm not exactly sure what folks were thinking about here, but if you're thinking about retroactively -- as TEGL 3-18 says, we're not only going reporting forward. We're not going retroactively. So we'll start and roll forward so you don't have to find out all this information about folks who exited previous to the reporting period.

Wage data not available in collecting data on non-WIOA students. So there are probably several challenges under each of those. I recommend that our State folks especially take a look at Training Employment Guidance Letter, which is our policy, 2616, Supplemental Wage Information Guidance. There's additional information about collecting wages -- collecting employment information where wage data is not available for any number of reasons.

And in terms of collecting data on non-WIOA students, I urge you to take a look at that attachment that was in your chat, as well as the attachment, it's the same TEGL[?] 3-18, which is you're not expected to have information about non-WIOA students. You're going to need to get some of that information from providers, again, if we're talking about wages. We'll talk a little bit more about the whole SSN situation and the wage matching, but you're going to need to work with providers for students that are not -- to get information for students who are not part of the WIOA program.

MS. LEWIS: Thank you, Christina. We've moved on to the next slide now. We're continuing the data collection challenges from States. And the questions continue about UI data, Social Security numbers. So those first three bullet points, would you address those. And actually on the FERPA question, I will address that question at the end. Christina?

MS. ECKENROTH: Absolutely. So I'll tackle these as well. So how do you handle wages for folks who are exempted from UI? And what if a provider doesn't collect or does not want to give SSNs? And again, same thing, if the SSNs are a concern for any kind of reason, what are your options? So reminder that if SSNs are not an option for any of the reasons -- you can't get the information from the provider, the person is not in the UI records -- there are other mechanisms.

And we outline those in TEGL 26-16, Training Employment Guidance Letter 26-16. And you can find all of our guidance -- there's a link at the end with some resources. But you can also find all of our guidance posted on our website at doleta.gov. So again, in terms of the FERPA implications, Shelia, what have you learned about that?

MS. LEWIS: Thank you, Christina. Specifically, as you can see there, our question was about community colleges that are reluctant to put programs on the eligible training provider list as they do reporting on all students violate the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, FERPA. Notice I'm spelling out our acronyms there. So what we did is we consulted our education colleagues into our FERPA expert. And I'm actually going to read to you their response because I want to make sure that we were getting correct, because we are not the experts in that field. But we did feel like we needed to provide a response to this question.

And I'm going to reference here TEGL 7-16, which is our joint guidance on data matching. So basically, the guidance suggests that institutions of post-secondary education may disclose without prior written student consent personally identifiable information, that is PII, contained in student's education records to State educational authorities, or their designated authorized representatives, which then may use the FERPA audit[?] or evaluation exception to consent to meet the eligible training provider reporting requirements under Section 115 of WIOA.

And there is a link to TEGL 7-16 at the end of this presentation. I encourage you to refer to that guidance. It's pretty extensive. It's about 70-plus pages long. And it does extensively address the data matching issue. And specifically, the section that I just referenced can be found on pages 13, 15, and page 30 of that piece of guidance. I hope that's helpful. We are not able to -- our FERPA representatives were not able to attend today's live event. But hopefully, if you reference that guidance, that will answer more questions that you may have. Moving on to our next slide, our next set of examples, and I'll cut it back to Christina, who will continue to talk more about our data collection challenges.

MS. ECKENROTH: Thanks, Shelia. So we have sort of a variety of things going on in this set of questions. There's something here about how do we help providers? Providers don't know how to define exit. They don't know when a person exits who's a WIOA participant. Good questions. Let's focus on so the State would know the information about a WIOA participant and when that participant's last date of service was applied retroactively after a 90-day gap. So that is something the State would need to track. The provider would not be responsible for knowing when a WIOA participant's last date of service was.

The next question is about wages that providers are struggling in this area. I encourage you to take a look at our Supplemental Wage Guidance and as well as work with your State to find potentially the solution that's going to work for you if you're a provider.

So the States are worried about the impact of providers who are new or are good providers, but they're not able to collect all the categories of performance data. So this is where the split between the requirements to be an approved provider on the list sort of lead into the requirements about reporting. As a quick reminder, there are requirements to get on the list to be an approved provider in a state. And once you are on the list as a provider, you are required to report. So the question about what if somebody -- or a good provider -- the State considers a good provider for whatever reason is not able to give us information on certain areas or not as much information as we want, etc.?

I'll just let you know that in the regulations, reference 20 CFR 680. So 20 CFR 680, two sections -- 450 and 460 talk about the process for getting on the list for new providers in programs and for getting continued eligibility for those who are already approved. And it just indicates that the State process -- which the State needs to have a process that's available to the public so all providers know how to apply -- the process must take into account performance accountability measures.

There's no mandate that a provider be removed for low performance or for not being able to report in a particular aspect, etc. That's really on to the State's process. There are lots of reasons why a provider might be kept on the list even if they had challenges. Maybe it's because they're the only provider of their type. Maybe it's a very rural area. Those are all detailed in the regulations in the guidance, so just to set your mind at ease there. OK. I think that addresses some of those general questions. And for that, I'm going to turn back to Shelia to talk about what's next.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you, Christina. Due to time checks, we have about 10 minutes left in our presentation. So we're going to defer to some of the questions in our chatroom. Kellen, do you want to take one of them?

MR. GRODE: Yeah. Well, I think I might take a few of them more generally, because I think we've got a lot that all can tie together. So one thing that I would remind people of is that a lot of the information that we've provided today is going more in depth on information that we provided in Part I, which we did on September 17th. You can find it if you go to Workforce GPS. If you want to look on the performance reporting community of practice on Workforce GPS, it's linked on there if you go under the Events tab and find it.

The other questions that I saw, a lot of the questions coming in were primarily about two things. They were about the provider's responsibilities for reporting to States, as well as how to get information that's not covered under a UI wage match, so supplemental wages. I think that we've addressed a lot of that today. But just as a reminder, States are responsible for telling providers how to report, what to report, and when to report it. If you're a provider and you haven't been told that by a State, we encourage you to reach out to your eligible training provider representative in the State.

I'm not sure if all of the providers that are on today are even on the eligible training provider list. As a reminder, the eligible training provider list is specifically for those training providers that want to be able to provide WIOA services for Title I participants that are receiving individual training accounts as their method of paying for their funding. So it's not going to be every single provider of education or training under WIOA. So it's only in that specific scenario that you need to be on the eligible training provider list, and therefore, responsible for submitting these reports.

On the supplemental question, as Christina mentioned a couple times in some of her answers, supplemental wage information guidance that we have provided can be found in Training Employment Guidance Letter 26-16. As far as who's responsible for collecting that data -- again, that's going to be determined by State policy. So some States may say that the providers are responsible for collecting supplemental data. In some States, the State may choose to take that responsibility on. Regardless of who takes that responsibility on, it must be in compliance with what's in 26-16 of the supplemental wage information.

And I know there's probably some questions about data validation, and so if and when the department puts out any sort of data validation requirements that would impact any of these measures, you're supplemental wage information collection should be in compliance with that as well. So that's sort of my general overview of a variety of the different questions that we received. I know we're running low on time, so I'm going to flip it back to Shelia to kind of give a few wrap-up points. And any other questions that we didn't get to, we'll look at those and we'll look at finding a way to get responses out to folks.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you, Kellen. Actually, we do have a few more minutes. Christina, was there a particular question that you wanted to respond to in the chatroom?

MS. ECKENROTH: Sure. There were a couple of questions that folks had about exits. And maybe I may have said something that was a little bit unclear for folks. A reminder that exit is defined as the last date of service applied retroactively after a 90-day gap. So the folks who are familiar with Title II, it's all the same. We have the same definition. There's not a new definition. Hopefully, folks understand that.

And in terms of a provider and a program new to the ETPL, some folks had a question about how do you report if you are not a new provider but you're adding a new program of study? Again, to Kellen's point, it has to be when you follow your State's requirements. And it has to do with when you were -- the program was approved. So it's not just providers -- it's also programs. Programs aren't required to report retroactively. So you are not required to report for a program that was -- until it's approved. And I think that's it for me, Shelia.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you, Christina. There is another question from the chatroom that I want to respond to. And that is about this joint guidance on data matching. Again, that's our TEGL number 7-16, which can be found on doleta.gov. There's also a link to it on Workforce GPS. And there's also a link to it on a later slide in this presentation. So we have about four minutes left, so I'll continue on with what's next for an ETP -- I went too fast there. So what's next?

We've had two webinars -- Part I and Part II. Part II, hopefully, went into a little more depth than Part I. And hopefully, we were able to answer a few more of your questions. Now, with respect to we were asked questions about will there be additional training either virtually or in person? For the training providers, that training would come from the State or local. That would be up to them. However, ETA will continue to develop some technical assistance for the States as time goes on and we see more need for technical assistance.

We do expect that States will continue to develop training and technical assistance for local areas and for training providers. Also, States should already be collecting data from your eligible training providers. If not, hopefully you can begin soon. And also, as Kellen mentioned earlier, you can also upload any test data into the WIPS system to run trial runs on your data. I believe that's open to do as long as the system's available. You're free to upload as many test runs as you desire. And the next steps, the most important one, I suppose, would be remember that the first reporting period for ETP reporting is October 1, 2019 -- not 2018, but 2019.

So moving on, we've referenced several resources today. Some of these are resources that were part of the last presentation, but some of these are newly added today. Again, TEGL 3-18 is the TEGL that this information is based on. And TEGL 41 -14 addresses ETP eligibility requirements. That's TEGL 41-14 Change 1.

We also talk a little bit about TEGL 10-16 Change 1 and that information is on our comprehensive performance guide, our joint guides of education. And in that guidance, you'll find information about the PIRL. And the PIRL is the participant individual record layout. There's TEGL 26-16, which we also discussed today on the use of supplemental wage information, and TEGL 7-16, the data matching TEGL, our joint guidance with education that I just mentioned.

The next page is pretty much the same information as in the last piece of webinar. I just wanted to remind you that all of this information is available on WorkforceGPS, the resource landing page for eligible training provider reporting. And also, I want to remind you that there's also an ETP topic of discussion page where you can join the discussion group. You can upload questions, challenges, strategies to share with your colleagues. So we hope that you will able to use that information and use that resource.

If you have additional questions on eligible training provider reporting, please submit those to: ETAPerforms@dol.gov. And any questions related to WIPS reporting should be forwarded to WIOA.Feedback@dol.gov. That ends today's presentation. If you have any other questions, please be sure to send those to us electronically via those two websites as appropriate.

And thank you for attending today's discussion and have a great evening.

(END)