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Overview

Course Overview

The UI National Integrity Academy’s Fraud Investigations Certificate includes three elements:

- UI Integrity Fundamentals for Fraud Investigations (eLearning module)
- Identify Fraud, Fictitious Employer Schemes, and Fraudulent Employer Schemes (online simulations)
- Basic UI Fraud Investigations (instructor-led course)

This report presents the results of the Basic UI Fraud Investigations pilot course, which was delivered November 1-3, 2016, at the Maryland DLLR office in Baltimore, Maryland.

This three-day course focuses on the UI fraud investigation process in the context of case studies and scenarios to promote critical thinking and successful strategies that learners can apply to investigate single-claimant UI fraud cases and make final determinations.

Pilot Participants

Although the course is designed for UI fraud investigators, the 23 pilot participants came from various UI backgrounds, including administrator, litigator, criminal investigator, and data analyst. The group as a whole averaged 13.5 years of UI experience.

Pilot Evaluation Strategy

To evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot course, all 23 participants provided feedback at the end of each day. They provided quantitative data by rating their responses to specific questions on a scale of one to five. Participants also provided qualitative data in the form of open-response comments.

Evaluations focused on the following areas:

- Course Overall
- Course Content
- Course References
- Course Activities

The feedback received from the participants was overwhelmingly positive in all areas.

This document presents quantitative data illustrated through pie charts along with anecdotal comments from the participants for each evaluation area.
Course Overall

Quantitative Data

Overall, the pilot course was well received. As shown by the chart below, all participants responded that they would recommend the course to others who do UI fraud investigations.

![Chart showing recommendation likelihood](chart.png)

Qualitative Data

Participants provided the following impressions of the course overall:

- “Great training - especially for new fraud investigators.”
- “Excellent program; very informative and educational on multiple aspects for any job. The knowledge acquired will definitely help me perform my job better.”
- “[This course is] valuable to all levels and professions. Great opportunity!”
- “This 3-day course was excellent! I enjoyed every lesson. It is a great training tool for new investigators as well as a refresher for seasoned investigators.”
Course Content

Quantitative Data

Participants were asked how well the training improved their knowledge/skills in each content area presented during the training. The pie chart below includes the evaluation data from all three days of training.

The pie chart shows that 99% of the participants felt that the training improved their knowledge/skills to some degree with 60% reporting that the training “greatly improved” their knowledge/skills. The reason that 9% of participants reported that the training had “somewhat improved” their knowledge/skills or “had no effect” may have two explanations:

1. First, since the participants’ job roles varied considerably, specific content might not have been applicable to certain job roles, as the course focuses on single claimant fraud investigations.
2. Second, the participants as a whole had a great deal of UI experience, and the course is designed for those new to UI fraud investigations.

![Pie chart showing evaluation data of training impact]
Qualitative Data

Based on evaluation feedback, an especially valuable part of the training for many participants, regardless of their job, was the PEACE\(^1\) Model, a non-confrontational approach to conducting fact-finding interviews.

Participants’ remarks on course content included the following:

- “Loved this training today. Learned a lot of tips on interviewing, especially in person interviews. The PEACE model’s name is fitting for non-confrontational interviewing! It is a great learning tool.”
- “PEACE Model was my favorite. [It is a] dynamic model for every level of expertise. [I] will use as my lead for completing interviews and employer audits.”
- “The content was great. Learned new interview techniques.”
- “Questioning difficult people was great.”
- “The content was very helpful for me to use in my job conducting investigations.”
- “The content was excellent especially for [those] new to fraud investigations.”

\(^1\) The PEACE model is an internationally recognized method of investigative interviewing. PEACE stands for Preparation/planning, Engage/explain, Account, clarify & challenge, Closure and Evaluation.
Course References

Quantitative Data

Ten course references were created to help participants back on the job. References include the following:

- PEACE Model Checklist
- Case Report Writing Checklist
- Common “Red Flags”
- Data Sources
- Internet Search Tools for UI Fraud Investigations

Note: The pie chart below includes data regarding the usefulness of all ten references.

The pie chart shows that 99% of the participants felt that the course references would be helpful on the job to some degree, with 75% reporting that the references would be “very helpful.” The reason that 6% of participants reported that the references would be “somewhat helpful” or “not likely to be helpful” may be due to the fact that the participants came from differing UI roles, and some references may not apply to specific jobs outside of claimant fraud investigations.
Qualitative Data

Several participants stated that the course references were their favorite part of the course and that they will be very valuable for future use.

Participants’ remarks on course references included the following:

- “Common ‘red flags’ is especially important in all aspects of UI, claims, tax, contributions, etc.”
- “I like how the posters\(^2\) are in our reference section to keep for future use.”
- “Very helpful. I will treasure the internet search tools.”
- “The references were/are very helpful tools.”
- “I am going to post them in my desk.”
- “Often we are in a hurry and guides are great for a quick reference to make sure we have what [we need for the next step].”

\(^2\) The visual aids and other classroom tools were provided to each learner in a comprehensive course materials package. The materials package included: copies of group activity reference posters, tools and desk aides as well as copies of the PowerPoint presentation slide deck.
Course Activities

Quantitative Data

Throughout the three-day course, participants were engaged in group activities that reinforced the course content. Through these activities, participants were able to practice using the strategies and materials provided in everyday UI situations.

The pie chart below represents consolidated data regarding each activity in which the participants were engaged during the training. Almost all of the participants reported that the group activities helped them to understand the materials.

* Answer categories < 1% are not shown
Qualitative Data

The group activities received an overwhelmingly positive response from the participants, especially the case studies, which provided the opportunity for participants to work on a real-life case in which they review data, develop theories and an evidence-gathering plan, analyze data, decide next steps, and make a final determination.

Additionally, participants were given the opportunity to practice interviewing techniques through two role-playing activities during which one participant played the role of the interviewer, and the other, the respondent.

Participants’ remarks on course activities included the following:

• “The case studies were very fun and engaging. The real life case scenarios helped me to see the other side of UI (benefits). I learned more about benefits side.”
• “The case study was the best method of developing an understanding of the full process.”
• “The diverse audience helped others learn more from the experience of the other participants.”
• “I really enjoyed the group activities. I liked how we were taken outside our comfort zones and grouped with individuals from other units. The class activities and games were great as well.”
• “I like working in individual and small groups to get the knowledge and experience from those in other units/areas of UI.”
• “Role playing is always great practice!”
Suggested Improvements

Regarding improvements, participants’ comments focused on instructional time.

Breaks and length of course: A couple of participants recommended adding more breaks during the day, and then increasing the course to four days. The course is scheduled for eight hours each day, with a 15-minute morning break, a one-hour lunch, and a 15-minute afternoon break. This schedule provides 6.5 hours of instructional time each day, which is common for adult instructor-led courses. In addition, providing the course in three days allows participants one travel day to the course and another travel day back home, within a one-week window. We believe this time commitment will be necessary for many participants.

Time for activities: Some participants also suggested providing more time for individual and group exercises. Activity timing is an important element that was tracked during the pilot course. Estimating the actual time for these activities is a challenge and could not accurately be determined until they were run with actual course participants. The course designer carefully noted activities where additional time is required, and will add time as necessary to specific activities in future sessions.

Next Steps

The results of the evaluation validated the overall design of the Basic UI Fraud Investigations instructor-led course. The training team will make minor “tweaks” to course materials, and the schedule. The final version of the course will be available in January 2017.