UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

QUARTERLY MEETING DAY 1

Wednesday March 24, 2010

+ + + + +

St. Louis, Missouri

The Quarterly Meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel convened at 8:30 a.m., pursuant to notice, in the Colonnade Ballroom, 13th Floor, Sheraton St. Louis City Center, 400 South 14th Street, St. Louis, Missouri, Mary Barros-Bailey, Chair, presiding.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY BARROS-BAILEY, Chair, Ph.D.
ROBERT T. FRASER, Ph.D.
SHANAN GWALTNEY GIBSON, Ph.D.
THOMAS A. HARDY, J.D.
H. ALLAN HUNT, Ph.D.
SYLVIA E. KARMAN
DEBORAH E. LECHNER
ABIGAIL T. PANTER, Ph. D.
DAVID J. SCHRETLEN, Ph.D.
NANCY G. SHOR, J.D.
MARK A. WILSON, Ph.D.

ALSO PRESENT:

DEBRA TIDWELL-PETERS, Designated Federal Official
DEBBIE HARKIN, Staff
MICHAEL Dunn, Staff
ELIZABETH KENNEDY, Staff
SHIRLEEN ROTH, Staff

A G E N D A

CALL TO ORDER
STATUS-PANEL SEPTEMBER 2009 RECOMMENDATIONS
PANEL DISCUSSION
BREAK111
PANEL DISCUSSION111
PUBLIC COMMENT143
AD TOTTON 166

PROCEEDINGS

(9:37:41 a.m.)

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: My name Debra Tidwell-Peters, and I am the Designated Federal Officer for the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel of the Social Security Administration. We'd like to welcome you to the second meeting of I will now Fiscal Year 10, and turn meeting over to the Panel Chair, Dr. Barros-Bailey. Mary.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,

Debra. Good morning, everybody. How is

everybody doing this morning? Okay.

I'd like to thank you for your attendance, live or telephonically, to our second Quarterly Meeting, and wanted to note that Gunnar is out of the country on an emergency, so he won't be with us during this Quarterly Meeting.

For those listening in remotely, to follow our agenda, please go to our website,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

www.ssa.gov/oidap for a copy of the agenda to follow along. And for those who are attending our meeting for the first time, or who might be interested in activities and deliberations of the panel in our past meetings, if you go to our meeting page that I just announced, the SSA.gov/oidap, you can click on Past Agendas, hotlink, download the and PowerPoint presentations from those sites. And you can also look at the website for technical papers, and our first report by this panel delivered to the Commissioner in September 2009.

As we indicate at the start of each the meeting, the charter of Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel, OIDAP, is provide the Social Security to Administration with independent advice for the development recommendations Occupational Information system to replace the Dictionary of Occupational Titles in Disability Determination process.

As you all know, our task is not to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

develop the OIS, itself. It is, instead, as implies, provide advisory our name to recommendations. Of critical importance that I really want to point out on our home page is to encourage public feedback and comment upon the report that we deliver to the Commissioner in September. Although we welcome input from stakeholders and the public at any point along our process, to help streamline input into the September report, we're strongly encouraging feedback from all sources by May 21st, 2010.

Following review to our September report, Commissioner Astrue further requested our assistance in providing SSA with recommendations in four areas. These included recommendations in developing sampling collection plans for data research development, recommendations for the creation of process recruit job analysts, to including methods for certification criteria and training. Third was recommendations for establishing associations between human

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

functions, and the requirements of work that would serve the Disability Evaluation Process.

And fourth was recommendations for reviewing relevant documents, or reports that SSA identifies that may affect or inform SSA's work on the development of the OIS.

In our review of the agenda for this meeting, we will discuss plans and activities toward accomplishing these requests. If we look at the agenda for today, we are going to start off with a presentation by Sylvia Karman and myself in terms of the Social Security Administration project activities, and the integration with panel activities in terms of the roadmap.

We will also then be deliberating about these, and then go into presentations by Nancy Shor, the Chair of the User Needs and Relations Subcommittee, and also Mark Wilson, the Chair of the Research Subcommittee.

We will have public comment. I think at this point, we still only have one

NEAL R. GROSS

person that has signed up for public comment, so we anticipate that we will probably be ending the meeting early right after that public comment instead of going to the 3:00 period.

And then going into tomorrow, we will be having a presentation by Margaret Hilton and Tom Plewes from the National Academies of Science in terms of their report, the panel report regarding the review of the O*NET, and deliberation on that report, as well.

So, welcome, and I will turn this over to Sylvia to start us off.

MEMBER KARMAN: All right, everyone. Good morning. I just realized I need to pull this over so I can talk a little bit.

Basically, what I was hoping to do today is just give you a brief overview of what our staff has been working on since we last met in January, and, also, how that is --

NEAL R. GROSS

how that work is really incorporating a number of the recommendations that the panel made in 2009, and then what next steps for the project. And then Mary is also going to discuss how that integrates with what the panel is going to be working on, or is, frankly, working on at this point.

All right. So, one of the initial projects that we've been diligently pursuing is the Occupational Medical Vocational Study. For those of you who are listening in, or are here today and are not familiar with this study, basically, the -- our team is taking a look at the reviewed claims at the initial level and the Appellate level, at approximately -- we're doing a proportional sample, so we're looking a little over 3,800 initial-level cases, reviewed at the State Disability Determination Services, as well as a little over 1,100 Administrative Law Judge reviewed cases. And the idea there is to collect a variety of information. One is to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

look at what type of jobs people typically have when they apply for disability, so what is their past relevant work, what kinds of occupations are most frequently represented among the population of claimants that we see at Steps 4 and 5. And that information would be very helpful to us in terms of targeting, at least initially, the type of occupations we should look at first. So, that's one area of information we're looking for.

We're also interested in what the - what we're calling the Medical Vocational
Profile, is of individuals who apply for
disability, and the final decision outcome, so
we may want to look at what the -- what we
call the limitations, were the physical or
mental limitations documented in these cases,
and the decision outcomes, what vocational
rule may have applied, and when it was
necessary, what jobs did the Agency cite as
examples of work that the individual could
still do, if it was a Step 5 decision, or at

NEAL R. GROSS

Step 4, what job, in fact, were we recommending as work that was indicative of their ability to continue to have function to do.

So, quickly, right -- we've just finished the Pilot Study. We did a pilot of about 120 initial-level case files. These are electronic cases, so the beauty of that is that we don't -- that's easy to pull up and review. We do have а data collection instrument, which able pull we were to together that has about 72 items.

Now, some of the 72 items potentially involve a number of multiple responses, so you could have, possibly, as much as 115 different responses. But for - the more straightforward approach to this is really there's about 72 questions on there, so we're looking at a number of data elements.

And we revised our data collection instrument, and some of the protocol based on the pilot, just to clarify a few things that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

came up during our Pilot Study. And we're beginning the full-blown study later this week, so I think we should be underway finishing this up by the summer. So, that's that study.

The next one is what we're calling the OIS Design Study I. One thing I want to point out is that this is not the Pilot Study. Now, for those of you who have been following the panel's recommendations, the panel had recommended in 2009 that the Agency pursue a This is a precursor to the pilot, so before we even get to going out to do a pilot, we believe that we had some actual design questions that we needed to tackle. only that, but this also gives us an opportunity to examine some of the operational issues, just how one would conduct job analyses, recruiting individuals to do that, training them, finding the occupations in the So, economy. there are а number of operational issues that we need to pursue.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And this Design Study, this initial gives us an opportunity to do that, as well as to test some technical design issues, so that move into the Pilot phase in the we following year, we would be in a position to document why we've pursued certain design decisions based on the results this particular study.

It also gives us an opportunity to look at some sampling issues, which we've discussion with the already begun Research Subcommittee, well the Taxonomy as as Subcommittee, so there's some work involved there. I think that the panel will be helping with later on this year in terms us sampling issues.

So, once we've completed the draft study design, we intend to share that with not only the two Subcommittees, but really the entire panel for their review and comment, as well as our internal Social Security Workgroup. So, both the panel, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Workgroup will have an opportunity to weigh in on that. We expect to conduct the study in Fiscal Year 2011.

The next investigation, or project that we have underway is a look at classification systems used are internationally. And this really grew out of a series of questions that we've been asked by some of our senior executives in the Agency, as well as others outside of the Agency. we're examining what we've been countries around Frankly, a number of world actually do use the DOT, so we're just checking in to see if, well, is that really true? And, also, otherwise, what other things -- what other classification systems are they using, and in what way? Because we're anticipating that if they were, in interested in trying to make the kinds of decisions with occupational information that Social Security tries to make, that's probably why they are not using some of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

econometric-level data systems, but that remains to be seen. So, we are, in fact, conducting interviews with number а of officials already in Canada, and with International Labor Organization. We're also talking with people in the European Union, Australia, New Zealand. We're following up now with some of the contacts that we've had just to get additional information beyond what we started with.

Some of the questions that we had, for example, in terms of how do you use the information in disability programs required our contact to go back and get that information. We expect a draft report in June, and a final report in August, which, again, of course, will be shared with the panel.

And something that actually has been taking -- another feature that our staff has been working on is just drafting the content model. And, in this case, the content model is -- right now consists of a draft of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what we're considering to be mostly the person side aspect of work that would we interested in gathering. What our staff has done is synthesize not only the panel's recommendations, but all of the user needs analyses that we did over the summer, some of which was incorporated in the panel's recommendations in the Appendices.

We've also taken a lot of stakeholder information, external stakeholder stakeholder information, well as SSA as information and combined all of that. basically, synthesized that so that we could pull together what all of the different comments were, try to get at where there was duplication. But, for the most part, didn't really want to screen a lot of that, so it was quite a lengthy document.

Last week, our staff, working with the Social Security OIS Development Work Group, met for an entire day to begin the process of calling the long list of content

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

model person side elements. We do have a job
site, but we have not filled that in. That's
not at this stage of the game what we're
working on. And we got through as much as
most, if not all, of the physical attributes
on the person side. The work group and our
staff are planning to meet again in a few
weeks to continue that process. And from
that, our staff is going to take and attempt
to categorize a lot of the physical elements
into whatever domains, categories, run that
past the work group, and then from there,
whatever comments come back, make those
revisions. Then work from that to develop a
draft of a person side instrument that would
enable us to then also develop something on
the work side. So, really the bottom line is,
we're trying to pull together all of the
elements that are of most interest to Social
Security that we believe we need to know about
on the work side that involves something that
we assess on the person. So, that's where we

NEAL R. GROSS

are with that. We're expecting to complete the draft content model in May. As soon as we have something that has been reviewed within the Agency, and by the work group, we will intend to share that with all of you.

Then, for communications, this is another pretty substantive area for because there's a lot going on, and there's a lot of change in terms of what the Agency is undertaking with this project. So, a number of the recommendations, actually, all of the recommendations that the panel made in the things that our staff is are now investigating, and a lot of work has also been going on with the User Needs and Relations Panel Subcommittee.

We are engaged with the Chief Information Officer's office staff to define a lot of web-based requirements for this project. A number of you may be familiar with an initiative called "Open Government." There is already with Social Security a website that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

may become available to us in early April, and we would like to use this project as sort of a sample, or an example of something that could be opened up on this website. It would really give, I guess, our stakeholders externally an opportunity to have a place to go to provide comments. The comments can be made — that would be available on line, so I think that there's a lot of possibility there.

We are, also, exploring the Federal issue, Register Notice so that is under advisement now among our senior executives. are, also, scheduling -- we And we scheduled recording of on-demand webinars. do an enormous amount. Some of you have already been involved in this, and thank you to those of you who've tackled this, attending a number of presentations or conferences and giving presentations on what the panel recommendations have been, what Social Security is working on now, so we usually send either myself, or someone else from our staff

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to be there with the panel member. But, basically, we are also recording some webinars to make that available to people that could download that. It certainly helps us in terms of not needing to be in all places at all times. So, we'll see how well that goes. So, we're planning to be recording those shortly.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

And we also have some fact sheets. Thank you to those of you who have done that. I know Shanan has done a lot of work in that And we're making those fact sheets available. I think this is just sort of, again, a follow-up to what we discussed in Dallas, that it would be helpful for a number of reasons if we could focus some of the more complex or difficult areas or topics that people have the most interest in, and put some FAQs out there for people to download, and would Maybe that be а lot accessible than some of the information we have to-date.

So, I know I've been talking to a few of you about the possibility of giving us some topics for other areas of FAQs that either you are aware of, or, perhaps, others have indicated are just topics that people are having a difficult time understanding exactly what we're meaning.

So, really the next steps that we have develop functional are to our requirements. We already have a working paper that looks at our overall plans for what the for desian elements the Occupational Information System could be, and what the ramifications of that, what the implications of that might be, so we are needing to really develop overall plan and functional an requirements for the OIS that we would want to share with a number of interested offices and stakeholders within the Agency, and then, as well, with the panel. So, that's something that we're concerned about, and working on.

Also, using the content model

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

prototype, later this year we're working toward developing the instruments that would be necessary for us to collect information. So, that would be person side, indicating what it is that we are concerned about evaluating, or would like to collect data about in the world of work. And then what the job analysis instruments would actually look like, so that's -- these are two areas that we need to focus on.

And, in addition, we would need to be developing a recruitment plan for job analysts, as well as training and certification criteria, so we are beginning work on that, and Mary is going to talk a little bit more about what the implications are for the panel with that.

The next steps for our project in 2010, of course, would be the OIS Design Study, so we're beginning the preparation for that. So, when we talk about job analysts at this stage of the game, we know we're talking

NEAL R. GROSS

about a small group that would be useful to conduct that test, and we can use experience of what might be needed moving forward, so that when we get to the stage of doing a pilot, we already have some experience under our belt with regard to what are we up against with training, what are we up against lot with recruitment? Α of those the design operational issues, as well as elements.

And then, as I mentioned before, model, functional requirements, content development of instruments, and just continue to focus on how are we communicating? What kinds of issues are important to us panel, important to us as an Agency for our project? is it How that we want to expressing what we're doing, what strategies might we need moving forward to make the connections with people who are stakeholders, lot of interest in what we're who have a doing, and what concerns are among the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

stakeholder communities? What are we hearing about that people have a lot of questions about? So, we have a lot of work ahead of us, and I think this is where Mary can jump in. Thanks.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Before I go into the review of the panel roadmap, maybe if anybody has questions for Sylvia at this point? Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: I just have a quick one. With all the research and papers you guys are doing, I recognize that you have to get them cleared before they can be shared with us, but after yesterday, when we were talking about ethics as SGEs, aren't we kind of within the Agency? Would you be able to check and see if there's some way of us getting some sort of extra approval to look at those, as opposed to waiting until they're all the way through?

MEMBER KARMAN: It's not really a matter of approval. It's really a matter of

NEAL R. GROSS

getting it through our staff so that our staff
is actually at a point where we're comfortable
delivering something that we feel we're in a
position to discuss. So, a lot of the work
that we're doing at this stage has been rather
informal, for example, with the Research
Subcommittee, when we are trying to tackle a
particular problem, or issue, we may be in a
position to ask some questions, and get some
sort of early feedback. But the thing is, in
order to share something with the entire
panel, we're automatically making it public,
so it's really not so much about you being an
SGE, it's about the public process of FACA.
So, I, personally, as manager for this, I'd
prefer it if we were in a position to be able
to deliver something to the panel as a whole
that would be something that, I think, that
our management would be fairly comfortable
sharing publicly. So, I kind of feel like it
has to, at least, get through a certain level
of development, rather than just giving things

NEAL R. GROSS

out before they're really fully thought through.

MEMBER HARDY: That makes sense.
Thanks.

MEMBER KARMAN: Thanks.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions? That's a perfect seque. Thank you, Tom, for the question, because I think it takes us to the next PowerPoint slide in terms And in your packet, I'm not sure of review. what tab it is, but you'll recognize from the January meeting that we had the roadmap, it looks the same, except there are a couple of things that are different about it. In January, I had indicated that I would be going through and assigning subcommittees to each of these line items. That has happened. And then the dates column has been reflected in terms of a -- a little bit differently in terms of start dates. We have status. of them have already ended, some of them are in the works, so it's a reflection of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

changing time line there. Does everybody have a copy of it? Okay. Tab 2, okay. So, everybody is there.

Before we go through and review this, and I'm going to do it by function, I want to really make sure that people understand when it says "review," what it really means, because there are three different levels of what is meant by review.

In a couple of instances, review just means a presentation of something that the staff has done. For example, Sylvia talked about the International OIS. That's something that staff is investigating. They're going to be sharing it with us. had a couple of those instances in the past, so we're just going to be, basically, reviewing it because it's coming to us.

There's a second level of review which is more advisory, and it's something that the staff is working on, but they might want some feedback from us at a level, such

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as, perhaps, the OccMed Study, that type of thing. And then there's a third level that is a little bit more involved, and that's more consultative. And that's like the OIS Design Study with the Research Subcommittee, where there's some interchange back and forth with the staff as they're working out some issues, and some problems. But none of those, none of these three review require a deliverable from the panel. And I know that after September people are kind of gun shy about what does this mean, and am I going to have to produce another 750-page report? So, I just want to kind of ease some concerns there, and make that all recovering sure are from we September, that when it says "review," that is what is meant by that.

Let's see. Let's go ahead and go to the next slide before, again, we go to the detail. Now, there are some deliverables that are on our table, and let's talk about those a little bit before we get into the roadmap.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deliverables? So, what are the The deliverables pretty well spelled are When we had the letter from the Commissioner that came to us in January, there were four very well spelled out that SSA asking for us in terms of our advice recommendations to them. And I know that we're all very passionate about what we're just doing, but to make sure that we understand that it is advice and recommendations in these areas.

The first is the development of a sampling and data collection plan for Research and Development. As we'll see in the roadmap that we're going into, that is something that -- there's some inkling of that going on right now, but in terms of a longer term time line, that's further out there.

The next is the creation of a process for the recruitment, training, and certification of job analysts. And later on this morning, I'm going to go ahead and have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Deb Lechner introduce the ad hoc group that is going to be working on that.

The third thing is the establishment -- the recommendations for the establishment associations, of or linkages between human functions and the requirements of work that serve the Disability Evaluation So, as we're going through the Process. roadmap, we're going to be seeing recommendations there in terms of roundtables and activities toward that end.

The fourth deliverable is advice from the OIDAP to SSA on relevant documents or reports that SSA identifies that may affect or inform SSA's work on the OIS. And tomorrow, as everybody knows, the National Academies of Science will be presenting to us on the O*NET report that was identified by SSA as one of those external reports they would like us to review and provide feedback on. And then, obviously, the last thing that is identified in that letter, and it's a function that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

happens more in terms of the administrative team, is the Annual Report of Activities on what we've done that's due in November.

just want to reiterate what we talked about in January, which was the two main going kind of interdisciplinary subcommittees that we have are User Needs and Relations, and Research. The work side, and the person side, so the Taxonomy, Physical Demands and Mental Cognitive Subcommittees are Those have not gone away. all in tact. we're going through the roadmap, we'll areas that each of the subcommittees are going to be more involved with. And before we go through the roadmap in greater detail, I just want to also identify that the administrative team will be teleconferencing with the chairs of each of those subcommittees to be able to then go through in a lot more detail a plan for each of the subcommittees, so it's a lot more integrated. So, there will be greater detail in terms of our work plan for each of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the subcommittees moving forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Let's see. One of the things that is not on that slide, but we will see, and I little bit mentioned а is the issue of roundtables that have been identified to-date. And there might be more, depending on needs moving forward. And what are the deliverables there? We've already had a couple of roundtables, so we have a really good prototype of what's going to look like. It won't be 750 pages long. It probably won't even be the length of a subcommittee report. Basically, Ι think Tom is the one t.hat. introduced the concept of the four-square document for the first roundtable that was done, which is helping to structure what is the concept, and what are the needs for the roundtable, helping, recruiting people to be part of that roundtable, and having some sort of short report process at the end of roundtable in terms of findings. So, that's the extent of the deliverables in terms of the

roundtable process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Before I head into looking at the roadmap in a lot more detail, are there any questions?

I thought I might MEMBER KARMAN: mention this, because when Mary and I were talking about this earlier, it occurred to one of us that, or to both of us that the language here, deliverables using that we're recommendations from the panel to SSA about the development of sampling, data collection, the creation of -- so, in other words, the panel is not expected to develop, create, do these things. You all would be in a position to provide the recommendations on it, and I just thought I would mention that, because it occurred to us that maybe that wasn't clear.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And, also, a lot of times, the public thinks that we, the panel, are developing the OIS, so it kind of clarifies it, that it's SSA that's developing the OIS, and we're providing advice and

recommendations to that process. Go ahead, Alan.

MEMBER HUNT: Can you say a little bit more about the four-square, because I do not understand that concept.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

MEMBER HUNT: Just quickly.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom, do you want to describe that? He doesn't. Okay. The four-square document, I think that's what we're calling it, is kind of the parameters or the purpose of a roundtable, and what are the framework, the conceptual framework that is guiding that roundtable.

MEMBER KARMAN: Actually, another example of that was what we did with -- what David and Bob did with the Mental Cognitive Subcommittee roundtable last summer, in which case, basically framed the questions for the people who were attending the roundtable, some of the panel members who were coming to the roundtable, as well as some of the external --

NEAL R. GROSS

other external experts, non-panel experts who were invited, so that everybody understood really what the focus was for the day, or two days, whatever. In this case, it was just a day, and what the result would -- what purpose would be, what the goals were, objectives were for that particular roundtable. And I thought that, as an example, that particular roundtable is a good example. So, we'd be happy to share that with you, Alan, because I have a suspicion I know why you're asking, because there's roundtables on here that you will have an interest in.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Are there any other questions before we kind of go through this in a lot more detail? Okay. And I don't know if we, necessarily, need to go through every single item in terms of each of the functions. I do want to point out that the very last page, page 6, there is an error, there's a duplication there. The very first one that says, "Person side data collection,"

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and then it says, "Job side data collection," there isn't a person side data collection in terms of the review for plans to identify potential methods for data collection in terms of ad hoc work group, so I just want to point out that that's a duplication that shouldn't be there. Okay. Was that clear? Okay. The very last page, page 6, the very first item. Okay.

Now, as we are kind of moving through this, I just want to maybe globally go function-by-function. And some of these are very straightforward. Communications, I don't think it's a big surprise that the items here would be, for the most part, within User Needs and Relations in terms of working with Nancy, and her Subcommittee with the different items that are involved here. So, Nancy is going to be talking later in terms of reporting where everything is in terms of that.

I think the only item within Communication that User Needs and Relations

NEAL R. GROSS

doesn't deliver specifically is the Annual Report to the Social Security Administration. That's a function more of the administrative team, and that would be myself, and Sylvia, and Debra Tidwell-Peters in terms of putting that together for the November delivery.

Moving on to the content model, and it would be -- some of these things have already happened. Last meeting had Shirleen Roth and Mike Dunn delivering the SSA User Needs analysis, reviewing the OIS Design Study, some of the things that Sylvia already pointed out. The Lessons Learned Working Paper expected to be completed this spring, that we'll probably see in June, I'm assuming. And then drafting of various things that we've seen Sylvia talk about in terms of how they fit into the content model development.

And then, you know, moving into the instrument development and testing, which is the big process coming up, and the job side, the linkage, and this is kind of the heart of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it, is that when we look at what's involved, and if we see all the subcommittees involved it's everybody, it's Research, There are some elements here that Taxonomy. are going to involve the Physical and the Mental Cognitive review, some of the things possibly coming through from the feedback we get from users might need to have a review by those consultative subcommittees, as come through, depending on what the need is So, you can see there's a lot of from SSA. activity there from lot of а groups with Research, probably, and Taxonomy being the two lead subcommittees within that.

Job analysis and sampling plans directly goes to the very first bullet that we have in terms of deliverables back to SSA. If you could see those dates there, they're later on in terms of the process. There's the second item there, the Roundtable on Labor Market Information Sampling Plans, which is probably what Alan was asking some questions

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about, in terms of coming up with some of those concepts directly related, again, to bullet number one. So, Research and Taxonomy being very involved in that process.

And then other, we put other, but, obviously, very involved, and job side data collection, that is the field job analysts, if that's not real clear there in terms of bullet number two from the Commissioner. And then the other being the National Academies of Science report. And we're also anticipating that we may need to have a roundtable to look at more technical matters, as those may emerge from that process.

That's a basic overview of where we getting lot detailed, are, and a more talk probably, as we to each of you individually. Are there any questions? Any thoughts?

MEMBER HUNT: It's going to be a very busy summer.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: It will be a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

very busy summer. But we don't have a huge report due at the very end. Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: I'm just looking for clarification on the roundtable for the NAS report. What are you kind of thinking about that, because it's the first I've heard, and could you flesh it out a little bit?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I'm sorry. I think I have my cell going on.

Τ think I mentioned that reviewed the -- myself, I have lot questions in terms of things that are involved in that report that relate to advice and recommendations we be asked to give, or are asked to give specific to probably pages 11 and 12 of our own report, which is Occupational Data needs of SSA. So, I have questions about sampling, I have questions --I mean, I think I mentioned before that I've only summarized all but six out of the ten 22 chapters, and I have pages worth questions typed out. So, I don't know if,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	necessarily, we'll have a chance to get
2	everything addressed tomorrow. So, is there a
3	need, possibly, to have a more technical look
4	at these questions in terms of a roundtable?
5	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: This may be sort
6	of out of place timewise, but do we know
7	what we've reviewed is a pre-publication
8	copy. Do we know when the final report will
9	come out yet?
10	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: We've been
11	told that it's supposed to be finalized April
12	of this year, and the Margaret and Tom
13	presenting to us tomorrow can give us a
14	briefing of what changes will occur in the
15	final, so they're ready to brief us on that
16	tomorrow.
17	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And have they
18	indicated whether there might be any further
19	changes after this meeting, or is it at
20	this point, they're committed to the final
21	text?

NEAL R. GROSS

BARROS-BAILEY:

CHAIR

22

my

It's

understanding they're committed, at this point.

MEMBER KARMAN: Getting to the question that Tom raised, the more roundtable, or an opportunity to talk about some of the more technical aspects of One of the things, I think, would be very helpful for Social Security would be for us to -- for the panel to provide SSA with a review of the NAS Final Report, and the implications of that report the Occupational Information development of an System tailored for our needs.

So, for example, I know that there were a number of recommendations throughout the NAS report to the Department of Labor in its development of a classification system having to do with sampling, having to do with data collection, having to do with and just a variety of descriptors, that, frankly, are issues that we will need to tackle, what do those as well. So,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recommendations mean for our purposes, even though a lot of our design decisions, because we have a different mission, and a different purpose than the Department of Labor did, and does for O*NET, we, nonetheless, have some areas to take a look at, so what does that report really mean for our purposes? So, I think that's really where we're headed with that. And a lot of that information may be far more detailed than we could probably cover tomorrow with the NAS representatives.

MEMBER HARDY: I think my question was kind of the softball question for you, but I was just more curious as to what you saw as a process, who you'd be inviting, how you'd envision it working. But I agree there's so much information in there that we need to look at and respond to, there's got to be a way of getting to it. I was just curious as to process.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions? Okay. Well, we're rolling

NEAL R. GROSS

right through this. We thought there would be a lot more questions than there are.

You know, I'm going to take maybe this a little bit out of turn before we go into a break. One of the things, or one of the bullets up there, the second one was the recommendations from the OIDAP to SSA in terms of the creation of a process for recruiting I have asked Deb Lechner to job analysts. chair the ad hoc group providing SSA with recommendations advice and within that process, so maybe if I can ask Deb to talk a little bit about that, and also to introduce the members of that ad hoc group.

MEMBER LECHNER: Thanks, Mary.

Well, it's a newly formed group. I think we had our first meeting this morning. Bob Fraser, and Shanan Gibson, and I met with Mary and Sylvia over breakfast to get a little bit of guidance about the direction that this ad hoc group should take. And, once again, we will be providing recommendations regarding

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

developing a team of job analysts. And our
first task is to get some preliminary
recommendations to Sylvia over the next three
weeks in terms of what things should be
considered as we develop, or as SSA develops a
team of analysts. And there will be a pilot
team that gets developed, I understand, of
approximately, we're thinking Sylvia
thinking in the neighborhood of a couple of
hundred analysts, initially, and then later
expanded to be a much larger team. And the
considerations that we discussed this morning
in our meeting were things like training,
certification, what professional groups have
the background and training for being a
potential pool from whom analysts could be
identified, and then subsequently trained and
certified. So, we will be making
recommendations about all those issues that
impact training and certification.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Are there any questions for Debra? Okay. Yes, go

NEAL R. GROSS

ahead, Alan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER HUNT: Sorry. You said a couple of hundred, presumably distributed around the country with some coordination with sampling plans in terms of the pilot?

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes, I think -we've just discussed this like an hour ago, so, I mean, the idea would be whatever number of people we might -- Social Security might be needing just to conduct the OIS Design Study initially, so that would be a smaller group of people than would be envisioned for the longer term, certainly the pilot, and then, course, the longer term data collection. So, the point I was making this morning Debra, and Bob, and Shanan, was that what looking for initially is just we're the initial group, and what process might pursue for recruitment, training, certification criteria, and that kind of thing for a small group of people, and then what recommendations might we have as a result of

NEAL R. GROSS

what we learn doing that for something for the longer term. So, that was really the point, is that we're starting with something small to get a sense of what's involved, and then look that could be generalized to how something, a larger effort. Just in case people are looking at this either roadmap or on the series of screens that I had for my presentation this morning, thinking that we're immediately going to the full-blown, what's the job analyst program for the entire nation, for the whole full project. We're just going to start with the first -what we need to conduct the first thing. I don't know what the total number is, but it does -- it would involve taking a look at the sampling issue to see how we would want to have those things integrated.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Nancy.

MEMBER SHOR: Sylvia, could you talk about -- we've got the ocean over there, I think. Could you talk about the chronology?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I'm a little confused about training, or creating this pool of folks who may be good candidates as job analysts, how that intersects with developing the instruments? What is it that they would be asked to do?

MEMBER HUNT: Well, if I'm understanding your question, clearly, you wouldn't be able to train job analysts until you had an instrument, if that's what you're asking me. I mean, we would need a work side instrument, an actual job analysis instrument before you could train anybody. But in order for us to prepare to do whatever is necessary to get job analysts on board, we felt that we needed the expertise that was already on the panel. For example, Debra has done some work in the area of job analyst training using videos, so we just felt that we needed to just get started with that. So, that sort of getting out in front, and then once we get a job side instrument together, then we'll have something to actually train these people on,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and protocol that goes with that instrument.

Is that what you meant?

MEMBER SHOR: Yes.

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes.

SHOR: MEMBER The reason Т was asking is, I think the panel and Social Security is going to be inundated interest from people who are interested in this, and they're going to want to know does this start next week. So, I think important to kind of clarify that. Ι understand it, you're setting up a structure and process, but that this isn't about people going out to analyze jobs starting next week.

MEMBER KARMAN: Correct. Right. What we're starting at this point is getting the panel through this ad hoc committee. And I appreciate you raising the question, Nancy. We're establishing the ad hoc committee so that -- this is, for example -- I guess a good way to look at this, since Nancy brought the subject up with regard to timing, there are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

things that the Agency is doing now, that the
staff is working on now, that the OIS
Development Work Group is helping us with, and
the panel may be involved at a variety of
points in either reviewing the outcomes of
these things, or hearing about it, or getting
asked questions about it, so then there's
the panel having a foot in the current time
frame. The panel also, to some extent, is out
in front of the Agency by having a foot in the
year to come, so this effort that we're
beginning with the ad hoc subcommittee to look
at recruitment issues, training issues,
certification criteria, that kind of thing for
job analysts is an example of the panel having
its foot in the future. So, the Agency is not
ready yet. It's the panel getting out in
front so that it can help bring the Agency
whatever information it's going to need as we
get to the point of needing it, so that we
don't get there with the job analysis
instrument, and realize that now we need to go

NEAL R. GROSS

and train job analysts, and that sort of thing. We don't have anything already examined, or no program for our part, anyway, that's been developed.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for that clarification, Nancy. I think that's important. Any other questions or thoughts on this whole issue of the field job analysts, or even sequencing. I kind of see the ad hoc group being one of these that we can start doing some things on now, although there are other things that are in development. I mean, we could have started it later, but this is just as good a time to start at this point. Okay.

Before we head into the subcommittee reports, I'm going to go ahead and have us take a break and come back in 20 minutes. Okay. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 10:36:28 a.m., and went back on the record at 10:58:49 a.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. going to get started here in a little bit. We are going to be having Nancy Shor, Okay. our Chair of User Needs and Relations Subcommittee, to give a report to the panel in terms of the activities of the Subcommittee. And there were some questions before the break in terms of the roundtables, and I wanted to be able to maybe process that a little bit more. So, since we are going through the agenda fairly quickly, after lunch I asked the people who will be some of the leads on some of those roundtables to maybe talk little bit more, about those take а and advantage of us all being together as a panel to be able to get some input into some of those roundtables. So, I will pass it on to Nancy.

MEMBER SHOR: Thank you. At Tab 2, just to go back to the roadmap, the very first page is a very nice summary of some of the things that the User Needs and Relations

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Subcommittee is working on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I find it useful to think about communication as kind of a two-way street, so I'm going to regroup some of these, and try to your thoughts present them, and get comments about outgoing communication from the panel to the public, and then, obviously, a section second on incoming, getting communication from the public coming into the panel.

And, first off, we've had a whole series of conference calls, catching people on the run in their cars, whatnot. I sure appreciate it, so I want to certainly thank Shanan, and Tom, and Deb, and Bob for their participation in numerous subcommittee conference calls.

Starting with outgoing, I think the most significant thing that's happened, obviously, is the posting of the report last fall, so that the report exists on Social Security's website, is accessible to anyone.

NEAL R. GROSS

I think one of the things that we have learned the really to anyone's along way, not surprise, is that folks would have asked for a entry, other than point of just sort starting on page 1 and reading to page 750. Is there a way to ease people in, identify what's in there, kind of give them a roadmap. And the Fact Sheet is an approach that I think is very attractive as putting yourself in the shoes of somebody, a member of public, kind of looking at this whole giant document and thinking wow, what is this? seems kind of impenetrable. What could I use that would help sort of me get started understanding what's here?

I want to thank Shanan very much for jumping in and putting together the first Fact Sheet, which I think is -- it's three pages, and then I guess a page of the panel members' identity. It's a great size that people can use to kind of figure out what's the overall overarching plan here, what's the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

content of this report? So, one of the things that coming from our Subcommittee as a request the Chairs of each of the other to Subcommittees, wouldn't you like to do a Fact about what's of interest Sheet to Subcommittee, and what your areas of concern Actually, it's not a request, it's more like we'd really like you to do this. So, I think if you take a look at what Shanan has done as kind of a template, and think about what could come from the other Subcommittees, we'd like to get that posted on the web page, as well. It's easily downloadable, people can take it and think about it. I think it would be a real helpful tool to get people to then say okay, I've digested this. Now, I'm ready to tackle the full report.

Kind of in a similar vein, I understand there's plans for getting videos done starring several of our colleagues here as another way to have, maybe, a 10-minute, is my understanding, segment that would be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

available on the web page that would be yet another way to talk about the issues, talk about what it is that the particular Subcommittee is trying to accomplish. And I think it's another way to help the public kind of have a place of entry rather than just being handed a copy of the report.

The other kind of new capacity with which I am barely familiar, Sylvia alluded to earlier this morning. a new initiative called "Open Government," which has been, itself, I quess, as a process out there as part of gathering comment. that comment period will soon end, or ended. And the expectation is that Government will be a new way that federal agencies can communicate to the public, and I gather vice versa, that comments can come in to the Open Government site. So, one of the really good point challenges, and а Shanan made in our last telephone call was figuring out how can we help the public have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

one-stop shopping so that going to the panel website is going to be where documents are available, and where links might be available to Open Government, that sort of thing. So, we're not expecting the public to go to a whole slew of different sites independently, but that if they come to the panel website, that's going to provide the links and connections to other sites of interest.

We've also been doing, or making old-fashioned plans for the style communication, which is going to meeting live, in-person. And Mary and Sylvia and are going to be living out of their suitcase, as best I can tell, for the next couple of months, have an extensive array of speaking invitations One of them that I'm personally coming up. very pleased about is they will be speaking at the NOSSCR Conference in New Orleans in May, so that's going to be just, to me, the very opportunity for communication, it's presentation, it's the factual the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information to get out there. But then it's the opportunity for whoever is speaking on behalf of the panel to open their ears, and listen to the questions that are coming back, it is that's identify what confusing, contentious, listen to somebody who's got something to say that we haven't about, that kind of thing.

thank for his So, Ι want to commitment to two, at least, future speaking engagements, Tom is on his way to Montana, and to Connecticut. And I think just to give you flavor, Shanan is recently back from Minneapolis, and I would love to ask her to share with you what that experience was like.

MEMBER GIBSON: Actually, I want to do two things. First, I want to back up just a moment, and this relates to my trip to Minneapolis, and focus on the idea of the Fact Sheets, and how they can be helpful, because I was sitting here as we were saying this, and I'm guilty, I haven't suggested another one as

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the Chair of the Taxonomy Subcommittee at this point. But when I was contemplating what were actually recommended in terms of Taxonomy issues for а Disability Occupational Information System, and what I presented, and what the questions were that came out of Minneapolis, I'm sitting here right thinking this can be the next Taxonomy Fact Sheet. Why did we suggest a new OIS? actually, we suggested a new Disability OIS, and it's about purpose and need. People keep asking what is a generalized work activity? How is that different from a task like we had in the O*NET, or why not the O*NET, define a task?

The very questions we, as a panel, had, and have gone back over and tried to understand are the questions that are coming out of these events, and would make sense for the next Fact Sheet from my group, for example. So, the two have actually been very beneficial in that regard.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In terms of what happened Minneapolis, first let me say that it was a group of rehabilitation professionals. They were exceedingly open and welcoming to us. Ιt myself, Debbie Harkin, and then was representative there who brought us was really Angie Heitzman, who's been at several of our meetings, and, as you know, is great to work with.

I think the presentation was wellinitially, received, although, the large audience didn't, necessarily, understand why this was important to them, at least not as a whole. There were several members who were highly interested, and several who tangentially why are you here, explain this to So, one of my Lessons Learned was that us. it's very important to have a member of that group do the introduction to the presentation, and why you're there.

Angie very well set the stage for us by saying you need to -- I'm one of you,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and you need to care about this, because what they do will impact us this way. So, that type of introduction and laying the foundation for why we were there was very important, because within this group, there were a lot of individuals who earn their primary living working with worker's compensation instead of vocational experts, so they didn't, as necessarily, see that immediate tie-in. that was very helpful to have that delineated in advance, and have someone from the group be part of the presentation. I think that made them more receptive to what we had to say.

Within the audience, itself, you find that some people are inherently motivated. It's kind of like teaching, a classroom setting with students, and others that are less so, so I think it was very important that we were able to talk about how this related to what they do, how it will impact what they'll do going forth, and how -- and kind of what is it we are doing, and what

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is it we're not doing here. So, that was very helpful.

One of the questions we've had as a panel that has come up, and I thought this was an excellent opportunity, is I got a chance to interact with one of the representatives from Oasis, which is a vendor, and he was very helpful, because one of the members said are our vendors, the people who create tools we like to use, what do they think about this? And he very bluntly said, if they had the data tomorrow, we'd include it in our next release, was the answer I got. Now, whatever happens, we will integrate and work with, because it's important to you, and it's important to our client base. So, there's the recognition among the vendors that they know something is afoot and needs to change, and they're not, necessarily - or, in many regards, they're actually very supportive of this model, and they're waiting to see what we'll do, and how they can use it, because they see it as an

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opportunity for their technology and product to evolve, as well. So, that was an outcome that I wasn't, necessarily, expecting, but it was very, very good.

Another Lesson Learned would be that probably -- I anticipated we more questions, I guess, and I actually had fewer questions than anticipated. Maybe we were overly prepared and tried to hit everything in the slides in advance, but I think leaving time afterwards for people to come up and speak to you one-on-one is imperative, because just like in a classroom setting, sometimes people don't want to raise their hand and ask the question that they think is insane, but we did have several people come up afterwards and offer insight. And that was very helpful, as well.

MEMBER SHOR: Thank you very much.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Nancy.

MEMBER SHOR: Yes.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: I want to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

derail, but I am curious, because since Mary and Sylvia have both gone out, and I suppose you have, as well, I'm not sure who all has gone out and done this, what are some of the other experiences, or do you want to hold off on that? But I'd be curious to hear what kinds of reactions, and questions, and concerns have been expressed.

Well, MEMBER SHOR: I was just going to jump in, and then we'll ask Mary and Sylvia for their specific experience. We devised a form to ask the presenter to bring back the feedback. So, it's not a perfect tool, but it will be, I think, real helpful to identify what were the types of questions, what could you answer, what did you not know the answer to, which also may inform the presentations of the future. So, yes, we'd like to use this as more than just a static event, but take advantage of the input coming back.

MEMBER GIBSON: Can I add one more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thing? The Fact Sheet was invaluable, and I'm just saying that because I found that very few people had actually read the report, for obvious reasons, so the fact that we gave them the Fact Sheet when we were there as a handout, they liked that, too.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And we just a copy of the Fact Sheet, and I just want to congratulate you, it's beautiful. It looks very nice, very professional. I think it's a great piece.

MEMBER SHOR: Mary and Sylvia, do you have any comments that you'd make at this point? Most of your speaking lies ahead, I know.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes, I think we lost track, but between now and June, the end of June, we probably have five or six presentations we're doing throughout the country. And Sylvia and I presented at NOSSCR, I think was our first presentation after the report. We presented at IARP a

NEAL R. GROSS

couple of sessions, and we did a webinar in
January, the day before our January meeting. I
haven't gotten the feedback yet from that
January meeting, but I know that as because
of that January webinar, a couple of the
invitations came from people who were
listening in on that, so we've kind of refined
the process as we have gone along. We have
the standard set of slides that Debbie Harkin
helped provide, that become kind of a cache
for us to be able to use and modify for the
different audiences. I think it's very
helpful to be able to talk to different people
from different audiences, like with you, with
the NOSSCR presentation coming up. Our next
presentation that Sylvia and I are doing is
going to be the National Council of Rehab
Educators, so these are all the educators for
rehab counseling programs, over 100 of them
throughout the country, Master's and Doctoral-
level, so kind of the research, and the
academic branch of the rehab world. And we're

NEAL R. GROSS

going to be presenting at a general session,
and then doing a breakout for that, as well.
So, that's a different audience, more of an
academic audience, so I think because of the
different audiences that we'll be presenting
at, it's going to be very valuable to probably
process that. Not just Sylvia and I, but
Tom's going to be out, Shanan is going to be
in Texas with Tom Johns, so a lot of us are
going to be out between now and the end of
June at different presentations. And that'll
give us a lot of information that I think
will, as Nancy was saying, help kind of guide
our process, but, also, allow us to know what
are the priority topic areas for not only Fact
Sheets, but the 10-minute clips on the
webinars are basically talking Fact Sheets, so
a different presentation, that if we need to
go and do more in-depth webinars, we can based
on maybe more content information, kind of
like the professional development that Mark
and Shanan did for us yesterday, if we need to

NEAL R. GROSS

go a lot more detailed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Sylvia, did you want to say anything about in terms of our presentations?

I think we found a lot of the same things that Shanan did, but you might have some thoughts.

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes. I think you've covered some of the things that we've already encountered in terms of questions. One of the things we have done, for those of you who are slated to go out over the next few months to if, in presentations, fact, or invitation comes up, do let, obviously, Nancy Shor certainly our Designated know, and Federal Officer, Debra, so that she can begin to coordinate that with the entity that is interested in having you speak.

Also, we like to coordinate a panel member going out, when possible, with somebody from Social Security, so usually it's somebody from our staff. Occasionally, some of the members of our OIS Development Work Group have

NEAL R. GROSS

graciously offered to also attend. think part of the reason for that has been that we have found, Mary and I have found that frequently, even though we may be -- the topic may be the panel's recommendations from 2009, inevitably, we get a lot of questions that are really directed at Social Security, and it just may be easier, frankly, to have somebody from the Agency there to sort of take up those questions, or at least be in a position to refer those questions to the appropriate office, or whatever. So, really, matter of support, I think, for the panel to have someone from SSA there.

Also, we have been preparing generic PowerPoints, and list of the top ten questions that we tend to get, and possible answers, depending on the audience. So, just sort of kind of prep material for folks going out so that everybody kind of has something to start with. And, obviously, they can take that generic presentation, and rearrange that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to suit their particular needs, but at least you've got something to start with.

And I know that as we go forward, I think some of the things that we're wanting to tackle are just some of the areas of possible confusion, like one simple area is, what does the panel do versus what does SSA do? That, in and of itself, I think to some degree, may be there is some confusion that the panel is there in an advisory capacity, and Social Security staff is actually conducting the work. So, that right there might be something of an area of clarification.

Another area of clarification we still run into is, because the DOT for many, many years has been so much a part of our process and our policy, we get a lot of policy questions, which, of course, our panel isn't taking up at this juncture, nor is our team working on anything of that nature, so that's something else that we frequently find we have to clarify. But, for the most part, we just

NEAL R. GROSS

get a lot of interest, and a lot of people really -- it seems just to me anticipatory, people are just really looking forward to this. And, to some degree, there may be some anxiety around that, because it's different, it's new. And David and I have discussed this, there's people living in a lot of ambiguity as we move forward, and that's That's hard for all of us, but it hard. certainly is for stakeholders, beneficiaries wondering what this might look like.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: But I think one of the most important lessons in this whole process is that the communication is really important. And I think we've said it from our inaugural meeting on that we're trying to be very transparent with this process, so information in/information out is vital.

MEMBER SHOR: Thank you very much.

This is just a plea, request to panel

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	members, as well as everybody who may be
2	listening out there, if you can suggest
3	organizations that you think would have an
4	interest in the panel's work, we're not shy.
5	We're happy to invite ourselves to speak, so
6	we'd be delighted to hear about organizations,
7	and your help in making that connection.
8	So, in addition to speaking to
9	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Nancy, on that
10	point -
11	MEMBER SHOR: Yes, David.
12	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: do you want
13	us to contact organizations first, or you?
14	How do you want it?
15	MEMBER SHOR: However you want.
16	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Okay.
17	MEMBER SHOR: Whatever is the most
18	comfortable for you. That would be great.
19	The final category, and this really
20	is designed to include those people who are
21	listening on the phone, as you know, when you
22	called in, you were asked for your

affiliation. Ιf you are a first-time listener, you'll probably be getting a phone call from a panel member within the next couple of weeks. We're simply following up, because you've demonstrated your interest in what the panel is doing. We'd like to just follow-up with you about your interest, and to encourage you to submit comments, if that's something that you'd like to do. So, we can't see you, we know you're out there, and we're certainly interested in what you'd like to share with the panel, as well.

So, that's kind of where we are in terms of outgoing communication. But turning for a minute to incoming communication, we are making progress, I think, on a couple of fronts with trying to crack the nut that I think is real important to crack, which is that any comment, any feedback that comes into the panel, we need a process where the public can see it, the person submitting it can see it, and know that it was received. And,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

obviously, all of us can see it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Mary and I had signed a letter to the Commissioner in early February, in which we kind of did two things. One was identify we were extending the comment period, which had been closing, I believe, in February. The new date is now May 21st, so the Federal Register Notice for this meeting, kind of buried in it at the bottom is a reference that the comment period is now open until May 21st, so that's good.

The second is, we were asking for his decision to allow us to use the Federal Register process as a place to post -- to receive comments and post comments. That's a medium that is very comfortable and familiar to lots of people interacting with the Agency, because it follows the standard Notice of Proposed Rulemaking protocol. It now appears that the Open Government may turn out to be an alternative, so we're waiting to hear back on which, or maybe both of these portals will

NEAL R. GROSS

become available. But, obviously, I think I speak for everybody, the sooner we can tackle and solve this problem of how to get comments available to everybody, I think the better.

We, at the Subcommittee, are open to the idea of trying to summarize them as we try to distribute them to the appropriate Subcommittee. But at the moment, frankly, the numbers are pretty low, and I don't think it's going to be too burdensome to give the Subcommittees the comments that we receive. If the numbers pick up, and it looks as though the Subcommittees are being asked to take on too much, we'll try to summarize those. But I think, at this point, it's a little early to make a decision about that.

So, the two areas of feedback that we're really looking to process right now are both anything that comes in in writing that could be construed as a comment, and I mean that in the most generic broad use of the word. And then, secondly, the feedback forms

NEAL R. GROSS

that come back from speakers that contain information about, this is the question I was asked, or this is the -- I could tell from the faces out there, and those of you in the teaching profession are going to have a real advantage there, but I could tell as I was speaking that the blank look I was getting, this was not communicating. So, I think all of that information, I think, is going to be real helpful.

I'd really just like And to I think Sylvia had a great segue to conclude. talk about a lot of the commenters out there are in sort of an anticipatory mode. Right now, a comment that I hear frequently, both from the attorneys I speak to all the time, who represent claimants, as well as a number of folks that I've called to follow-up, because they were on our list of listeners at is completely on board previous meetings, with the need to update the DOT, everything that you're talking about on

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

physical side feels real comfortable and great. You're talking about adding Mental and Cognitive, and I really don't understand what that means. So, as soon as you can show me a job, here it is in the DOT, here it is as a sample of what it might look like in a new Occupational Information System, then I think is when people will be in a position to really offer comments.

Most people are telling me that right now things are so theoretical, that it's very hard for them to offer anything concrete. So, for that reason, I think it's just important to clarify both for panel members, and anyone else who may be listening, that we have set a comment period of May 21st, because, let's face it, deadlines are very helpful. And I expect we will be hearing from lots of organizations in or around May 20th, but the opportunity to offer comments does not end, so that at any point during the panel's existence that somebody wants to offer a comment in

NEAL R. GROSS

reaction to something new that's posted, or just because they're ready to offer a comment, I wouldn't want anybody to have a takeaway that May 22nd, you're out of luck, you're too late.

So, I think the comments are really important. It helps the panel understand what's ambiguous and clarify. It may bring things the panel that have to not addressed, or thought about before. So, it's really designed -- my request is designed to people, if you encourage have comments, hopefully, before May 21st, because it's going to be easiest for us to process them, but if there are things that you want the panel to be aware of at any stage down the road, please And we're working on a get those to us. process internally to make sure that things are distributed to panel members, not in a piecemeal fashion, because I think that's hard to work with, but in kind of an organized We'll try to pull things together by fashion.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

topic, as well. So, I'd be happy to take suggestions, comments.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan.

MEMBER GIBSON: What Nancy said just reminded me of another -- one of questions that does seem to come up, is our time line. And I think it was very helpful that we had а common answer that was established, but I do think that's a very common question, because of this anticipatory nature, and where are you, and when is this going forth? So, being able to discuss our time line is very important to the different end-users out there.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Sylvia.

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes, I just wanted to have sort of a follow on to a question that David raised earlier about reaching -- whatever outreach. A number of us have contacts outside, what we call outside the Agency, obviously, in your professional

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

domain, so when a speaking engagement arises, or you know you're going to be attending a conference, and you're asked, it would be helpful if, in addition to letting Nancy know, if as soon as that occurs, that you let Debra Tidwell-Peters know. She, as our DFO, would be the contact within the Agency that would handle the external contact. If we have that person's name, and their contact information, and we're able to establish, first of all, what time frame they're interested in, we need to get budget clearance to have people travel, and that sort of thing. So, those kinds of things are operating.

Also, it's also helpful for us to have a sense of what exactly the topic is that they have in mind, and what the panel members' comfort level is with that, as well as what our position might be with regard to that, because sometimes, as Nancy's certainly coming across, people are anticipating what's coming up, and they may be asking us to speak about

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

things that we're ready yet, because they're just simply not there yet. So, that means we may need to go back and re-frame that, or ask if well, would your organization still be interested if all we could really deliver at this point in terms of a presentation is regarding thus and such, because we wouldn't want to disappoint people. So, that's helpful. That's all I have. Thanks.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I could just give an example of things that come to me, People contact sometimes. me, and usually respond, if it's an email, and include Nancy, and Sylvia, and Debra on that email as trying to clarify what it is that they want, and need, and indicate to them that somebody else -- somebody will get back to them, including them in the process would be helpful.

Okay. Any other questions or comments for Nancy? Okay.

Before I have mark present, it

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

occurred to me, as Shanan was speaking earlier, because this happened at the end of the last panel meeting, that maybe we hadn't made a public announcement of a couple of changes in terms of Subcommittee Chairs. I just wanted to be able to indicate that the Research Subcommittee that was Chaired Sylvia, she is a member of that Subcommittee, but Mark is our Chair. Thank you for saying yes, for taking that position. And he now does not Chair Taxonomy, Shanan is the Chair of Taxonomy Subcommittee, so as I pass it on to our Research Subcommittee Chair, Mark, to talk about the activities that you've been involved with. Thank you.

MEMBER WILSON: Thanks, Mary. If you remember from the roadmap document, that is a good place to review the various activities of the Research Committee, that have either taken place, or about to. There are three that I want to mention, and I think later on we're doing to discuss some potential

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

other activities with regard to roundtables, until I'll hold that off later. certainly, the three most prominent activities that the Research Committee is engaged in, is and advice regarding the National comments Academies of Science study. And we can discuss more about that, or answer questions from the panel that you might have.

The activity is second what's referred to in the roadmap as OIS Design Study I, and this is the beginning of a potential Research project around OIS-related issues, and we have also provided some advice. And the third primary activity, as some of you there, is professional know who were development activity, which I guess is kind of a joint effort of Research and Taxonomy at this point in terms of providing some more background, some more frames of reference around research-related issued.

If the User Needs focus is more external, I think it would be fair to say that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the Research Committee, at least the way it's
conceived now, is much more of an internal
contemplative, providing advice about
research-related issues. For the most part, I
don't see us advocating a particular approach
to research so much as responding to questions
and inquiries based on our expertise, and
things of that sort. That was certainly how
the professional development exercise came
about, as the result of a number of questions,
why do you think this way? Please be more
specific, and less theoretical, about what you
mean by some of these issues. And there I
would like to take an opportunity to thank
Shanan, if for no other reason, that everybody
seems to thank, Shanan, but as someone who's
willing to do a lot of work. And, in this
particular case, in terms of the professional
development exercise, it wasn't particularly
apparent, because the activities worked so
well, but what the panel, and staff members,
and others didn't realize is the enormous

NEAL R. GROSS

number of hours it gets attributed in order to make some of these programs work. And Shanan did amazing job, and it really an And not only that, she put up appreciated. with my attempts at humor while I was doing my presentation, so since we're in my home state, the message here is that Midwesterners don't torture people, other than the ones that they like. It's a sign of respect. If we're not doing that, that means that there's something So, we appreciate that. I don't know if that's what you were looking for in terms of a review, but I'd be happy to answer questions people have.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any questions for that activities in terms of the Subcommittee, and what they've been doing? I know that each of the Subcommittees is meeting every two weeks, so they've been very active in terms of the last three months. And it looks like Nancy wants to say something.

MEMBER SHOR: First of all, I want

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to thank Debra for reminding me what I forgot. This is just one last item on User Needs concerning webinars, which are scheduled to record the first week in May. The first one will be overview, and the an panel recommendations. The second is the Fact Sheet with specific information from the recommendations. And once recorded, webinars will be available from the website on-demand. So, I'm just going to add one thing that I think would be real useful. soon as those are up and running, how about we get that information out at least to the panel members to make sure, unless you're visiting the website everyday, but just in case you're not, we could get a quick email out to you, and just let you know that they're there, and go forward with that. So, thank you very much.

(Off mic comment.)

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. For those that didn't hear Debra that are on the phone, we do have the electronic mailing list

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that if you want to be on it, just email oidap@ssa.gov, and ask to be put on it. And any time there's an announcement for a meeting, or when the webinars get put up, or anything along those lines, that list does get notified in terms of some push marketing.

Tom, you look like you want to say something.

Just two things came MEMBER HARDY: to mind for me about User Needs that we had talked about, and we haven't gone back to yet. One was taking the Fact Sheet, once we had it, and starting to disseminate it to people who have called in to listen. And that might be something, now that we have a Fact Sheet, that could look into doing, we as а suggestion.

And the other thing was, I don't know if this is going to be encapsulated somewhere, but have we considered a Fact Sheet that compares DOT and O*NET? I know we had talked about that a little bit as something

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that we could maybe focus on as a full Fact Sheet that talks about why we are going in the direction we're going specific to those two areas. And are any of the Subcommittees working on that?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia?

MEMBER KARMAN: I don't know if any of the Subcommittees are working on it, but staff recently assembled some talking points for senior executives in the Agency, so that when they are out and about, and they are asked questions that they have responses that appropriately direct, yet given the of audiences, tried variety we to put something together that would be accessible to a number of audiences. So, we can certainly provide that to the User Needs and Relations Subcommittee in some draft format for panel members to consider. And I'm not really -- I don't know which Subcommittee. I'm quessing, maybe, that's something that, perhaps, Mark and Shanan might want to take a look at.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

least, Shanan, certainly. Shanan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: See, I used to call him Mark all the time when he was the Chair of Taxonomy. Now I get to call on you, so it looks like questions are coming your way.

MEMBER GIBSON: And that's funny, because the one thing I was actually doing while you were asking me a question was trying to think of how to respond to Tom's question, and was going to say one of the things that User done by the Needs needs to be Relations Committee is we need to get the Fact Sheet up on the website. And I was checking, and it's not there yet, so that's something that should be forthcoming, so that people who have called in, or who are calling in and want to see the Fact Sheet that we've referred to several times today can easily access it, and interested peruse the rest of then as under panel documents, report. But should, and probably will be there very soon.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. And I know that we have email addresses, I think, for all the people who have been listening in since the beginning, so that's easily -- we could disseminate that easily, as well. Abigail.

MEMBER PANTER: Just regarding the Fact Sheets, I think it would be very useful to have an organized rollout of them, and I'm not sure if that's in the works right now, but perhaps when we get all of the ideas that we think about should really how they sequenced, because the first one really feels like a first one, but the second might feel like a second, and maybe there's an order to presenting this information.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: When you look at the panel roadmap, if you look down to the communications, number three and four, in terms of plans for developing outreach plan, including presentations, meeting with stakeholders, a lot of that, I think that's

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

one of the things that maybe the administrative team could work with Nancy on in terms of helping to develop that, so it's kind of an orchestrated, organized, rational way to present things, so it's orderly. Mark?

MEMBER WILSON: Well, another thing that would be useful looking at some of the URLs in here, is I very much appreciate the idea that we need to have a well-organized, and accessible website. So, I think it would be useful, rather than pointing people to just the home page, but to put in URLs to specific points would be useful. I think it would even be neat, if possible, to provide URLs to various points within the report, so that we very carefully link the Fact Sheets to the more detailed document in a way that makes it easy for people. And, especially in electronic form, you pull this up, and this is kind of a little cheat sheet to the report, and as they click on various topics, there's a URL to that particular point in the larger

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	document. Just an idea.
2	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And hyperlinks
3	within, Fact Sheets to other Fact Sheets.
4	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes, as
5	things link up. Yes, absolutely.
6	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes, because
7	that way people can see, I'm reading this Fact
8	Sheet, and it refers to this, and then you go
9	to that Fact Sheet. Because I think for a lot
10	of people, opening a 700-page document is just
11	not something they're going to do.
12	MEMBER KARMAN: So, if we keep this
13	up, we'll have 750 Fact Sheets. Is that it?
14	(Laughter.(
15	MEMBER KARMAN: Or 750 links. No,
16	I'm kidding.
17	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I know
18	that we started with User Needs and Relations.
19	We went to Research, and we ended up with
20	User Needs and Relations, but I wanted to
21	maybe bring both of the Subcommittees up to
22	see if there's anything else the panel wants

to bring in to either Subcommittee in terms of questions for Nancy or Mark. Okay. Great.

MEMBER FRASER: One question.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Bob.

MEMBER FRASER: Are we going to discuss the nomenclature in relation to the Occupational Information System in terms of something different, or a Disability Occupational Information System, or something like that?

BARROS-BAILEY: think CHAIR Ι that's a great question, and it's something that I think has been very helpful in terms of a point of awareness for this group. When at our second meeting we realized that there was nomenclature problem, that awareness advanced us, because when somebody was saying something and there was a disconnect, we could second -- we could question is it that they're saying something I disagree with, or is that they're saying something different? think that awareness has helped us. And I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

don't know if there's always that connect beyond us to people who are reading Fact Sheets, or reading our report, or listening to us when we present, so one of the attempts that we tried to make in terms of bridging that was the glossaries for the report, and then the Subcommittee reports. We've talked about taking those glossaries and making them into a general glossary, that we add to as we go through this process to help develop a common language to make things very distinct and very clear on how we're doing that.

And I was kind of playing around with some things a few weeks ago, and I subscribe to these "Words of the Day" through NetLingo, which is push marketing. Once a day I get what does this word mean in this format. And, for me, it's just kind of amusing to see how people in the industry talk, an industry that has consumed a lot of our lives in terms of technology, but the concept is that they, obviously, have a glossary that they are going

NEAL R. GROSS

from, and they're pushing that information out a daily basis. And they're training through that very small bit of information. It's a very easy system to set up, so if we develop a glossary that we already have the foundation information for, we could do anything we want with it. It could be a static document on the website. It could be attached to anything we do, and if later we want to do anything else with it, we already have the foundation from it. So, I think that might be a start, but I think that is a very important comment, and question. Shanan?

MEMBER GIBSON: I can't help but follow-up on that, because Bob and I have had that discussion, and Mark Wilson has brought this up numerous times. And it's been brought up numerous times in other venues among panel members, both informally, and formally. But I do think it's very important for everyone who hears us, either calling in, or reads our documentation, to understand our purpose,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

which is to develop a Disability Occupation Information System. And we, like any other comfortable with group, who are our own shorthand fall in the habit of just calling it the OIS, and it sounds like it's this allencompassing, we're taking over the world. So, it's very important that we continue, maybe that is our own shortcut is doing us an injustice. And I think what Bob might have been alluding to is we really want to make an effort to make certain people understand that what we want to create, what we've recommended created is а Disability Occupational be Information System that meets the needs of SSA. It has a distinct purpose.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think that's a really important point, and I try to make it that the difference between the O*NET and the Disability Occupational Information System is, essentially, that the O*NET was being created by the DOL for a lot of users, not for DOL, but for a lot of users. The

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

purpose there is very different than this one. This one is being created by SSA for SSA, for disability within SSA. The purposes are very different, and because the purposes are very different, you have to look at it as something very different.

Bob was teasing me the other day that he wanted to listen to my construction oriented examples, but last time I used a I mean, a hammer is very precise in terms of trying to nail in a nail, and a dowel wouldn't work. A dowel is -- not a dowel, excuse me, a trowel. They're both tools. trowel is developmental. What do we do with a trowel? We are creating something. It's a starting point to building something. So, for when look at those construction me, Ι metaphors, this is -- we're looking something that has to be very precise, so the design aspects of it are very different terms of a hammer nailing in the nail, opposed something that's lot to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

developmental, which is more the orientation of the O*NET. They're two different things. Deb.

MEMBER LECHNER: I want to play a bit of a devil's advocate at this little point, at the risk of being the lone person out on this subject. But I really think that this OIS will be used to a broader extent than merely disability, particularly in world of Worker's Compensation, So, I don't know what risks rehabilitation. do we run there? And those systems need just as much precision as the disability, so are we really limiting this in a way that it doesn't need to be limited, and will that create some problems with other entities that need -- that cannot use the O*NET for their purposes. are there some medical/legal issues for a system that's developed only for disability?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I don't think you're alone out there on that tangent, because it is -- work comp is disability.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Whether work comp is dealing with the forensic end of work comp, or it's dealing with the rehab end of work comp, it's disability, so I don't think anybody -- I mean, you and I are one of the founders of the IOTF, you know, Tom was on there, Sylvia was on there, we were all on there because the issue was Disability and Occupational Information. So, it's described in our report to the Commissioner. couple of little comments in there in terms of acknowledgment that because it's a Disability Occupational Information System, there other systems that, obviously, may need it, it, but that's may use not the purpose, specifically, with what we're doing here with the panel. Sylvia.

MEMBER KARMAN: Deborah, maybe what I'm hearing you say is -- are you making a distinction between what we have in the charter with regard to the type of information that we're -- that Social Security is looking to develop for its disability programs versus

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the nomenclature, the types of terminology and language that we use to describe what we're doing? Is that what you're saying? Are you -- in other words, calling it a Disability Occupational Information System might fully describe its use, even though the Social Security Administration is intent developing an Occupational Information System disability programs, which also for SSA's would be useful to other people. Is that what you're -

Right. And I just MEMBER LECHNER: think that while within this group individuals we might see disability and the work comp falling in that greater context. can guarantee you the work comp world doesn't view it that way. The insurers, and you may want to speak to that, Tom, but I don't think the insurers, the work comp insurers view themselves as a disability insured's policy. So, I just -- and I think that there are so many flaws with O*NET that this system will

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

get -- end up getting used for things, and purposes that we don't really see, so I am in favor of a broader terminology, a broader title for it as an Occupational Information System. So, I guess I disagree with other members of the panel on that particular issue.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Alan.

MEMBER HUNT: I would respectfully disagree, Deborah, because the insurers are paying for disability. In some cases it's impairment, but they're not paying for lack of disability. I mean, I understand what you're saying, that we hope the use is going to be broader than the Social Security Administration, but I think they would -- the Worker's Comp world would be very comfortable using the word "disability." That's business they're in when they're claims.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And back in January, Mark and I talked about how we had on our own met with the National Academies of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Science, and that was one of my approaches to 8, that it entitled, Chapter was was "Disability Determination," and the only player in that chapter was the Social Security Administration, so it left out the rest of the disability community in terms of disability management, in terms of the private insurers who also have disability determination systems that deal with occupational information within And within my presentation to National Academies, I did address those other systems, but that's separate from what we're doing here. Mark.

MEMBER WILSON: Yes, to me, the important thing in terms of our charge is to be clear exactly what we're doing, and so I think this nomenclature discussion important. And the reason that I and others said early on we need to start calling this a Disability Occupational Information System, so that we don't confuse people as to what its Now, I think Deborah makes an intent is.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	important point, that we certainly need to be
2	mindful of the fact that people outside Social
3	Security Administration are very likely going
4	to want to use this. And all things being
5	equal, if we can achieve the objectives of
6	Social Security Administration, and create a
7	system that other people find useful, that's
8	great. But I still think that we have to
9	focus like a laser beam on what our task is,
10	and what we're doing. And by not being
11	specific in the naming of what it is we're
12	going to do, I think will conceivably create
13	either confusion, or a sense in some people's
14	eyes that we've exceeded our mandate, that
15	we're we asked you for a disability system,
16	and you're doing one for Worker's Comp, and
17	all that. So, that's why I, from very early
18	on, said that I think it would be useful to
19	refer to what we're doing as providing advice
20	on the design and development of a Disability
21	Occupational Information System.

MEMBER KARMAN: It almost feels to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

me like the nomenclature maybe is specified in
terms of that it's for forensic purposes, and
maybe that's I'm not getting into whether
it should we should have forensic in the
name, or not, but perhaps that concept might
be more getting at the concern that Deborah
Lechner is having with regard to the message
that it sends around. We certainly don't want
to be sending out a message, like you've
pointed out, Mark, that we're exceeding our
charge, or that we're in any way trying to
compete with other systems that are already
existing for completely different purposes,
much broader purposes than what we have. But
I am sensitive to what Deborah Lechner has
mentioned, because we do get that question
from time to time from people, when we present
to other groups. Mary and I even had a whole
slide about how the information that SSA needs
can be seen as a subset of what people in the
rehabilitation community, vocational
rehabilitation community would need. So, I do

NEAL R. GROSS

appreciate what both of you are saying.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Nancy.

MEMBER SHOR: I would just comment that I think using disability up front, that Disability OIS, this is а suggests that there's something about it that has gone into the data collection, that has something to do with people and disabilities, and I think that's true. I think the OIS portion is just the four corners of the document. Here's the description of the job. Here's the description of what a worker needs to be able to do the job. So, I would be -- I think it would be clearer, something along the lines you were suggesting, Sylvia, which is that it's an OIS for forensic purpose. To separate out the data collection, I mean, how you're going to design the instruments, all of that is going to be just to get the accurate descriptions of what goes on in that workplace. And then what you're going to do with the data, to use it within disability

NEAL R. GROSS

evaluations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I think that for general usage, a Disability OIS immediately raising a question, well, how would that be different from an OIS. So, I'd be happy to put the usage part later in the title.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Mark.

I think we've got MEMBER WILSON: another Fact Sheet here what is the on difference, because I think it's important to this is front Disability say up Occupational, and here is what the difference is.

MEMBER KARMAN: I think that's a great idea. And I am actually really glad that we're having this discussion, because that is a point that I know Mary and I have tried to make salient when we're presenting to a number of organizations, that we're in the - we, Social Security, are in the process of developing, doing the research and development to gather data about occupations that -- those

NEAL R. GROSS

data are critical to disability evaluation, to our adjudicative process, but there's nothing initially in of the set out terms instrumentation, or the -- there's not weighed about those data that are disability oriented. In other words, this really is about the requirements of work that are of relevance to assessing disability. And I think that that's the more objective aspect of it, if I'm hearing you correctly, Nancy. we want to be very clear about that. And I'm sure everyone on our panel agrees with that, so maybe that's just a challenge we should take up for seeing how we might go about (a) doing a Fact Sheet that can explain that; and (b) coming up with nomenclature.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think what I'm hearing in terms of a general concept is when use OIS, people see it we competing format to other systems that exist, they do understand because not the specificity, and that the purpose

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

completely different. As I mentioned, one is more developmental, the other one has to have precision, because it's forensic. And along with forensic, it has to have the legal mean, defensibility. I that is part specifically the Occupational Information needs that have been outlined in our report, so the design of such a system is completely different than the design of a system that's more developmental, and a starting point. if people don't understand those distinctions, all then they make and leap to conclusions that are inaccurate in terms of what the purpose and the need is. So, I think that's a really fine point.

I know we all understand it, and we could talk about it, and understand what we're talking about. It's making that leap, again, in terms of communicating that to the public, so other people could understand it the way we do. So, great discussion.

Any other thoughts? Sylvia.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMBER KARMAN: This is unrelated, but it -- Deborah, our DFO, noted that we wanted to mention that the report online at our website is now available in sections, so individuals visiting the website can actually click on individual appendices, as well as the summary report, which includes recommendations, the panel's recommendations. Also, there is -- you can also open a PDF of the entire 750 pages, if you so desire. hopefully, that will be more useful, or more accessible to people.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think we did that because in January it became very clear that people were looking at the report as a whole report, and didn't understand that the Subcommittee reports were finalized before we voted on the final recommendations. So, even on the home page, the link that you'll find there in terms of feedback is to the main report, which is the 61 pages or so, and then if you want to look at the supplemental

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information, which are all the Subcommittee reports and the appendices, you actually have to go to the web page that has those outlined there. Mark.

MEMBER WILSON: Is the main report available in HTML? I mean, is that -- or is it all PDF?

MEMBER KARMAN: PDF.

MEMBER WILSON: I think at least for the main report, it would be great to put that up there in HTML, and have some linkages between the Fact Sheets and that. I agree that it would be going too far with the Subcommittee reports.

MEMBER KARMAN: We'll take a look at that. I know we have some, not some, we do have very specific issues with regard to 508 compliance, so that things can be available to individuals who have, for example, visual impairments. So, to the extent that HTML could be supported to make it 508 compliant, we can pursue that.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other comments? Well, we are about lunch time. We're a little early, so let's go ahead and break for lunch, and come back at 1:00. Okay. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 12:05:46 p.m., and went back on the record at 2:05:29 p.m.)

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back.

Before we broke, I had indicated that we would be having some discussion this afternoon because there was some questions in the morning of the different in terms roundtables. So, what I'd like to do is maybe describe a little bit about what roundtables are, and how they work with the process that we are involved with. People hear us talking about Subcommittees. Subcommittees are committees made up of groups of individuals within the panel, and because of our structure as a panel, it doesn't provide us with the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opportunity to bring people in from outside. Roundtables are -- give an ability to us address a specific topic, either that needs to be addressed in one shot, or needs to be maybe the start of a process to consider sequential, or a longer term subject. So, this morning when we talked about the roadmap, identified three potential roundtables that we're looking at, holding that's not -- that we are limited just to those roundtables. kind of information depends the on we anticipate we need to be able to provide the advice and recommendations that we have been asked to provide.

what I've asked So, are the individuals who could give us some information roundtables, about the and maybe what's anticipated, or the kind of input that we can have to maybe talk a little bit about it this Deborah had something she wanted afternoon. me to say about the roundtables, and I forgot. Okay. Sorry about that.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I want to open it up to maybe asking the Labor Market roundtable individual. That's what it was, the four-square document.

Okay. We talked about the four-square document, and the four-square document is the document that kind of sets the parameters for the roundtable.

We are willing to share those with anybody who needs a copy of the four-square document that was used for transferable skills, the Work Experience Analysis Subcommittee, or the Mental Cognitive Subcommittee. Alan, you had asked about that, so we could get those to you.

We have asked you to maybe lead the process in terms of the labor market information roundtable. Maybe you could open it up to discussion in terms of some of your thoughts, and maybe some questions you might have of the panel members.

MEMBER HUNT: Well, I have a lot of questions, but let me just start by saying

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have talked about a roundtable on issues, particularly, sampling labor market plans as an addition. We probably need to think about how far along we're going to be at what point in time. And I confess that haven't thought much about this, and was little surprised, but let me tell you what I And I have not seen the four-square document, Ι don't that so have quidance But just from my general experience, it seems to me it would be extremely valuable and informative for us to hear the experience of other people who gathering some are occupational employment data. And, obviously, the Department of Labor is the main place where that occurs, both ETA and BLS. BLS has several programs that might be relevant.

I was just speculating after lunch about would it even be worth talking about people who gather things like safety and health data, and the connection there would be well, they use a state-federal partnership to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

do this. I have no idea if that's even feasible for Social Security, but at least it's another opening to think about. I mean, is there some connection here? And, of course, not trying to piggyback on, but with the state-federal voc rehab program in mind, they are, obviously, some issues.

So, what I would like to do at some point, and sooner rather than later, because our meeting in June is going to be kind of late, in my mind, to be inviting people to come to make presentations. An old mentor of mine said you can get anybody to do anything if it's far enough in the future, but once the day is coming, it's much more difficult to get agreement. So, I would hope that -- and we need to be informed by what develops tomorrow, as well. But I would hope that we could at least bring together people from Department of Labor, and from the Census Bureau, maybe from Military Manpower. That's unknown to me, but, certainly given that they have another

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Occupational Information System, and have certainly serious needs, both incoming and outgoing, they would be, I think, participants that would be important to have.

And what I would like to get some information about, both in terms of other agencies, and other entities that you might think might contribute something, but, also, a little bit of wisdom from the panel on who among users might be valuable to have at such a meeting. And given that we are showing that it's going to be completed by August, I mean, we're talking July and August in terms of when this is going to happen, so the more you can give me now, the better.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any ideas in terms of participants?

MEMBER KARMAN: You know, it might be helpful for us to talk about what some of the questions might be. I am imagining that by -- I think that, to some extent, some of these roundtables may be one time events, some

NEAL R. GROSS

of them may be more than one time, so it may turn out that we have an initial roundtable on labor market information issues, as well as what kinds of sampling questions SSA may be having at that stage of the game. And I'm thinking about our first design study, so we may want to be -- have our four-square document, in other words, our boundary of things that we're looking to accomplish at that meeting really be very focused toward that end. And then that might help us determine what people we should be inviting, and who might be -- what users might be helpful to be there, if any. I mean, maybe this is an issue of you want the experts in the room with us, or expert users, as well.

So, I know, for example, we've talked a little bit about, at least among our staff about knowing that we will have to find the occupations. And, certainly, Alan and I have talked about meeting with Bureau of Labor Statistics to find out who we need to work

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	with to identify employers in certain locals
2	based on the SOC codes that the government
3	currently collects information about, and what
4	we can do beyond that, since we're going to
5	need to have more detailed information about
6	work than what is currently reflected at the
7	SOC level. So, I know of some initial things
8	that we're going to be struggling with we're
9	going to need some help with. So, I think
10	that may be useful, for example, to find out
11	from some of these experts when they collect
12	data, like for the OES, or even CPS. If
13	they're asking the individuals filling out the
14	surveys when they are indicating the types of
15	work, we're wondering whether or not that gets
16	coded after it arrives at BLS, or Census
17	Bureau, which means that if there's raw data
18	that we could, that might be more helpful to
19	us than something that's already been coded at
20	the SOC level, so there are some things like
21	that that might be useful for us to
22	investigate.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: My thought is, from reviewing some things recently in terms of the role of trade organizations, I know that's been used by the DOL in terms of same of the sampling. That might be helpful. Alan.

MEMBER HUNT: Well, let me just say that, obviously, I will take some guidance from the Research Subcommittee, since we meet by telephone every two weeks, and it will be a chance to ventilate some of this. And I apologize for not having gotten farther along in my thinking, but that's the way it is.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: That's okay.

I put you on the spot, so I appreciate you taking the time to do this right now. Sylvia, you had something to add?

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes. I just wanted to mention, we have also been informed about a National Business Registry, and it's something that our staff has been trying to nail down.

And I don't know if anybody -- Alan, if you're

NEAL R. GROSS

familiar with that, or if anybody else is
familiar with that, but we're thinking that
that might be another source of information
about entities that we might want to visit, or
to set up a way to visit, so that we can do
job analyses as we move along. So, there's
just a lot of questions, and I, too, apologize
to Alan, because we really haven't had much
opportunity to talk about this.
CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: NAICS,
another potential source, so there are a
variety of them out there that are collecting
data, representing it in different forms.
Okay. Any other thoughts, or questions?
Okay. Thank you, Alan. Okay.
We also have the linkages
roundtable. Sylvia, do you want to say
something about that?
MEMBER KARMAN: Yes. So, we're
MEMBER KARMAN: Yes. So, we're going to talk a little bit about roundtables

already been thinking about

22

of

some

the

roundtables, because they were issues that
came up when we were voting for final
recommendations in September. But with regard
to the linkages one, certainly, as we our
staff is moving forward with developing the
person side elements that are of most interest
to the Agency that we would want to collect
occupational information about, and then
developing a prototype person side instrument,
and then something on the work side, we're
going to get into measurement issues. And, of
course, that gets to linkage concerns, so I
have been talking with Dave Schretlen about
that, and I certainly think it's something
that we have the Research Subcommittee sort
of set aside to take that up, but I think,
certainly, to the extent that the physical
demands and mental demands Subcommittees have
a focus there, I think that that would be a
very valuable thing to bring into that. And
we may want to parse that out in terms of
roundtables, because one of the things I've

NEAL R. GROSS

mentioned to David is that we're not anticipating that one roundtable, or a one-day meeting to talk about some of these issues is, necessarily, all that the panel might do with regard to this, this being linkages, or this being measurement issues. Certainly, the staff may also be -- will certainly need to be taking up some other kinds of investigation, as well. But it does offer us an opportunity to get started.

So, I think of MEMBER SCHRETLEN: this, the linkage roundtable, or the linkage part of what -- of the advising that we're going to be doing to SSA are being critically important to this entire project, because as we've talked about many, many times, ultimately, it all comes down to an N of one analysis of matching an individual's residual capacities to the demands of various jobs. So, it has always seemed to me that this is kind of -- goes to the very heart of what we will be advising Social Security about.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

yesterday, Mark, toward the end of his
presentation showed these sort of profiles of
worker character or job demand
characteristics that you could arrange
visually as sort of a graph, or you could turn
the axis on its side and represent among
different job demands what each particular
occupation's loading is on that in terms of
strength, or endurance, or complexity, or any
number of characteristics. So, ultimately, I
think they way I've always sort of envisioned
this is the OIS, or Disability OIS is going
to, ultimately, lead to a series of
occupational descriptions that, essentially,
amount to a profile of the demands, the
various demands of a worker that each
occupation has. And, ultimately, we're going
to need to compare that to the characteristics
of the workers, of the applicants. So, it
seems to me that it's not going to be one
roundtable, but a series of roundtables. And
this is going to be, I think, some of the

NEAL R. GROSS

hardest work that Social Security is going to have to do. And I think that there are people with statistical expertise in the area of pattern matching, and looking at profiles, sort of statistical approaches, and we can bring in experts with a variety of backgrounds.

One of the concerns, I think, that, in my mind, we punted down the road when we, by we, I mean the Mental Cognitive Subcommittee, made recommendations to the And the panel as a whole, panel as a whole. with modification, adopted those for SSA, is that we really were talking about dimensions of Mental Cognitive function. We never talked about how those things going to are measured, really. I mean, we sort of -- we discussed option, we noted, if you will, very briefly, options, but I think that there's a lot of hard work to be done in figuring out the kinds whether of abilities that identified, and that we've suggested that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Social Security consider are things that can be rated accurately, and whether they can -- are valid predictors of a person's ability to perform in a job, or actually on a test of the ability that we're trying to rate. So, I think that, in the end, there's going to be a fair amount of research that needs to be done, as well. And I think -- I suspect that a roundtable, or two, or three on this topic will make it clear precisely what kinds of instrumental kinds of research need to be done before Social Security can really feasibly develop a person side instrument to take into the field for investigation.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, in terms of the questions, maybe some of the thoughts or the feedback that you might be thinking, or wanting to have some input from the panel, any specific areas in terms of the starting point?

Is it just asking the question, is that what you're -

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: I think that's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

it really it's exactly right that every
single Subcommittee is represented in this.
It has to be. This is going to be a joint
effort, and I think it's just for us to begin
thinking about well, what is the expertise
that we are going to need to try and figure
out how we match the person side
characteristics with the job side demands.
And I don't think this is going to be this
is going to require some heavy lifting, and I
think we all I, certainly, am very open to
suggestions that anyone might have about what
kind of expertise could guide us in this, in
the recommendations we make to Social
Security.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And match it better, because there are matches going on now that I think we all know that they could be done better. Nancy.

MEMBER SHOR: I just had a question about how roundtables are constructed. Can individuals apply, volunteer, or is it

NEAL R. GROSS

strictly by whom you pick? If there's someone who would like to participate, can they indicate that?

MEMBER KARMAN: You know, I don't I don't know that there's a roundtable know. like regulation or protocol, but at least -let me just say, the way we handled it with the last two, the Chairs of the Committee in -- the subject Committee was taking the lead of recommending the type of expertise that might inform the discussion, given the foursquare document, given the boundaries of what we were trying to look at for that day, or that series of questions. And those of us in that Subcommittee met, we discussed it, tossed around well, what about this area of expertise, what about making sure that's represented, should it be a practitioner and a scientist, and dah, dah, dah, dah, and this kind of thing. So, I think we're pretty open to hearing what a variety of people might have in mind for this roundtable, or others.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there may be some roundtables where maybe we'd want to have people volunteering. I just don't know how we would vet that, so, I guess, I'm open to hearing ideas about it. Keeping in mind that a roundtable you would want to have it small enough to be manageable.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes. I can just share a little bit of our experience. You may recall that for the roundtable that we did, it was -- we were under enormous time pressure, so we actually had suggested -- we had people suggested to us by a number of panelists, both within the Mental Cognitive Subcommittee, and outside the Mental Cognitive Subcommittee, and contacted virtually everybody who was identified and suggested to us, and people were unavailable. It was all on short notice, and we were asking people to do a fair amount of work, and some people just said I don't think I have time for that. tried to have very broad representation. research community, we had people terms of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from a DDS, or DDA rather, from Baltimore, so we had practitioners and academics, both.

I would underscore that it's useful to keep it on the smallish side, to be strategic in who you choose, because the more people you have, the more difficult it becomes to coordinate. So, just based on that, I would encourage whoever ultimately puts together these roundtables to keep it on the smallish side.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I just wanted of it add, too, some came from the literature review, so a lot of people who had been publishing in these areas, just knowing а lot of times in terms of happening currently doesn't get into literature sometimes two to five years later, so looking at the literature and trying to come forward to seeing who can be at the table that could bring the most current information. Any other thoughts or input into the Okay. linkages roundtable? I think everybody knows

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that is the ultimate tire that needs to meet the road right there, and the ultimate test. So, I do think you're right, that it's probably the start of a process. Sylvia.

MEMBER KARMAN: I just wanted to mention, also, especially for the newer members on the panel, we do staff the roundtable meetings. So, in other words, our staff will staff that, and will help develop the materials, will help you and others that are from the panel, who are working on that particular roundtable contacting individuals, pulling together the what we keep calling the four-square document. By the time we send this to you, Alan, you'll be like this is no big deal. We're like working this up to be this really amazing document, and it's like it's just -- it just explains what we're going to cover in our roundtable. So, there is There is -- in other words, you will have programmatic support for -- staff support do this. haven't had to And we an

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opportunity, at least in -- I mean, I should really leave this for Mark to talk about, but at least within the Subcommittee that I'm on, and we haven't had a chance to talk about how we're going to conduct roundtables. We have broached the subject of the NAS roundtable, but that's the extent of it, so that's probably why you're getting these responses, where people are not too sure yet exactly how that's going to work.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Well, it's because we've just transitioned. The last meeting we were in transition, at this point we have transitioned, and everything is just starting to kind of take off in terms of our involvement in some of these activities. So, that's where we are. That's a great segue, Sylvia, to Mark in terms of maybe talking about the NAS roundtable, and some thoughts in terms of that. And I'll turn it over to you.

MEMBER WILSON: As everybody knows, we're going to have a presentation tomorrow

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from the NAS, and the panel has a draft
version of their report. And, of course, one
of the reasons that we're interested in this
is because of, I believe it's Chapter 8 in the
NAS report, where they address disability
determination issues. So, I think the primary
question I have for other panel members is
and I think Nancy's question is very
appropriate here in terms of the National
Academies is not an inconsequential group of
people. What they say about various issues,
research policy, or otherwise, is something
that needs to be paid attention to. But, at
the same time, I think it's important to
insure that the panel understands completely
what the recommendation imply for us, and
perhaps don't imply for us. Most notably, as
we have repeatedly experienced, even use of
the exact same terms may, in fact, mean
different things to different groups of
people. So, one doesn't want to get
particularly concerned until there have been

NEAL R. GROSS

discussions. And I'll digress back moment to another activity of the Research Committee with regard to advisement of Social Security on OIS Study I Design, where it -oftentimes, I found that more casual informal conversations will oftentimes lead to better understanding that roundtables, and meetings, and exchanging of documents, things of that sort that can, oftentimes, cut to the chase quicker. So, don't want to make more of it than what it is, but I can say that in terms of my own thoughts as to who might be participants in a roundtable, and then I would to others, is certainly open it up some members of the National Academies panel that participated in writing this report.

I think because the National Academies only gets around to looking at work analysis once every 30 years, it might be good to go back and invite some people who are still around from the National Academies report that addressed O*NET, and some of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

-- DOT, sorry, as well as the current National Academies study that looks at O*NET.

And then the third group which speaks to the -- I think it was you, Mary, who said identifying authors based on literature search, and people who are currently active, and there are a few of those. But those were the sort of initial ideas that I think we have. I'm certainly, as David said, very much open to suggestions, and ideas as to how do this.

I think this particular roundtable is a little different in terms of, we're dealing with a fairly substantive scientific agency here, so there may be some extra protocols that we need to follow, and things of that sort. I'm not sure, but I'm certainly open to guidance.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: Just a quick question. The purpose and goal of this roundtable, I think, would drive some of that.

NEAL R. GROSS

And I'd like clarification on the purpose and goal.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think Mark identified it, once every 30 years or so that a huge independent group looks existing OIS, and gives some feedback in terms of critique of certain areas that are pluses and minuses in terms of that system. lot of think there's a lessons that learned from not only the Miller Study from 1980 that reviewed the DOT, which is currently being used in the SSA process, and one of the reasons that we are here around this table to with try to come up а system recommendations for a system to replace it, but, also, the development of its replacement under the DOL scenario in terms of the O*NET. So, what are the lessons learned from both of those, the DOT and the O*NET that lend to our advice and recommendations, to the things that have been identified in the letter by the Commissioner, anything else that's coming down

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the pike that we are asked to provide advice
and recommendations on. There might be things
that are common between both reports in the 30
years that are problematic as a sampling, I'm
thinking. And they used field job analysts in
DOT, they're not using it with the O*NET, so
they allude to it in the NAS report, data
collection. You know, those kinds of things,
so what are the lessons learned, what are the
take-aways that maybe are not answered in
these reports? But, as you know, there are a
lot of things that happen that we learn that
don't end up on the piece of paper that
somebody might be able to provide us
information about, so I think that's part of
it. Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: Are you looking for a written document coming out of this? I'm just curious.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I don't know anything different than any other roundtable.

Are you saying from the NAS roundtable? I

NEAL R. GROSS

don't think that it would be anything different than any other roundtable.

MEMBER HARDY: A summary.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

MEMBER HARDY: Okay.

MEMBER KARMAN: Ι think earlier when I was going over the project areas that we're covering, I think we made some mention of the connection between what we could learn from the NAS. Well, right now it's the prepublication report, but when they do publish their final one, I think it would be very helpful for Social Security to have - I think Mark mentioned this, as well - a real sense of what the implications are of all of these recommendations to the development of an OIS for SSA's purposes, because we will be subject to the same laws and statistics, and psycho metrics, and sampling, and everything else that everyone else is. And, to some degree, where are we different, because we are looking at data at a more granular level, we call

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ergometric, as opposed to econometric. Is there a distinction there? So, I think that's part of it.

Now, Tom had asked about the document at the end, and I don't perceive it as we would need anything different from roundtable, but there's another issue about the document. Maybe that's what's -

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. So, when you mean document, that's why trying to clarify from you if it was from the From the roundtable, I think roundtable. it's a document that you would perceive coming out of like the TSA Subcommittee, anything like that. But if you remember, this morning when I had the slides up on the board, and I talked about the deliverables, those four point areas that the Commissioner has asked Right? One of those was any reports or us. documents that are out there that asked us to review, and the NAS is one of So, there will be a report coming to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	the OIDAP at some point in terms of the review
2	of the whole thing, and what does it mean in
3	terms of advice and recommendations that will
4	be on any of those, including our annual
5	report that will go to the Commissioner.
6	MEMBER HARDY: So, that final
7	report, is that going to that's going to be
8	that will take information from the
9	roundtable, and then there will be other
10	things that go into that report?
11	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.
12	MEMBER HARDY: You think it will be
13	the summary.
14	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. It will
15	be a variety of things.
16	MEMBER HARDY: So, it's a longer
17	process.
18	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Right. It's
19	a point-specific focused report specific to
20	each of those bullets, so one of those bullets
21	being the NAS, one of them eventually being
22	the field job analyst, one of them being the

sampling, the other one being the linkages, and then annually a report of activities.

MEMBER KARMAN: I might point out that the only report that is actually -- that the Commissioner had requested in his letter to the panel chair that's due -- that has a due date was the summary. So, the others were left more open, so that the panel would be delivering them at the point at which SSA would be needing the information. So, that's not to say that that's, necessarily, due by September 30th, 2010, just in case anybody has a concern about that.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think we're all very hypersensitive about deadlines after September 30th of last year, so yes, thank you for clarifying that. The only deadline we have is the annual report in terms of our activities in November, but everything else is as it is available, and as it comes. Any other thoughts about the NAS roundtable? Any other roundtables, or any other roundtables

NEAL R. GROSS

that we haven't talked about?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER FRASER: Just in terms of roundtables, if this -- thinking if the meeting is in Seattle, if there's people at the university in neuropsychology, or IO, or rehab medicine, not just thinking of University of Washington, but Oregon Health Sciences, you know, it's a good opportunity to get them. And the thing about the northwest, people don't leave so much in the summer because it's a good place to be, so we can corral them with a little notice is the point.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thanks, Bob.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: I also wondered about like representatives of NADR, where there are people who are concerned about the N of 1 problem might be interested in participating in this, because they might have some insights about the usefulness of O*NET.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, more of a users roundtable.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: One specific
2	to users?
3	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: No, no, no, as
4	participants. Users as participants at the
5	NAS roundtable.
6	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. As
7	part of the participants at some point.
8	MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes.
9	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. Okay.
LO	Thank you. Any other discussion at all about
L1	roundtables? Okay.
L2	Then I think we are at a point of
13	being able to have a public comment. We have
L4	one person signed up for public comment, and I
L5	would welcome Mr. John Reeves. John Reeves is
L6	with Reeves Associates, and we have all been
L7	given two pages in terms of his comment. He's
L8	with Midwest Independent Sales and Training
L9	Representative for VERTEK, and Vocational
20	Rehabilitation Institute. Welcome, Mr.
21	Reeves. You will have 10 minutes, and after

that, I will open it up to questions from the

panel. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. REEVES: Thank you. I'm very happy to be here. And after going through all of the things that have been written, and I've had many conversations with the late Gail Gibson about what you were doing. This is very important to a number of us with VERTEK, but some of the advice was to just get right down to the things I've learned from training hundreds of people, and doing transferable skills analysis, disability determination, using the Oasis program, so I'm just going to jump right into some data elements, and some job analyst, and user training perspectives that I have.

One that was mentioned a little bit in the TSA Subcommittee is the certifications. As people are collecting data about occupations, it becomes very problematic if it's an occupation that has a certification or a licensure attached to it. For instance, a person could have results of a transferable

NEAL R. GROSS

skills analysis come out where there are
several or one occupation listed, and if that
occupation has a licensure attached to it, for
instance, having been a job developer and a
manager of education and training, and a
vocational rehabilitation consultants, it's
one of my transferable occupations in the
logic of the DOT right now is that I could be
a principal. There would be kind of a snort
with my local school board that I would not
I would probably have to go back to school for
many years. So, some way to deal with that
it's an occupation that's likely to have
certification issues. And the certifications
change from state to state, so it would be
very hard to actually have that in the
database, but some way to deal with when that
came up, because that could be problematic for
your end users figuring out can this person do
work, or can't they? And if it's an
occupation with certifications attached, it
becomes problematic.

NEAL R. GROSS

Another data element that I could
not find reference to is something called
Combination Work Fields. Had anybody seen
reference to that? But that also becomes kind
of problematic, in that there are certain
hands-on occupations, usually that have
subsets, for instance, a construction worker
II, a huge list of things are attached to that
in the DOT, welding, abrading, gluing, and
that would be something that in some systems,
those are all included automatically if you've
been a construction worker II. I know in our
product, Oasis, it would only be if you could
talk to the individual, and find out that they
actually did have that construction site
welding, or abrading, or gluing. It can
greatly affect the results of a TSA search, so
it's a data element.

The other thing, looking through Appendix F, where you were looking at getting a lot of input from end users, I just have to, on behalf of a lot of people using Oasis in

NEAL R. GROSS

the Midwest say to hopefully the door hasn't
closed on aptitude yet. The Occupational
Aptitude Patterns is a system that I think is
already developed, and lends itself well to
what we're looking for. It won't cover all
the Cognitive Mental issues that you're
looking at, but it is a system that all the
vocational rehabilitation state agencies in
this area use, aptitude testing. A lot of the
employment networks use the aptitude testing,
so if the limitation of what you're doing is
that it can only be used for disability
purposes within the Social Security
Administration, one thing to look at is what
are your ticket to work providers using. And
I think you will often find that, I made a
note that if a person can't do what they used
to do, what are they apt to be good at, and
apt to be able to learn? So, that is ofter
something that people look to for helping a
person, if they did decide to go back to work.

The point I make in my handout that

NEAL R. GROSS

I won't get into too much, is that people I've run into people in my private practice
that wanted to get off Social Security, and it
was -- as the economy improves, there might be
more people like that. So, it could be that
ticket to work might have more than 1 or 2
percent of your people looking at that, maybe
new types of work will come out, but there can
be a lot of things, and I think that would be
something -- on behalf of my customers, we
really hope aptitude stays in there.

The other piece that I've run into when I'm out training DDS people is that a lot of them were using the SCO, the Selected Characteristics of Occupations. That is nested within the 12 GOE interest areas, which got a very low rating in your user input, the 12 GOE interest ratings. However, it seemed to be standard practice in some offices to use the skills and abilities nested within the work groups, there's 12 GOEs, and about 66 subcategories called work groups, different

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

where people were using that. I don't know if you'd want that to go on, but the other piece about that, if there ever was an interest inventory attached, which I know doesn't seem likely, the 12 GOE interest areas are often preferred by Voc Rehab people, because, whereas, the Holland Codes just have realistic as one of the six areas, the GOE breaks out mechanical, protective, industrial, and about four different areas. These are often the interest areas where people have been injured, where maybe they can't do their mechanical any more, but there might be something related to that, that would still be kind of lost within just the realistic field. And I'll move on from there.

There is another data element source that I might want to share with the Mental and Cognitive Subcommittee, and it's on the second page of your handout. I make a reference to a system called Workplace Mentor. And this was developed over six years. It

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

was a grant from the Department of Education's
Rehabilitation Services Administration, and
NIDR, the National Institute of Disability
Research, but it is an example of a system
that very specifically looks for the low-
functioning population, how to do job
analysis, how to do a consumer profile, and
how to match those people. And I have some of
the samples here, but I also have the websites
to look at. It might be just something to
add, if nothing else, at the data elements
that you're looking for, for Cognitive Mental.
And, also, Dr. Jeff Harris, I have listed at
the bottom there. He's at the Vocational
Research Institute, which is a part of the
Jewish Employment Vocational Service of
Philadelphia. It is a non-profit
organization. He is an expert on aptitude,
and also what's called situational assessment
leaning towards supporting employment, which
is what Workplace Mentor does. It has the
system has built-in training. We've had a lot

NEAL R. GROSS

of field experience. We're trying to get people to do job analysis, and so there might be some useful input from his standpoint.

Moving on to because I am kind of the go-to trainer for Oasis when we have a high-stakes implementation of some sort, couple of things that the job analyst might run into is especially after layoffs, I didn't see any reference to what are called composite jobs. A person might be the last person in department, and suddenly has their three job descriptions piled on top of them. And when we're doing transferable skills analysis, we often address that by you were and the bookkeeper, the secretary, whatever, but the job analyst could be running into situations where it would be hard to discern that this is actually somebody who is the last person standing after a layoff, and they're actually doing two or three different job titles. And it's just kind of a heads-up that I would see could be -- could flummox

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some of your job analysts to watch out for.

The other thing that I run into is the end-user, not the job analyst, but the end-users of your database not being able to find the occupation, or its equivalent in the database. So, this brings up a training I see people all over the road as far as how well they know all the different ways to slice and dice an occupational database to find exactly what they're looking for. The solution we've finally come up with was minute training modules as flash demos. The attention span, if somebody talked about this for two hours straight, and if you aren't overwhelmed, you weren't listening. So, put it in 15-minute, 10 to 15-minute segments, and that reflects just perhaps have а test questions within those segments that would be very hard to guess at, or just know because you're kind of an expert. But that would be a way -- that's how I certify people for Oasis training. Ιf you Google Oasis training,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you'll see a, not as well as you will probably do it, example of taking people through different part, different steps of doing transferable skills analysis, and then being able to certify them. One of the benefits to it is, if they are licensed at some sort, you can also get continuing education units for doing that.

And, finally, the other thing, far as what I've been running into field after 10 years of O*NET, and if Google O*NET versus DOT, you get me. been an outspoken person of it really won't work for what you're trying to do, because very early on working with VERTEK, we wanted if we could use O*NET to do to see transferable skills analysis. It is very hard to explain to people why it won't work, so I've been documenting as much as possible, and I've actually seen changes in O*NET that could only have been because of what comes up first when you Google O*NET versus DOT.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	But despite my cause, I just ran
2	across a presentation at a voc rehab
3	conference in a nearby state where the
4	subtitle was "O*NET is the greatest single
5	source of occupational information for rehab
6	counselors. This presentation will provide
7	participants with an overview of O*NET, and
8	how it can be used throughout the
9	rehabilitation process to assist consumers in
10	making good career decisions." And this was
11	from a, "I'm very glad that you're going to
12	the rehabilitation education conference."
13	This was from their school within a major
14	university, called the National Rehabilitation
15	Institute. This is the Director. And what
16	I've had to deal with is his students for 10
17	years who will absolutely refuse to learn the
18	DOT, even when they go to work for a place
19	where they're supposed to be doing vocational
20	evaluations using the DOT. They will try to
21	make O*NET work, and it gets very difficult.
22	And what I'm finding out is some of them are

NEAL R. GROSS

promoted into the position of making policy. And, for instance, because of their leaning towards homogeneity, they don't want people to see job titles, even if they've been filtered hiqh growth existing show in the to marketplace. The heterogeneity that you're looking for has been kind of trained out of them, and they're loyal to their professors. So, I just -- this is only a few schools, but the people that know the old DOT are getting fewer and fewer in the workforce. The joke is that IARP rhymes with ARP, but -- I heard that a conference. I'm sorry.

So, that very quickly covers some of the very specific data things that I see coming up from doing a little bit of what you're probably doing in a very good way, by the way.

The last thing that I learned from when I used to work in private corporations implementing person side and job side Human Resource Information Systems, was the database

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	implementation paradox is that you don't know
2	everything you need to know until you start to
3	do it, and you have no business doing it until
4	you know everything you need to know. So, we
5	would say there has to be a pilot, there has
6	to be experts from a lot of different parts of
7	the thing. And what you're doing, as would be
8	from the corporate standpoint, what we would
9	look for as, is this going to work out? So,
10	thank you very much. If there are any
11	questions, I'll stay here.
12	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,
13	John. I'll go ahead and open it up to the
14	panel. Any questions? Alan.
15	MEMBER HUNT: Can you go back to
16	the combination work fields? Are you talking
17	about the problem that the duties, or the
18	applications are not sufficiently delineated
19	within such a situation, or is there something
20	else going on that I'm not grasping?
21	MR. REEVES: Well, just because I'm
	1

the trainer on Oasis, if you put in a number

of different more hands-on occupations, construction worker II, a screen pops up. These are the combination work fields attached to that particular DOT. And some people would select them all, and some people would select none. My advice has always been only select the ones, if you know that person did it, because it can affect what if a person was deemed transferable to a welding job, and yet they've never done welding. So, fields, that combination work just wasn't something I had seen addressed during the TSA roundtable that you had. Did that answer your question?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia.

MEMBER KARMAN: Hi. Thank you very much, Mr. Reeves. One of the questions I have is about the first point that you made with regard to certification. Were you suggesting that it would be helpful for the SSA's Occupational Information System, if we were to gather information that basically is sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

binary with regard to yes, there is certification required, no, there isn't. Just so that -

MR. REEVES: Or it might be a might, or no, or just an indicator somewhere that certification might be an issue. I've heard that a florist has to be licensed in Texas, and that's probably not all over the country.

MEMBER KARMAN: Right.

MR. REEVES: So, trying to track certifications would be almost impossible, because they're always changing. But it could be just some indicator that certification might be an issue with that occupation.

MEMBER KARMAN: I mean, you know, right now our current policy is we don't concern ourselves with that, but it may, in fact, be useful for adjudicators to know whether or not a certification is even at issue, especially if we're looking at skills transfers. You wouldn't want, in other words,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to be recommending something that -
2	MR. REEVES: If the skills transfer
3	said they should be a massage therapist, there
4	might be six states in the country where they
5	could be, so that would be an issue if they
6	weren't licensed.
7	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think ar
8	example of that is the use of TORQ in terms of
9	a very broad application that somebody used
10	with the O*NET, where they did a transferable
11	skills from somebody who was a team assembler
12	in the RV industry, and came out with a dental
13	hygienist. And I currently have somebody ir
14	dental hygiene school, and know that most
15	states require licensing for dental hygiene.
16	MR. REEVES: It's two to four years
17	training.
18	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Two to four
19	years, absolutely.
20	MR. REEVES: And it's a very
21	it's not for everyone, if you talk to them.
22	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, a system

such as this where you don't consider retraining, that would not be a good transferable skills outcome to come up with.

MEMBER KARMAN: Also, I really appreciate your caveat about the composite jobs issue, which I'm sure a number of job analysts are going to encounter, so that was a good heads-up, appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. REEVES: I've been an outplacement consultant, and in some ways, the people I was helping find their next job were the lucky ones, because the people left behind were having all different types of job duties piled on them. And that will still be happening for several years in this economy.

The other thing, my pitch for aptitude is, if people with disabilities are going back into the workforce, the DOT was originally created to partly address frictional unemployment. The jobs are there, people want to work, but there was not system for matching them. And there could

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

be, I think, a great deal of interest, ever
though you really have to focus on what you're
creating this for, but I think there would be
a great deal of interest. Our customers for
Oasis include workforce development, refugee
resettlement. For instance, having the
interpreter ask them what they did in Bosnia,
or Somalia, and then, perhaps, even adjusting
their language skills down, and seeing do
they have transferable skills into the U.S.
economy. And, sure enough, somebody from
Bosnia has been some of those jobs that we
haven't had since 1950 in their developing
economy. And then they were delighted to find
that Somalians would argue about whether they
were goat herder I, or goat herder II, but
that was the pastoral economy that they were
coming from. Well, what else can they do
without good language skills in our economy?
So, there were all kinds of different
applications that I've seen for Oasis, not
that that's what you're going to address, but

NEAL R. GROSS

I would not be surprised if the data is very well received by a lot of different groups.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions of Mr. Reeves? Bob.

MEMBER FRASER: Just a quick question. Sir, the Workplace Mentor, was that developed at a university?

That was developed by MR. REEVES: a grant, under a grant from the Department of Education, and I have the literature here, and search criteria there on your the have But it was created by the Vocational Research Institute, which is not affiliated with a university, and the lead developer was Jeffrey Harris, who is also the developer of the APTICOM system, which was the first computerized replacement for the GATB. And has since become CareerScope, which if you saw the list of all the VR and VA, and service providers, VR service providers that are using CareerScope, that is -- I'm a salesman, also, so I have to qualify, but it is a huge list of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 who is using that computerized aptitude 2 assessment system. MEMBER FRASER: But the information 3 is on the website. 4 MR. REEVES: Yes. 5 MEMBER FRASER: Thank you. 6 7 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Alan. MEMBER HUNT: I read your comments 8 in general between the lines as being -- as 9 10 praising some of the processes we've followed Would you give us any comment, other 11 than these specifics on the process 12 13 whole? Where do you see gaps? Well, a little bit of 14 MR. REEVES: the 15 heads-up was on the new crop vocational rehabilitation people are trained 16 There are some schools that still 17 on O*NET. train DOT, but a lot of those professors have 18 19 retired, and it is very hard to -- when the Department of Labor says that DOT is obsolete, 20 it's very hard to have a curriculum around 21

something that you're not supposed to be using

any more. So, a lot of people have been They don't learn about the trained on O*NET. DOT until they and work qo out at an assessment clinic, or in the field somewhere. finding people to be the As far as job analysts, they will need some training, indoctrination why your granularity is important.

Also, with the -- because I sell to IARP people, one state, because of Worker's Comp law, might have two to hundred IR people, Missouri only has 19. say only about four or five them transferable skills analysis, so that is a very valuable group, but it's not evenly distributed from state to state. It would also, if it really only was to do disability determination, and it ends there, there might not be as much in it for them to help out. I'm making my pitch for aptitude again, but as far as the process, there's been some very -am I to say, but I've been very and who

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	impressed by the comprehensive process that
2	you're going through for developing what could
3	be an extremely important tool for our
4	country.
5	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.
6	Any other questions? We appreciate your time
7	in coming here today to speak to us.
8	MR. REEVES: Thank you.
9	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.
10	Before I close for the day, I just want to
11	open it up and make sure we don't have any
12	loose anything loose out there in terms of
13	agenda items for today.
14	Okay. We will resume in terms of
15	the public meeting at 8:30 tomorrow morning.
16	I just wanted to indicate that we do have a
17	Fact Finding for the panel. It will be closed
18	to the public, and we will start that up at
19	about 2:30. And I think we will resume next
20	door. Okay. Thank you.
21	Can I have a motion from the panel

to adjourn for the afternoon?

1	MEMBER GIBSON: So moved.
2	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan moved.
3	Do I have a second for adjournment?
4	MEMBER KARMAN: I second.
5	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia
6	second. All those in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any opposed?
9	I didn't think so. Okay. We are adjourned.
LO	Thank you.
L1	(Whereupon, the proceedings went
L2	off the record at 3:09 p.m.)
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	