

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT  
ADVISORY PANEL

+ + + + +

QUARTERLY MEETING  
DAY 2

+ + + + +

Thursday  
March 25, 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
- DAVID J. SCHRETLEN, Ph.D.
- NANCY G. SHOR, J.D.
- MARK A. WILSON, Ph.D.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

ALSO PRESENT:

DEBRA TIDWELL-PETERS, Designated Federal  
Official

MARGARET HILTON, The National Academy of  
Sciences

THOMAS J. PLEWES, The National Academy of  
Sciences

DEBBIE HARKIN, Staff

MICHAEL DUNN, Staff

ELIZABETH KENNEDY, Staff

SHIRLEEN ROTH, Staff

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order	4
Overview of Today's Agenda	4
Public Comment	--
Presentation: Overview of The National Academies' Review of O*NET	
-- Margaret Hilton	11
-- Thomas J. Plewes	22
Panel Discussion and Deliberation	130
Administrative Meeting	146
Adjourn	

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (8:39 a.m.)

3 MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Good morning,  
4 everyone. If you could please take your  
5 seats, we are about to begin.

6 I am Debra Tidwell-Peters, the  
7 Designated Federal Officer for the  
8 Occupational Information Development Advisory  
9 Panel, and we welcome you this morning to our  
10 second meeting of 2010.

11 I am going to now turn the meeting  
12 over to the Panel Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-  
13 Bailey. Mary?

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,  
15 Debra.

16 Good morning. I want to welcome  
17 back those who were in attendance with us  
18 yesterday at the start of our second quarterly  
19 meeting in 2010, and also welcome those who  
20 are with us for the first time this morning,  
21 whether it be in person or telephonically.

22 This is just a reminder that this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting is being recorded.

2 For those listening in remotely, to  
3 follow our agenda please go to our website,  
4 [www.ssa.gov/oidap](http://www.ssa.gov/oidap) for a copy of the agenda.

5 As I indicated yesterday, for those  
6 attending our meeting for the first time who  
7 might be interested in the activities and  
8 deliberations of past meetings, if you go to  
9 the meeting page on our website you can click  
10 on any agenda, and associated with that agenda  
11 are the PowerPoints that were delivered for --  
12 or to the OIDAP since our inaugural meeting in  
13 February of 2009.

14 On our website you will find a  
15 variety of materials, including technical  
16 papers and the first report issued by the  
17 panel in September of 2009 called "The Content  
18 Model and Classification Recommendations for  
19 the Social Security Administration,  
20 Occupational Information System." The  
21 Occupational Information System is also what  
22 we call the OIS.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           It outlines our advice to SSA  
2 regarding the data elements we felt essential  
3 to include in the content model specific to  
4 disability adjudication.

5           As we indicate at the start of each  
6 meeting, the charter of the Occupational  
7 Information Development Advisory Panel, OIDAP,  
8 is to provide Social Security with independent  
9 advice and recommendations as to the  
10 development of an OIS to replace the  
11 Dictionary of Occupational Titles in the  
12 disability determination process.

13           To reiterate something I said  
14 yesterday, our task is not to develop the OIS.

15           As our name implies, we are advisory in our  
16 capacity.

17           Yesterday during her report to the  
18 User Needs and Relations Subcommittee, Nancy  
19 Shor encouraged public feedback and comment  
20 upon the September report. I want to  
21 emphasize what she said -- that we welcome  
22 input from stakeholders and the public at any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point along this process.

2 To help streamline input into the  
3 September report, we are strongly encouraging  
4 feedback through May 21st of this year.  
5 Besides having the report available at our  
6 website, disseminating it for feedback through  
7 notices along with our meetings in the Federal  
8 Register since November, notifying individuals  
9 subscribed through our electronic mailing list  
10 about it, and the public feedback request, and  
11 speaking about it at four conferences, with  
12 presentations slated at eight more conferences  
13 between now and May 21st, we are attempting to  
14 get the word out about the report, as well as  
15 potentially including it in other means, such  
16 as the Open Government website and/or  
17 independently through the Federal Register.

18 What stakeholders say matters, and  
19 we want you to know that what you have to say  
20 we want to hear.

21 Following our review of our  
22 September report, Commissioner Astrue further

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requested our assistance in providing SSA with  
2 recommendations, and we reviewed those  
3 yesterday. I will reiterate them this morning  
4 for those who weren't in attendance with us  
5 yesterday.

6 In January, he asked us to provide  
7 SSA with advice in four areas -- in developing  
8 a sampling and data collection plan for the  
9 research and development process. Number two,  
10 for helping with advice and recommendations  
11 for the creation of a process for recruiting  
12 field job analysts, including methods for  
13 certification criteria and training. Three,  
14 establishing associations between human  
15 functions and the requirements of work that  
16 would serve the disability evaluation process.

17 And, four, reviewing relevant documents or  
18 reports SSA identifies that may affect or  
19 inform SSA's work on the OIS.

20 In our agenda for today, we  
21 specifically address the fourth request by  
22 Commissioner Astrue.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           As identified in the September  
2 report, the data elements recommended to SSA  
3 were the starting point of our process, not  
4 the finish line for the OIDAP. While many  
5 panels are assembled to study a topic for a  
6 designated time, and that culminates with a  
7 report, after which time the panel is  
8 disbanded, our panel is different in that we  
9 have been asked for further independent advice  
10 and recommendations into the research and  
11 development process of the OIS development.

12           The 2009 National Academies of  
13 Science report on the O\*NET is the first time  
14 that an independent group has reviewed an  
15 occupational information system in 30 years,  
16 since a review of the Dictionary of  
17 Occupational Titles was conducted by the  
18 National Research Council in 1980, and what is  
19 often referred to as the Miller Study.

20           We commend the U.S. Department of  
21 Labor for commissioning the National Academies  
22 of Science Panel to independently review the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 O\*NET upon the O\*NET's tenth anniversary.  
2 This is an important process.

3 It is timely that the National  
4 Academies of Science reviewed an existing  
5 civilian occupational information system while  
6 we are providing advice and recommendations to  
7 the Social Security Administration on the  
8 development of an OIS. The existence of the  
9 National Academies of Science panel in its  
10 report provides us with the opportunity to  
11 explore areas that exist in the development of  
12 any occupational information system, and learn  
13 from that process to better advice and  
14 recommendations to the Social Security  
15 Administration.

16 The National Academy of Science  
17 report provides us as a panel with a great  
18 chance for learning. That is the goal for  
19 this morning.

20 We thank Margaret Hilton, the Study  
21 Director and Senior Program Officer, and Tom  
22 Plewes, Associate Study Director and Senior

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Program Officer with the National Academies of  
2 Science for accepting our invitation this  
3 morning to come and speak to us.

4 Behind Tab 3 in our three-ring  
5 binders we will find the biographical sketches  
6 for Margaret and Tom, and we will also find  
7 copies of their PowerPoint presentations.

8 Margaret and Tom have quite a bit  
9 of information to present to us this morning.

10 I will ask the panel to withhold questions  
11 until after they are completed with their  
12 presentation.

13 Welcome.

14 MS. HILTON: Thank you. That's it.

15 The name of our study, which is available  
16 right now on our -- the National Academy Press  
17 website -- is called "A Database for a  
18 Changing Economy: Review of the O\*NET."

19 The Department of Labor asked us to  
20 do this study. As Mary mentioned, it seemed  
21 like a good time to study O\*NET, because it  
22 was about a decade old. And they especially

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wanted us to document how O\*NET is used, but  
2 they also wanted us to evaluate those uses.  
3 And they are especially interested in use in  
4 workforce development, because O\*NET was  
5 originally created for that purpose by state  
6 and local employment offices.

7 They were interested in human  
8 resource management uses of O\*NET, and  
9 especially in business and in job matching  
10 systems. And they were interested in how  
11 O\*NET links to other occupational  
12 classification systems, in particular the  
13 Federal Government's standard occupational  
14 classification system.

15 The linkages are important, because  
16 it is a database. It is an electronic  
17 database, and it is sometimes used going back  
18 to the HRM and HRM information systems, HRM/IS  
19 systems.

20 They wanted us not only to document  
21 how O\*NET is used and evaluate it, but also to  
22 identify how O\*NET could be improved, and they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 were especially interested in the areas you  
2 see listed on the slide. Currency, how up to  
3 date is this information? Efficiency, are  
4 there better ways to collect the data? Cost  
5 effectiveness, is there any way to do it less  
6 expensively? And they wondered about using  
7 new technologies to collect the data.

8 We just had breakfast with Mary and  
9 Sylvia and Mark. We were talking a little bit  
10 about the panel selection, and you will see a  
11 gold brochure at your place that talks in  
12 greater depth about our whole National Academy  
13 study process.

14 Basically, Tom did most of the  
15 recruiting, and I think he did a great job.  
16 Tom talked to the members of the Committee on  
17 National Statistics. That's a standing  
18 committee of the National Academies. And he  
19 also just talked to people in the field.

20 And when we talk to people, they  
21 identify other people, so it's a complex kind  
22 of a snowball sampling process we go through,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and we talked to many people and we have  
2 finally come up with a slate of nominees.  
3 They are only nominated. Our proposed slate  
4 of staff people goes all the way up to the  
5 President of the National Academy of Sciences.

6 Only Ralph Cicerone, the President,  
7 can approve their membership, and yet even his  
8 approve is provisional, because those names,  
9 those nominees' names are then posted for  
10 public comment for 20 days. And at the first  
11 committee meeting we always hold a closed bias  
12 and conflict discussion, and based on that  
13 discussion some members may decide to  
14 voluntarily drop off or there may be other  
15 problems.

16 After the bias and conflict  
17 discussion, we write a memo that goes to our  
18 lawyers, and then, finally, when the lawyers  
19 say it is okay, then they become the final  
20 committee members. So it's a complex process,  
21 but we try to -- we do it that way to try to  
22 make sure we get the best panel members.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We also are trying to balance areas  
2 of expertise, and on our panel we have -- we  
3 had quite a few IO psychologists, people in  
4 the field of work analysis, but we also wanted  
5 users of O\*NET. We also tried to get a mix of  
6 views of O\*NET, so that we weren't having only  
7 the people that were involved in the original  
8 development or the people that are known to be  
9 its biggest proponents, but we also tried to  
10 include people who had more questions about  
11 the system.

12           So these are the panel members we  
13 ended up with. I am not going to read through  
14 all their names, but obviously they are people  
15 known in the field of IO psychology and users  
16 and statisticians.

17           Our study process is that we were  
18 reviewing the literature throughout the study  
19 process and, of course, our panel members  
20 helped us, because some of them know the  
21 literature quite extensively. We did hold  
22 public workshops in both March and April, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Sylvia Karman spoke at our March workshop.

2           The National Academy has a special  
3 exemption from the Federal Advisory Committee  
4 Act that allows us to hold some of our  
5 deliberations in closed session, and we did  
6 hold such deliberations. We created a review  
7 draft, based on all of the information we had  
8 received that entered our review process in  
9 August.

10           Then, we did what's called a  
11 response to review, where we talk about every  
12 comment we received from the outside  
13 reviewers, how we plan to address that  
14 comment, and, if we don't plan to address it,  
15 we have to have a very good reason not to make  
16 the change.

17           Our response to review was accepted  
18 in November. One thing I should mention is  
19 that all of our panel members and all of the  
20 outside reviewers are volunteers, so I was  
21 just going to mention the name of our  
22 volunteer review coordinator. That was Neal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 Schmitt from Michigan State University. He  
2 approved our response to the review comments  
3 in November, and we transmitted our report to  
4 DOL in November, in pre-publication form.

5 And if you are interested in  
6 reading the whole report, you can see the web  
7 address right there. It is still published  
8 right now in pre-publication form. Right now  
9 there is final editing going on to the second  
10 page proofs, and on April 22nd we expect to  
11 actually receive the books, the published  
12 books, from the National Academy Press.

13 At the time that we get the final  
14 copies of the book, the website version will  
15 also change and reflect the changes that are  
16 in the final printed report.

17 We have done other studies that are  
18 related to our recent O\*NET study, and Mary  
19 mentioned our important study in 1980 when we  
20 reviewed the Dictionary of Occupational  
21 Titles. And that committee found a lot of  
22 flaws in DOT -- uneven coverage. There were a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot more job titles listed in the DOT from  
2 manufacturing than existed in the economy,  
3 because even in 1980 the economy was already  
4 beginning its shift, which continues away from  
5 manufacturing towards services.

6 That panel recommended a lot of  
7 very fundamental changes in the Dictionary of  
8 Occupational Titles. One that is actually not  
9 listed on my slide was the idea of going to an  
10 electronic database, because it is just going  
11 to inherently be out of date if you are going  
12 to create a big paper dictionary, and then  
13 have to update it and print it.

14 So the vision was to have much more  
15 continuous updating and to have some permanent  
16 professional people within the Department of  
17 Labor who could oversee the development of a  
18 better and improved database for the future.

19 The panel also recommended an  
20 outside Technical Advisory Committee, and the  
21 only reason I mentioned that recommendation  
22 from a study way back in 1980 is that our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 panel that met just last year makes the same  
2 recommendation to the Labor Department, that  
3 they should have an outside Technical Advisory  
4 Committee.

5 1980 was a time when a lot of jobs  
6 were being lost, manufacturing was shrinking,  
7 people were being laid off, and so that  
8 committee recommended looking at jobs,  
9 defining them broadly and looking at what can  
10 be -- what kinds of skills, abilities, and  
11 other characteristics can transfer from one  
12 job to another?

13 So they talked about cross-  
14 occupational linkages. That panel recommended  
15 that the new system be more in line with other  
16 federal occupational classification systems,  
17 and that study was important, because it led  
18 the Labor Department to create the Advisory  
19 Panel on the Dictionary of Occupational  
20 Titles. And that panel led to the creation of  
21 O\*NET.

22 Another earlier study that relates

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more directly to your charge was a preliminary  
2 review of a research plan to redesign  
3 disability determination. That study  
4 expressed a concern that O\*NET, as it was  
5 being developed at that time, was not going to  
6 meet SSA's needs. That panel suggested that  
7 SSA and DOL enter into an interagency  
8 agreement to create a version of O\*NET with  
9 information on minimum as well as average job  
10 requirements.

11 Another study, which Tom brought a  
12 copy of, so I can show it to you, is called  
13 "The Dynamics of Disability." And this one  
14 came out in 2002. It is related to the study  
15 I just mentioned to you, in that it is a more  
16 final study of the same SSA research plan.

17 Basically, they observed, which we  
18 all know, is that the Labor Department was no  
19 longer updating the DOT, that the O\*NET would  
20 not meet the SSA's needs to define residual  
21 functional capacity to work, without major  
22 reconstruction. And that if there wasn't any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resolution to this problem that SSA would be  
2 left with no objective basis for justifying  
3 the decisions.

4 Now, another study that is -- we  
5 are getting a little more -- a little more  
6 recent, still 10 years old, the time flies.  
7 This book is called "The Changing Nature of  
8 Work: Implications for Occupational  
9 Analysis." This study was actually done for  
10 the Department of Defense, which was looking  
11 at a lot of different occupational information  
12 classification systems.

13 This panel concluded that O\*NET  
14 brings together the most comprehensive  
15 analytical systems. It is theoretically  
16 informed. It is fully accessible and offers  
17 significant improvements over the DOT, and it  
18 maps well with other systems. So this panel  
19 was basically encouraging DoD to consider  
20 O\*NET as a framework as it tries to bring its  
21 occupational systems closer together.

22 And now I'm going to turn it over

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to Tom to tell you more about O\*NET.

2 MR. PLEWES: Thank you. And let me  
3 just say that more recently there was a Rand  
4 panel that took a look at the DOT -- that took  
5 a look at the possible use of the O\*NET and  
6 other classification systems for DoD purposes,  
7 and recommended that DoD take a look at O\*NET.

8 So that work keeps on going on. I know about  
9 that, because I happened to be lucky enough to  
10 serve on that panel.

11 Let's see here. Here we go, okay.

12 So what is O\*NET? I really don't have to  
13 tell this group that, but let me just start  
14 out with some very basics here. It is a very  
15 large database. It is probably not as big as  
16 some people would like, but it is a lot bigger  
17 than a lot of users would like to see when  
18 they open up those files.

19 It is accessible online or by  
20 download, and it uses this thing called a  
21 content model to describe work. Pretty basic  
22 stuff, but I just want to kind of start out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this way, because I think it's important that  
2 we understand that.

3           There is a rigor to what O\*NET --  
4 how O\*NET approaches it. The folks who  
5 developed O\*NET took a look at all of the  
6 literature at that time, and came up with, if  
7 you will, this quadrant, taking a look at not  
8 only work-oriented but job-oriented kind of  
9 characteristics of work that wanted -- they  
10 wanted to have incorporated.

11           We will get into the evaluation in  
12 just a minute here.

13           The important thing I think that we  
14 need to understand is that O\*NET is a general  
15 purpose kind of a classification system. It  
16 has a wide variety of users and uses, and we  
17 drilled into some of these in the report that  
18 we published. Some of the data that we were  
19 able to assemble, that really wasn't well-  
20 known before, was quite astounding as a matter  
21 of fact.

22           For example, over 37 million

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 individual users did some access to an online  
2 career guidance system, which is in turn  
3 driven by O\*NET in 2009. That was a very  
4 large number, and it caused some people to  
5 think, gee whiz, maybe if we just owned O\*NET  
6 we would really be rich.

7 But the fact of the matter is is  
8 that there are a lot of folks out there who  
9 use it for career guidance and have built it  
10 into these career guidance systems -- state  
11 workforce development, for job counseling and  
12 the more traditional roles that O\*NET and the  
13 DOT and O\*NET itself were originally designed  
14 for.

15 They had two experts, as you know,  
16 from state labor market information  
17 organizations that helped provide this  
18 information to those folks who are trying to  
19 match workers with jobs out in the field,  
20 human resource managers, researchers, and  
21 then, importantly, vocational rehabilitation  
22 counselors, who are of course represented by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 your Chair and other members of this panel.

2 Those are the folks who use O\*NET.

3 In fact, I think that if someone asked me  
4 that question, who uses O\*NET, I would say  
5 you. You may not know it, but in some way  
6 this structure called O\*NET fits into many of  
7 the things that you do on a daily basis, and  
8 in a wide variety of areas.

9 The important thing is is that --  
10 to understand is that it is designed to meet a  
11 wide variety of uses, but in each case there  
12 probably is a better system that could be  
13 developed for that particular use. But it is  
14 a general purpose system, and it does not try  
15 to fulfill all of the needs of all of the  
16 users, but it tries to, if you will, provide a  
17 basis for all users to understand and to view  
18 an occupational information system.

19 So what did we say here? First of  
20 all, why did we get into this SSA business?  
21 People have asked that question. Why did the  
22 panel choose to look at this? If you look at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the original charge that the panel came up  
2 with, it does not specifically say, "Now, you  
3 take a look at whether or not O\*NET meets the  
4 disability -- you know, the requirements of  
5 SSA for the disability adjudication work that  
6 they do." It just wasn't there.

7 But as the panel began to look at  
8 the major uses and the previous studies that  
9 were done by the National Research Council and  
10 the Institute of Medicine, it became very  
11 obvious that a major interface between O\*NET  
12 and a user system was represented by the need  
13 that you are looking at now, the Social  
14 Security Administration's need.

15 They didn't feel that they could --  
16 that they could put out a report without at  
17 least addressing that interface, and so you  
18 saw Chapter 8 in our report.

19 We did not have on the panel a  
20 person who was an expert in Social Security  
21 Administration disability adjudication, and we  
22 did not look at all of the issues that your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 panel is looking at, nor in the depth of  
2 hands-on experience that you are taking.

3           So Chapter 8 has to be looked at in  
4 a slightly different view than the work that  
5 you are doing, it seems to us. And that view  
6 is, if you are developing a general purpose  
7 occupational information network system, here  
8 is a major user, and are there opportunities  
9 to serve the needs of this particular user,  
10 given what we understand to be the needs of  
11 the user and the functionality that O\*NET  
12 provides. So we need to make that very clear.

13           Now, the panel was not you, and it  
14 did not bring the same expertise to bear on  
15 the issue. But I was pleased to note from the  
16 report that you put out in January that they  
17 faced and they approached the issues in many  
18 of the same ways that you have approached the  
19 issues -- by taking a look, if you will, at  
20 the ability of O\*NET to fulfill some of those  
21 particular functions.

22           So they actually said, okay, could

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 O\*NET be used by the Social Security  
2 Administration for this? Well, what you need  
3 to do, if you are going to make that kind of  
4 decision, is that you need to take a look at  
5 your residual functional capacity approach,  
6 and you need to take a look at the O\*NET  
7 descriptors, and so let's do that  
8 systematically.

9 You've done a lot of that work here  
10 in your report, and I will not spend a lot of  
11 time at it. But I do want to let you know  
12 what the panel came up with.

13 First of all, here are the O\*NET  
14 descriptors. They are a mix of the cognitive,  
15 psychomotor, physical abilities, sensory  
16 abilities, a mix of the traditional, if you  
17 will, occupational classification, with some  
18 of the work in fact taken directly from  
19 Fleishman's work on the physical ability side.

20 But it covers a wide range of  
21 domains, and it doesn't focus on the  
22 domains of absolute most interest to you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay? It is, again, a general purpose. And  
2 there is, of course, the work context domain,  
3 which we won't spend too much time on.

4 So we took a look at comparing, as  
5 best the panel could, the residual functional  
6 capacity with O\*NET comparisons. And the  
7 first thing they looked at was physical  
8 abilities. We took as a given the residual  
9 functional capacity requirements that have  
10 come up with -- that the Social Security  
11 Administration has come up with.

12 And it was very obvious that when  
13 taking a look at physical abilities that O\*NET  
14 has much less specific -- specificity in the  
15 measures. There is not the kind of  
16 specificity that is necessary to meet the  
17 current RFCs for physical disabilities. And,  
18 interestingly enough, that is exactly what  
19 your report found as well.

20 And this is just an example. The  
21 same example is in your report. I won't dwell  
22 on this. It's in our presentation.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           In terms of comparing the RFCs for  
2     lifting, standing, sitting, pushing, you can  
3     read all those. Again, there are specific  
4     time ranges versus a relative time used in  
5     O\*NET. The anchors are very different, and it  
6     causes, if you will, a not direct  
7     transferability of the O\*NET work context to  
8     meet. It is the RFCs of Social Security, and  
9     here are some of the examples in O\*NET, and  
10    you can see that. We'll just go through this  
11    very quickly.

12           In terms of environmental  
13    conditions, the RFCs are quite specific in  
14    terms of ability to withstand environmental  
15    hazards. There is -- the O\*NET work context  
16    has exposure to heat, contaminants, vibration,  
17    and so forth.

18           I would call this -- you may not  
19    agree with me -- I would call some of these  
20    differences between O\*NET and the RFCs used by  
21    Social Security to be marginal. They aren't  
22    critical to say O\*NET will never ever meet

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that, but it is a matter of your judgment.  
2 And I think you should -- you need to take a  
3 look at that, and here are the O\*NET anchors  
4 there.

5 In terms of sensory perception and  
6 abilities, we have just gone through again  
7 near acuity, near vision, far acuity, far  
8 vision. Is that nuance, or is that terribly  
9 important? If you are sitting in the field  
10 and you've got to make a judgment, perhaps it  
11 is terribly important, and you need to have  
12 something much more specific or different than  
13 O\*NET is offering you.

14 And so what did we come up with?  
15 What did the panel come up with? I think that  
16 there was -- there is a general concurrence on  
17 the panel with the findings of the previous  
18 National Research Council reports that O\*NET,  
19 in and of itself, cannot be used in the way it  
20 is for the purpose that you need to use it.  
21 It just -- it is not -- it is not fully  
22 capable of serving that purpose.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           However, there are those good  
2 things we talked about in terms of O\*NET --  
3 its tie-in with other classification systems,  
4 particularly with the standard occupational  
5 classification structure, the rigor that is  
6 used in building O\*NET.

7           Some of that rigor is based on  
8 surveys of workers in establishments that may  
9 have some issues with response rates, and so  
10 forth, and we looked at that also. And, yes,  
11 we recommended some revisions in the way that  
12 those surveys are done.

13           Some of that has to do with the way  
14 in which experts, job analysts, provide their  
15 input to this. And, again, there has to be a  
16 reconsideration of some of -- the way in which  
17 that particular business is done, and we --  
18 the panel made recommendations in that as  
19 well.

20           But I think that they saw enough  
21 goodness in O\*NET that they recommended that  
22 the Social Security Administration and the DOL

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 create an interagency task force to study the  
2 viability of modifications of O\*NET to  
3 accommodate the needs of the Social Security  
4 Administration.

5 It didn't say, "Social Security  
6 Administration, change the way you do business  
7 to meet O\*NET." There are some things that  
8 could be changed within O\*NET, for example,  
9 that would help make that system much more  
10 reflective of -- or much more consistent with  
11 where the Social Security Administration wants  
12 to go with disability adjudication.

13 It asks that there be an assessment  
14 of SSA occupational information needs.  
15 Whoops, we didn't recommend your panel, but  
16 that's certainly a contribution that we  
17 believe that you are making. And then,  
18 analyze interagency cost-benefit and cost-  
19 sharing.

20 These things don't come without  
21 cost, both to DOL in terms of the kind of work  
22 that must be done to make O\*NET somewhat more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 friendly to this particular use, nor certainly  
2 to the Social Security Administration as it  
3 would try to work with Department of Labor to  
4 make O\*NET much more friendly to the  
5 disability adjudication and the disability  
6 adjudication system -- information system much  
7 more friendly to O\*NET.

8           So there is a cost-benefit that has  
9 to be made. We did not make that cost-  
10 benefit. The panel did not -- didn't have the  
11 time, the input, but we recognized -- the  
12 panel recognized that you don't make these  
13 decisions based on what is nice to have. You  
14 make the decisions based on what is practical,  
15 what is affordable, and what is consistent  
16 with the ultimate need of the user. And I  
17 think that was the recommendation.

18           So a lot of the work that was  
19 suggested by the panel has been handed back to  
20 the Department of Labor, and not just to  
21 Social Security Administration. So, and we  
22 are still waiting to hear what Department of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Labor's response to that particular  
2 recommendation is.

3 MS. HILTON: Thanks, Tom. That was  
4 a very good explanation of where the panel is  
5 and what we recommended.

6 When Debra Tidwell-Peters invited  
7 us to speak, she mentioned some specific  
8 issues that she would like us to address,  
9 because our report is very broad, so I just  
10 wanted to try to address some of the specific  
11 questions she asked about.

12 One is the aggregation issue, which  
13 I know you all are very familiar with. I  
14 mean, obviously, DOT had 14,000 jobs. Right  
15 now, O\*NET has 1,100 occupations, so that's --  
16 it's a huge difference.

17 The O\*NET is aligned with SOC. It  
18 does have a coding system with digits, so that  
19 you can relate any O\*NET job to an SOC job.  
20 Nevertheless, it is not perfectly aligned.  
21 The SOC has just revised. It has 840.  
22 Obviously, O\*NET has over 1,000.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Since 2006, O\*NET has added 153 new  
2 occupations.       These are what they call  
3 breakouts of SOC occupations. In other words,  
4 it is becoming more disaggregated. Part of  
5 the breakouts are related to the search for  
6 green occupations.

7           What our panel observed is that for  
8 some of the users of O\*NET they really want  
9 this disaggregated data. People in career  
10 guidance want to be able to direct young  
11 people towards a more specific job, not  
12 towards such a broad occupation.

13           Obviously, your users would like  
14 more disaggregated data. On the other hand,  
15 there are other users, and specifically in  
16 workforce development. And that is the core  
17 constituency that is why, first, DOT was  
18 created, and then O\*NET was created.

19           It was to serve state workforce  
20 development people who are trying to place  
21 people in jobs. And they like the broader  
22 occupations, because they are completely

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 aligned with SOC occupational codes and they  
2 can then link this occupation with a lot of  
3 data collected by the Bureau of Labor  
4 Statistics and state and local agencies, and  
5 that is all collected at the SOC level.

6 So the panel observed these -- some  
7 people want more disaggregation, some people  
8 want less disaggregation, and the panel didn't  
9 agree. I think that shows that our panel was  
10 well balanced. I mean, you could say it's a  
11 problem that they can't agree, but it just may  
12 reflect the reality.

13 The panel -- although the panel  
14 didn't agree what the level of aggregation  
15 should be, again, just as in the case that Tom  
16 just mentioned, our panel met for a certain  
17 amount of time and then it quit -- that was  
18 the end of our time, money, and effort, and so  
19 the panel felt very, very strongly that this  
20 aggregation issue was critical for the future  
21 of O\*NET and for the usefulness of O\*NET.

22 And so they recommended that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Labor Department either conduct or commission  
2 research to look at the costs and benefits of  
3 changing it, of either making it bigger or  
4 making it smaller, and, you know, what would  
5 be the result of making it bigger, what are  
6 the pros and cons, what are the results of  
7 staying smaller, closer to SOC, what are the  
8 pros and cons.

9 One element of our recommendation  
10 on this aggregation issue, and it's a long  
11 recommendation -- we had many long  
12 recommendations. So one element was  
13 specifically calling for some research into  
14 whether O\*NET is too disaggregated for the  
15 purposes of disability determination, and to  
16 what extent.

17 There is the recommendation. Sorry  
18 I didn't put it up there, but it seems -- I  
19 know you have this all right in front of you  
20 anyway, so -- okay.

21 Data collection -- now that was  
22 another issue, and Tom just started to mention

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it briefly. Right now, O\*NET is using --  
2 collecting data using a lot of different  
3 methods and a lot of different sources. It is  
4 collecting data from many different types of  
5 respondents, including job incumbents.

6 Then, there are people they call  
7 occupational experts, people who may have  
8 worked in the occupation at one time, but now  
9 they might be trainers or doing something else  
10 related. That is another group. And then,  
11 the third group are the occupational analysts.

12 Our conclusion was that these --  
13 all these different sources may or may not be  
14 the best representative of the work that is  
15 performed, and that the impact on measurement  
16 error is unclear, because with every method  
17 you introduce new error.

18 Specifically on the issue of the  
19 use of occupational analysts, here again this  
20 was an issue where our panel did not entirely  
21 agree, and all you have to do is read Chapter  
22 2. You can tell it. But you can especially

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tell it because there is a dissent at the end  
2 of our report, where two of our panel members  
3 dissented on about a few issues, but they were  
4 -- one of the issues was this use of  
5 occupational analysts where they felt that  
6 giving paper descriptions of an occupation to  
7 a trained occupational analyst would not  
8 result in an accurate rating.

9 Another data collection issue that  
10 we identified was that the construct validity  
11 of the taxonomies of descriptors varies across  
12 the different domains of the content model.  
13 Tom showed you a picture of the content model.

14 It is very, very big. There are many  
15 domains. Within the domains, there are many  
16 specific descriptors. And some of those  
17 descriptors have a strong research base.

18 Tom mentioned the abilities  
19 descriptors. They are drawn from Fleishman.  
20 They are widely accepted as some of the best  
21 descriptors of abilities, with the strongest  
22 research base. Some of the other taxonomies,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 skills, and knowledges there is less support  
2 in the research.

3 So to the database quality, another  
4 conclusion was that DOL has achieved its goal  
5 of populating the O\*NET with updated  
6 information over about a decade. We did see a  
7 problem that there were some short-term policy  
8 agendas that were sometimes reducing the focus  
9 on the core database activities.

10 And to mention some specific  
11 concerns there, the Labor Department and the  
12 O\*NET center, trying to make it more user-  
13 friendly, put a lot of things onto O\*NET  
14 Online, which some of the users in the field  
15 don't entirely agree with, especially trying  
16 to define an in-demand occupation, define it  
17 nationally, and yet we had state people  
18 speaking at some of our workshops saying they  
19 did not like it that O\*NET Online puts little  
20 flags and highlights certain occupations to  
21 suggest that, you know, these are growth  
22 areas, this is where you can place people in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 jobs, and so forth, and especially now with  
2 the recession.

3 So basically that is an example of  
4 a short-term policy agenda, and certainly the  
5 current focus on the green jobs, where they  
6 are adding a lot of green jobs, but how  
7 representative are those jobs of the whole  
8 economy.

9 So our recommendation here was that  
10 DOL should be focusing its resources on the  
11 core database activities, and not getting so  
12 involved in developing the applications and  
13 tools and trying to become more user-friendly.

14 Related to that, as Tom mentioned,  
15 many people just take the whole O\*NET database  
16 and they make it more user-friendly anyway,  
17 especially these online career guidance  
18 systems. So Labor Department doesn't need to  
19 spend its own time and money creating these  
20 applications.

21 Our most important recommendation  
22 for improving the quality of the O\*NET

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 database was that we strongly believe that the  
2 Labor Department should establish and support  
3 a Technical Advisory Board. That advisory  
4 board we think should be prioritizing research  
5 suggestions that come from the field or from  
6 within DOL. They should develop RFPs for the  
7 high priority research items, and then they  
8 should review and rank proposals from outside  
9 researchers to conduct that research.

10 As I mentioned, we have many  
11 recommendations in our report. We have a lot  
12 of long recommendations. But since many of  
13 our recommendations relate to research, this  
14 is our top priority.

15 If you are interested in how we see  
16 the priority of all of our many  
17 recommendations, I would recommend that you  
18 read Chapter 10. In Chapter 10 of our report  
19 we rank all of the research and development  
20 recommendations.

21 We also noticed there were problems  
22 in terms of the users and the communication

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back and forth between the database developers  
2 and the users. We didn't think there was  
3 enough ongoing communication. The  
4 example I just gave to you of the O\*NET center  
5 identify nationally in-demand occupations when  
6 people at the state level don't even think  
7 those are in demand is an example of a lack of  
8 communication. So here we recommended that  
9 they establish and staff an ongoing External  
10 User Advisory Board.

11 When we met not long ago with the  
12 SSA Subcommittee of House Ways and Means, they  
13 wondered, are there any lessons learned from  
14 the development of O\*NET that could be  
15 applicable as you start to create your own  
16 occupational information system? Our main  
17 conclusion would be that developing and  
18 maintaining a high quality occupational  
19 database takes a lot of expertise, and it  
20 requires money.

21 We were not able to develop an  
22 estimate of how much it costs to create the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 content model, but that was a very, very  
2 extensive research project that went on for  
3 five years -- developing it, developing the  
4 constructs, the taxonomies -- and then going  
5 to the field and pilot testing it.

6 We do know that the data collection  
7 costs right now are about \$6 million a year,  
8 and that updates 100 occupations a year. So  
9 that gives you some idea.

10 And one other thing I'll mention  
11 related to data collection costs is that  
12 whenever O\*NET adds more occupations, whenever  
13 it becomes less aggregated, more  
14 disaggregated, as it has done, that is always  
15 going to increase your data collection costs,  
16 because you have more occupations to go after,  
17 and that means that same money that could have  
18 been used to refresh your existing occupations  
19 more frequently is going to chase more  
20 occupations. So there is always a tradeoff in  
21 any kind of database like this.

22 And that's it. Now we're ready to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take your questions.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,  
3 Margaret and Tom, for your words and your  
4 presentation. I think this is very useful to  
5 us this morning.

6 Before I open up questions to the  
7 panel, I have some questions I would like to  
8 ask. And I know that we have mentioned that  
9 Mark and I met with you independently outside  
10 of the OIDAP, and Mark outside of his  
11 university, me outside of my previous IOTF  
12 representation, and we also understand that  
13 SSA has met with you as well.

14 So in terms of the version of your  
15 report that is online, on the website, in  
16 terms of the pre-publication copy, and you  
17 mentioned in your slides that you are going to  
18 have the final report available in April or  
19 May, what are the changes that are in the  
20 final copy of the report?

21 MS. HILTON: I can't -- I mean, I  
22 just can't give you that answer. We made

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 changes throughout -- well, we made some  
2 changes to almost every chapter, as a result  
3 of the feedback we got both from DOL, from the  
4 O\*NET center, and from you.

5 But, you know, without having a  
6 copy in front of me, because every change --  
7 as I mentioned to you at breakfast, there was  
8 a lot of internal discussion, because our  
9 policy is that we don't change major  
10 conclusions or recommendations. So that I can  
11 say, that the major conclusions and  
12 recommendations, including the recommendation  
13 that Tom shared with you about an interagency  
14 task force, have not changed.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: How about for  
16 Chapter 8? What were the specific input that  
17 you received that might have changed anything  
18 in Chapter 8?

19 MS. HILTON: We did make some small  
20 changes to Chapter 8 in response to our  
21 meeting with you and with SSA.

22 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: What were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those?

2 MS. HILTON: Like I said, I can't  
3 -- without having the, you know, copy in front  
4 of me where I see the redline strikeout, I  
5 can't say.

6 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So were they  
7 editorial in nature?

8 MS. HILTON: I would say they are  
9 more editorial in nature.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

11 MS. HILTON: As I mentioned, our  
12 policy is not to change major conclusions or  
13 recommendations.

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank  
15 you. And then, in terms of how I came at the  
16 report, and as a panel member, what guided my  
17 evaluation of the report was our own  
18 evaluation of the occupational information  
19 needs of SSA. And I know that Tom has a copy  
20 of the report, and I know that's outlined in  
21 pages 11 and 12 of the report.

22 And so for anybody who is listening

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 in and wants to access a copy, I mentioned at  
2 the beginning of the meeting that you can go  
3 to our website, the home page, and access the  
4 report.

5 The occupational information needs  
6 that are outlined in pages 11 and 12 of our  
7 report include four categories of what an  
8 occupational information system must contain  
9 to meet SSA's needs. I would like to ask some  
10 questions specific to the recommendation that  
11 the National Academies of Science panel has in  
12 terms of occupational information needs for  
13 SSA in Chapter 8 for disability determination  
14 as they relate to these four areas.

15 One of the things -- the very first  
16 thing that is -- the bullet says reflect  
17 national existence of incidence of work. It  
18 says a new occupational resource must show  
19 that work exists and that work exists in  
20 numbers sufficient to indicate that it is not  
21 obscure.

22 One of the things -- the last

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things that you just mentioned was the  
2 inclusion of green jobs and whether, you know,  
3 that overemphasis is really reflective of work  
4 as it exists in the national economy.

5 So how did the NAS panel consider  
6 this occupational information need for SSA in  
7 terms of the disability determination process  
8 in its recommendations for Chapter 8?

9 MS. HILTON: We didn't specifically  
10 address, you know, the specific need of the  
11 work identified in numbers, or specific -- we  
12 did not identify that question specifically  
13 within the context of the need for disability  
14 determination, and we didn't even make a  
15 specific conclusion or recommendation.

16 But I think it's fair to say that  
17 our panel believes that the current  
18 occupations that are in O\*NET are pretty well  
19 representative of the occupations in the  
20 national economy. I think it's fair to say  
21 also that some -- well, I don't -- we didn't  
22 really reach consensus, as I mentioned, about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the recent growth and the new occupations that  
2 are added, with some panel members feeling  
3 like these are being added for political  
4 reasons, if they are green jobs, and other  
5 panel members saying that it is very important  
6 that any occupational system remain up to  
7 date. And if jobs are changing, and if new  
8 jobs are being created, they should be  
9 reflected.

10 So I'm sorry that is not an exact  
11 answer to your question.

12 MR. PLEWES: Without directly  
13 addressing this point that you make here in  
14 terms of reflecting national existence and  
15 incidence of work, I think the panel did talk  
16 to that, and consider that, in terms of  
17 reaffirming the need for the linkage to the  
18 standard occupational classification  
19 structure.

20 The standard occupational  
21 classification structure is that structure  
22 which allows you to link to those databases

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which tell you about the trends in the  
2 occupations out in the field, the new and  
3 emerging occupations, and so forth. The  
4 standard occupational classification structure  
5 is updated on a recurring cycle, a regular  
6 cycle, so there is a built-in updating  
7 mechanism there.

8 So those two aspects of O\*NET I  
9 think are -- commend themselves to being able  
10 to reflect the national existence and  
11 incidence of work. Whether they do or not in  
12 practical aspect as they are applied, as the  
13 O\*NET information flows into -- I'm sorry, as  
14 SOC information -- based information flows  
15 into O\*NET, is not something that the panel  
16 looked at.

17 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.  
18 And in your presentations I noted that you use  
19 the word "occupation" in terms of reflecting  
20 the O\*NET, and I know that in terms of a  
21 decision point that DOL had to make in the  
22 development of the O\*NET was what was the unit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of analysis. And in your report you indicate  
2 that to be the unit of analysis at the  
3 occupation level.

4 Was there ever a consideration of  
5 the unit of analysis or a user need where the  
6 unit analysis was at the job level?

7 MS. HILTON: Well, as I mentioned,  
8 when the Advisory Panel on the DOT met, one of  
9 their concerns was that it was just not  
10 practical, not affordable, to continue trying  
11 to collect data on 14,000 job titles. I think  
12 it is important to remember that even the DOT,  
13 even with 14,000, that those job titles were  
14 representing more different, unique jobs.

15 If you are going to create a  
16 national database, it is not ever going to be  
17 possible to define every job, because  
18 organizations have their own job titles and it  
19 just gets very, very large.

20 I remember Rich Froshel telling me  
21 something about when the state of Texas talked  
22 to their employers and said, "What job titles

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do you use here in Texas?" And they got  
2 something like 80,000 different job titles  
3 back.

4 So I believe that it -- that the  
5 reason -- one reason O\*NET uses the broad  
6 occupations it does is that it was trying to  
7 follow the recommendations of that earlier  
8 advisory panel, which recommended looking at  
9 fewer, broader occupations, partly because, as  
10 I mentioned, their concern of identifying the  
11 transferable skills and knowledges, and so  
12 forth, that people might be able to use to  
13 move from job to job.

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.  
15 The second area in terms of SSA's needs for  
16 occupation information was reflecting work  
17 requirements, that it must enable SSA to  
18 evaluate an individual's ability to perform  
19 work rather than to obtain work. As such, it  
20 says any new resource must reflect  
21 occupational information that is aggregated,  
22 defined, and measured, in a way that allows

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SSA to compare work requirements to an  
2 individual's RFC and to determine the ability  
3 to work despite a severe impairment.

4 So the question is: how did the  
5 National Academies of Science panel consider  
6 this occupational information need for SSA's  
7 disability determination process in its  
8 recommendations?

9 MR. PLEWES: Again, I think that if  
10 you look at Chapter 8, the panel did not go  
11 into the level of detail that you are -- have  
12 and will go into. Let's say that right up  
13 front.

14 So its comparisons that I discussed  
15 with you between the RFC and the O\*NET are at  
16 a fairly high level of aggregation. That  
17 said, when you go into the various  
18 descriptors, you can see that in some cases  
19 O\*NET does a pretty good job, and in some  
20 cases it falls way short of the mark as to  
21 meeting this particular requirement in terms  
22 of reflecting work requirements, as you have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 defined them as necessary to conduct -- to, if  
2 you will to clearly understand the RFCs. So  
3 it varies.

4 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.  
5 And you mentioned in the chapter the RFC,  
6 which is the physical. I didn't see a mention  
7 of the MRFC, which is the mental/cognitive.  
8 Was that something that the National Academies  
9 of Science panel considered in its  
10 recommendations for Chapter 8?

11 MR. PLEWES: Not in any depth, no.

12 MS. HILTON: No.

13 MR. PLEWES: There was a mention,  
14 and that's it. No.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. And I  
16 know you have read our report. That's a  
17 really big area of research that needs to be  
18 done. It's one of the fastest-growing areas  
19 in terms of claims, and a really big issue in  
20 terms of disability determination.

21 One of the questions -- and I know  
22 when I met with you I talked about and you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 mentioned in your presentation that I'm a  
2 rehab counselor, and I talked of my role as a  
3 vocational rehab counselor and also a forensic  
4 expert.

5 And I noted in your PowerPoint  
6 presentation that you talked about voc rehab,  
7 but I didn't see that you had anybody present  
8 to you who came from the forensic community,  
9 somebody with a legal background, somebody who  
10 does expert witness testimony. And I just  
11 wanted -- did you have any testimony, any  
12 information in terms of the forensic  
13 application?

14 MS. HILTON: No, we didn't.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. And so  
16 that goes to my question in terms of the third  
17 bullet, that the database, the occupational  
18 information system must meet a burden of proof  
19 that the individual is actually not  
20 theoretically capable of doing some kind of  
21 work.

22 And so has there -- did the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 National Academies of Science -- or how did  
2 the National Academies of Science panel  
3 consider this very important threshold in  
4 terms of occupational information for the  
5 disability determination process?

6 MS. HILTON: Right. Well, again,  
7 we didn't consider that. I think one reason  
8 that what -- our recommendation here would be  
9 to create an interagency panel to look at this  
10 in greater detail, is that we recognize that  
11 we did not -- I mean, it is not only with  
12 disability determination, but many other  
13 areas, we began the process of looking into  
14 the database in greater depth.

15 We identified areas that we thought  
16 were problematic with our quick look, and we  
17 think further study is needed.

18 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So  
19 insofar as further study has occurred since  
20 these recommendations, I know that you noted  
21 that one of the recommendations was basically  
22 for something such as our panel, then that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be additive to the recommendations that  
2 the National Academies of Science panel has in  
3 Chapter 8, is that what you mean by that?

4 MS. HILTON: Well, I think as Tom  
5 mentioned it would -- you know, one of the  
6 things we recommended that this interagency  
7 group do would be to look at SSA's needs, and  
8 obviously, you know, you have done that.

9 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

10 MS. HILTON: So --

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So in the  
12 fourth bullet -- and I just want to bring this  
13 one up, I'm not going to go through each of  
14 these individually, because it's my  
15 understanding that you didn't look at the  
16 specific needs, is that correct, in terms of  
17 any of the occupational information needs as  
18 outlined in our report, that that was not  
19 considered by the National Academies of  
20 Science panel?

21 MS. HILTON: Well, this report came  
22 out -- our report came out before your report,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so, you know, we couldn't address --

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Our report  
3 came out in September.

4 MS. HILTON: Oh, that's true, but  
5 our committee had done its work. Our report  
6 was in review at that point, so we were not  
7 going to be making changes except in response  
8 to review. So there was -- you know, it  
9 wouldn't have been possible for us to look at  
10 all of these things.

11 I mean, I would say in terms of  
12 these three bullet points here, the reflect  
13 work requirements, as Tom just mentioned, that  
14 the analysis in Chapter 8, we did try to look  
15 at what we thought -- what some RFC needs  
16 were, specifically physical, and compare those  
17 with some O\*NET descriptors.

18 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. And I  
19 know that Chapter 8 does mention our report,  
20 and it also mentions our recommendations,  
21 outlined --

22 MS. HILTON: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: -- in the  
2 report, so there was some cursory review of  
3 our report, but not a consideration of our  
4 report within the recommendations?

5 MS. HILTON: Right. Right. It was  
6 -- you know, in editing some -- some of the  
7 final editing of the report after it had been  
8 through review, just to update it, was to  
9 mention that your report had come out and try  
10 to briefly capture some of the things that  
11 were said. But the panel, no, did not  
12 deliberate on your report's findings. the  
13 panel finished its deliberations in late  
14 April, with a final teleconference.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So if the  
16 recommendations had been made before our  
17 report was out, might that have impacted some  
18 of the recommendations?

19 MS. HILTON: Certainly. I would  
20 think we would have taken that into account.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Okay.  
22 I'm going to open it up to the panel to see

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if there are other questions for members of  
2 the panel. Sylvia?

3 MEMBER KARMAN: Hello. Thank you  
4 very much, Tom and Margaret, for coming out  
5 today. I do have one question -- well,  
6 actually, I've got a couple, but one that just  
7 occurred to me. You mentioned that it, you  
8 know, wouldn't be practical to gather data at  
9 a more disaggregated level, and the level that  
10 we've been really looking at.

11 I notice on page 7-10 of your  
12 report that the second bullet under O\*NET  
13 content refers to occupational information is  
14 not customized for jobs in a particular  
15 organization. This inability to describe a  
16 specific job in detail can limit O\*NET's  
17 utility for legal defensibility, and this is  
18 for personnel selection. We face the same  
19 issue --

20 MS. HILTON: Right.

21 MEMBER KARMAN: -- with regard to  
22 any occupational information system that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would need in order to meet our burden at step  
2 5.

3 MS. HILTON: Yes.

4 MEMBER KARMAN: And so, therefore,  
5 that is why that is so, you know, incredibly  
6 important to us.

7 MS. HILTON: Yes.

8 MEMBER KARMAN: Among the questions  
9 that I have is also page 2-2 of your report  
10 provides five different questions that you all  
11 felt were important in assessing an  
12 occupational information system.

13 And they each -- one starts out  
14 with, how general or specific will the  
15 descriptors of occupational requirements be?  
16 Second one is, given a particular level of  
17 generality/ specificity, should the set of  
18 descriptors of a particular occupational  
19 requirement be a representative sample of all  
20 possible descriptors of that requirement? Or  
21 should it represent the entire universe of  
22 descriptors?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Third one is, should each  
2 descriptor of occupational requirements be  
3 applicable to every occupation or unit of  
4 analysis? Fourth is, is the taxonomy to  
5 include genuine taxons, such as those that  
6 exist in biology? This gets at the issue of  
7 skills that you mention there. Certainly,  
8 skills cannot necessarily meet the definition  
9 of a taxon.

10                   Five, can the taxonomy be designed  
11 to serve a wide range of purposes among  
12 diverse users? I'm wondering how the panel  
13 answered those questions for O\*NET, or did you  
14 feel that the Department of Labor answered  
15 those questions for O\*NET? And then, also,  
16 how did you all assess those questions in  
17 terms of our -- the needs that were outlined  
18 in Chapter 8?

19                   MS. HILTON: I think that these  
20 questions are raised as a way to introduce  
21 this whole chapter, which is about the history  
22 of the development of O\*NET. You know,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 basically, near the end it said that the  
2 developers of O\*NET have addressed all of  
3 these questions.

4 So basically they are kind of  
5 rhetorical questions, if you know what I mean,  
6 saying how general or specific should this be?

7 And then, if you read the rest of the  
8 chapter, you know, you will see that they  
9 ended up with something they called OUs,  
10 occupational units, and I think there were  
11 about a thousand of them.

12 So I don't think these questions  
13 are introduced, you know, with the idea that  
14 then our panel is going to answer these  
15 questions. As I say, it's a vehicle to get  
16 you to read on and find out, you know, what --  
17 how the developers address these questions.

18 And as for our panel's view on the  
19 -- for the first question, how general or  
20 specific, as I mentioned, our panel did not  
21 agree on how general or specific it should be  
22 and recommended that it was important to study

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the pros and cons of being more and less  
2 specific.

3 MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. I just want  
4 to mention that when we -- our panel went  
5 through the assessment of what basically SSA  
6 gave the panel, its occupational information  
7 needs, and a lot of what we did as a panel was  
8 really address these kinds of issues.

9 And so what we're noticing is that  
10 almost at every stage or at every question we  
11 would have selected a direction that is  
12 decidedly differently --

13 MS. HILTON: Different from what  
14 O\*NET took, yes.

15 MEMBER KARMAN: -- from what the  
16 Department of Labor did, because their mission  
17 is decidedly different.

18 MS. HILTON: Right, right.

19 MEMBER KARMAN: Thank you.

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Dave?

21 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Good morning,  
22 and thank you very much. I have a question

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that concerns sort of the first recommendation  
2 in Chapter 8, and that is the recommendation  
3 that SSA and the Department of Labor create an  
4 interagency task force to study the viability  
5 of potential modifications of O\*NET to  
6 accommodate SSA needs.

7 And my question concerns a point  
8 that you make in Chapter 8 about the  
9 behavioral anchors for the rating scales. I  
10 think it's on pages 8 -- 6 and 7 of Chapter 8.

11 And you give an example of behavioral anchors  
12 for arm -- I think arm stability, and the  
13 example includes lighting a candle at a point  
14 of two on the ability scale. This is hand  
15 steadiness. And threading a needle at point  
16 four.

17 And you make the point -- you  
18 acknowledge in this report that there are  
19 problems with these behaviors.

20 MS. HILTON: With those bars, yes.

21 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And there are a  
22 couple of them, and you cite a couple that are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 very clear, and I think that you did an  
2 excellent job of articulating some of the  
3 problems.

4 I do think that there are others as  
5 well that are not articulated there, but I  
6 think that the bars' anchors are intuitively  
7 appealing, but had a lot of scaling problems.

8 And you mentioned the lack of specificity.  
9 In fact, that's sort of a theme that runs  
10 through, you know, Tom, your presentation as  
11 well, that the 52 abilities may lack some  
12 sufficient specificity for SSA's needs.

13 But with regard to this behavioral  
14 anchors, and the problems, those behavioral  
15 anchors and the 52 abilities that they have  
16 been used to assess, have been applied to the  
17 1,102 occupational units in O\*NET. And my  
18 question is this: if those behavioral anchors  
19 lack enough specificity for SSA's use, and  
20 have other scaling problems, how could it be  
21 modified, how could the existing database be  
22 modified for SSA's use?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           It seems to me that the only  
2 modification would be to essentially start  
3 from scratch, because you can't simply go back  
4 and reapply new behavioral anchors to the  
5 existing database. The existing database was  
6 developed using these behavioral anchors, and  
7 so the -- my question is: can you envision a  
8 way of modifying O\*NET that does not include  
9 replacing O\*NET?

10           MS. HILTON: I think that it  
11 deserves further study. That is what we  
12 recommended, that it needs to be studied. But  
13 one thing I would mention is, you know, in  
14 terms of the analysis in Chapter 8, that the  
15 whole focus -- it does not focus only on the  
16 abilities domain. You know, it also talks  
17 about the work context domain, and some of the  
18 other domains.

19           I mean, that is the thing about  
20 O\*NET. As Tom mentioned, it is a general  
21 purpose. It is very big. It has 239  
22 descriptors. It is like please all, please

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 none, you know. It was designed for many  
2 purposes, and it doesn't serve any one user  
3 exactly the way that user would like it to be.

4 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: In fact, one of  
5 the things you said is that the panel could  
6 not agree on the appropriate level of  
7 aggregation.

8 MS. HILTON: Yes.

9 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And that some  
10 people might think of that as a problem of the  
11 panel, but it strikes me that it's really not  
12 a problem of the panel at all, but the fact  
13 that O\*NET -- that Department of Labor has  
14 attempted to make a sort of all-purpose  
15 occupational information system.

16 And there are -- different purposes  
17 have different requirements, of course. So  
18 for some reason, as you pointed out very  
19 appropriately, some users might want a more  
20 aggregated, more disaggregated system.

21 But my question about this bars issue is  
22 really not one that I think further study

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could address, because it's illogical. My  
2 question is: is there a logical way -- is  
3 there a way that it could be modified without  
4 replacing it? And I don't think that that's a  
5 question that really -- that further study  
6 will answer. I think it's a question that --  
7 is it that a logical analysis of the existing  
8 system leads to an answer?

9 MR. PLEWES: I agree with you. I  
10 don't believe that you can fundamentally  
11 change the anchors and retain the system as it  
12 is. But the panel didn't look at that.  
13 That's just my sitting here thinking about it.

14 Now, how about tweaking?

15 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: That's what I'm  
16 asking.

17 MR. PLEWES: I think it would be  
18 possible, with proper research, to tweak. If  
19 indeed the result of the tweaking brought it  
20 closer to the Social Security Administration's  
21 RFCs than the current system, without  
22 fundamentally changing the result.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER SCHRETLEN:   Okay.   So that  
2   is -- so that is wonderful.   Then, how -- can  
3   you imagine even one way that it could be  
4   tweaked?   That's what I'm trying to get at.  
5   I'm trying to understand how this could be  
6   done without fundamentally recreating the  
7   database, because, you know, either the bars  
8   --

9                   MR. PLEWES:   I don't give you an  
10   answer.   In a research approach, I would think  
11   -- I would compare results of current with the  
12   tweaked, and then to see what the differences  
13   are.   But I don't know.

14                  MEMBER SCHRETLEN:       So you are  
15   suggesting like starting with new behavioral  
16   anchors.

17                  MR. PLEWES:   Yes.

18                  MEMBER SCHRETLEN:   On some of the  
19   existing occupational units.

20                  MR. PLEWES:   On those of most  
21   interest, where the deviation between the  
22   descriptors, the anchors -- current anchors

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 for the descriptors and the RFCs are -- have  
2 the greatest differences that are very, very  
3 important to the Social Security  
4 Administration processes. But that's me. I  
5 -- the panel didn't look at that, I have to  
6 tell you.

7 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Right. I guess  
8 the question is, if you were to find a  
9 correspondence between revised behavioral  
10 anchors and existing behavioral anchors, that  
11 still wouldn't answer the question of what to  
12 do about levels of ability that fall between  
13 those points on the scale.

14 MR. PLEWES: No.

15 MS. HILTON: I mean, we definitely  
16 thought there needed to be research on the  
17 behavioral anchors, but all of our research  
18 recommendations don't necessarily mean that we  
19 think that O\*NET has to be rebuilt from the  
20 bottom up.

21 There are always costs and benefits  
22 to making any change to a big system like

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this, and this is why we thought they needed  
2 an outside ongoing expert technical advisory  
3 committee, one of the reasons being to  
4 prioritize what research is most important,  
5 and, secondly, what are the potential costs  
6 and benefits.

7           You know, some people are very,  
8 very critical of the behavioral anchors in  
9 O\*NET. Our dissent, if you read the dissent  
10 to our report, the two dissenters say, "Just  
11 get rid of -- get rid of the behavioral  
12 anchors on the level scale," because they are  
13 so problematic. The rest of the committee did  
14 not agree with that.

15           Nevertheless, even the dissenters  
16 do not say we should scrap O\*NET, that we need  
17 to start over. So as Tom mentioned, there are  
18 a lot of tweaks. You can make modifications.

19           And then, there are costs and benefits to  
20 doing that.

21           CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: When you say  
22 "tweaks," what do you mean?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HILTON: For example, the two  
2 people that dissent to say that we should get  
3 rid of the level scales in the abilities and  
4 skills domains, and only use the importance  
5 scale, and that they also suggest maybe we  
6 should be looking at other scales, such as  
7 frequency or duration.

8 I think that relates a little bit  
9 to the Chapter 8, the comparison of how much  
10 time do you spend sitting, kneeling,  
11 crouching, and it is like half the time, all  
12 the time, whereas for RFC purposes you need  
13 actually number of hours. So things like  
14 that.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And you  
16 mentioned the work context, you are referring  
17 to 38 in your slide that talks about how much  
18 time in your current job do you spend  
19 kneeling, crouching, stooping, and crawling.

20 MS. HILTON: Right.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And for  
22 disability determination, we might have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 somebody who has a shoulder injury who can do  
2 kneeling, crouching, and stooping, but they  
3 can't do crawling, because that involves the  
4 upper extremity. So are you talking about not  
5 just changing the anchors but also changing  
6 the descriptors?

7 MS. HILTON: Definitely. I mean,  
8 we called for research into the descriptors.  
9 We said that the content -- what was the exact  
10 language? The content validity of the domains  
11 and the descriptors is uneven. We think that  
12 in some domains, like abilities, the  
13 descriptors are stronger, they have a stronger  
14 research base. In some of the other domains,  
15 like knowledges and skills, there is not such  
16 a strong research base.

17 So here again, I mean, I think some  
18 people would say that our report is radical,  
19 because how could you go back and look at the  
20 content model. The content model is perfect,  
21 it's -- you know, it was studied. It was  
22 studied a long time ago. We think it is time

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for a fresh look at this.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia, and  
3 then Shanan.

4 MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. I guess it  
5 seems like the panel must have had some  
6 things, though, in mind, you know, just sort  
7 of piggybacking on what David has asked, and  
8 Mary has brought up, because, you know, on  
9 page 8-3 the panel -- the National Academies  
10 of Science report, its panel stated that the  
11 panel is not advocating the adoption of O\*NET  
12 by SSA, or the development of a hybrid O\*NET  
13 disability system in the disability  
14 determination process.

15 However, we conclude that a  
16 considerably modified or expanded O\*NET would  
17 be capable of informing the disability  
18 determination process.

19 So for one -- one question I have  
20 is that this seems contradictory, but, you  
21 know, then the other question I have is, given  
22 the discussion that we've just had for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 last few moments, it seems as if you all may  
2 have had something in mind, what would that  
3 modification look like that would not, as  
4 David pointed out, or as Mary brought up,  
5 really require extensive change to the point  
6 where it would be impractical and not a cost  
7 savings in terms of, you know, not requiring  
8 two different systems.

9 MS. HILTON: And I have to say I  
10 really can't answer this question, because, I  
11 mean, this is really what the panel thought,  
12 what we have here in the report. The panel is  
13 not meeting anymore. As Tom mentioned, you  
14 know, we didn't look in-depth at this whole  
15 disability question. We took a quick look,  
16 and we thought it needed further study. And  
17 since it was important to both agencies,  
18 that's why we suggested that the two agencies  
19 study it together.

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan?

21 MEMBER GIBSON: My question will  
22 likely be a simple followup to that, then, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actually I have a couple of questions. The  
2 first was, I noted that the chapters did not  
3 identify the primary authors for each chapter.

4 Is it possible to find out who the primary  
5 chapter author was for Chapter 8, so that, for  
6 example, in this case we could ask them, what  
7 were their thoughts perhaps related to those  
8 comments, so that we understand better, so we  
9 have the information going forth.

10 MS. HILTON: No, I don't think so.

11 You know, it is a committee consensus report.

12 If one panel member did take a lead on a  
13 chapter, that chapter did not go forward for  
14 inclusion unless the rest of the committee  
15 agreed to it. So we really try to talk about  
16 these as committee reports, not -- they are  
17 not like edited chapters by individual  
18 authors. It's a consensus.

19 MEMBER GIBSON: It just seems that  
20 there is very great distinctions among how the  
21 different chapters are written, so, for  
22 example, Chapter 7 does a very good job of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 identifying specific issues related to  
2 psychometrics, which might impact the use of  
3 the O\*NET. And then, we see nothing similar  
4 to it in other chapters, like ours, so I'm  
5 thinking one person probably wrote this  
6 chapter, and so their styles are very  
7 distinctly different, which is what leads me  
8 to that conclusion.

9 My other -- my second question --  
10 so I guess I have three now -- is in the very  
11 beginning of your discussion you talked about  
12 how you received a review of the report and  
13 created a response to the reviews. Are those  
14 part of open documentation, so that we could  
15 look at them as well?

16 MS. HILTON: No, they're not.

17 MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. And then, my  
18 final question is simply to try to make  
19 certain I understand kind of your overall  
20 theme here. Is it a -- am I understanding  
21 correctly when I say that it appears the  
22 overarching decision of the panel was that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 O\*NET is a general purpose instrument, which  
2 means it will meet the needs of some but not  
3 the needs of others, it will meet the needs of  
4 individuals and groups to differing degrees,  
5 and, therefore, other systems might be  
6 necessary or appropriate to meet the needs of  
7 different organizations.

8 MS. HILTON: I don't know that we  
9 commented on whether other systems were  
10 necessary, but certainly what you said about  
11 how it's an all-purpose and it meets some  
12 needs but not other needs, that's correct.

13 MEMBER GIBSON: So the logical  
14 conclusion of it doesn't meet the need,  
15 something else must --

16 MS. HILTON: It could be. I mean,  
17 we have to -- we are representing what's here  
18 in our report, so we can't --

19 MEMBER GIBSON: And that's --

20 MS. HILTON: -- go beyond what our  
21 panel said.

22 MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

2 MEMBER HARDY: Good morning. It is  
3 a real pleasure having you here, and I -- I  
4 would imagine all of us would like to spend  
5 two hours talking with you, because we all  
6 have volumes of questions. And so I'm not  
7 going to take a lot of time, I just have two  
8 because in my role here -- I'm a vocational  
9 counselor, but I'm also an attorney.

10 So I've got two different  
11 interests, and they are each -- and my  
12 question is that -- I actually rather more  
13 have a discussion than a question, if you want  
14 to know the truth. One is more for you, Ms.  
15 Hilton. Because of my vocational background,  
16 I am very interested in skills, and in  
17 transferability of skills.

18 And we are working right now on  
19 coming up with a definition, and I noted in  
20 the report you spoke several times about the  
21 fact that O\*NET doesn't truly define "skills,"  
22 and that it is kind of difficult in some ways

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to track skills using their raters for skills.

2 In doing that -- in reading that, I  
3 also read went out and read a little further,  
4 and I found your report on future skill  
5 demands.

6 MS. HILTON: Okay.

7 MEMBER HARDY: Which I read, and I  
8 thought it was fascinating. I really loved  
9 reading this.

10 MS. HILTON: I'm glad you liked it.

11 MEMBER HARDY: You did a great job.

12 MS. HILTON: Thanks.

13 MEMBER HARDY: And it really made  
14 me think about a lot of things. But what  
15 really stuck with me -- and I go back to what  
16 you said about we are very concerned about SSA  
17 and what those needs are, but there is broader  
18 context, and I get -- and that report really  
19 broadened my context of how skills can be  
20 used, and for workforce development, workforce  
21 planning, education, and huge numbers of  
22 things.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But what struck me was all the way  
2 through here everybody kept commenting on how  
3 O\*NET was not going to be useful, for the most  
4 part, in answering the workforce development  
5 questions. Is that a good reading on this, or  
6 am I kind of skewing it because of something  
7 else?

8           MS. HILTON: Well, actually, I am  
9 not sure that -- you are talking about the  
10 workshop report on future skill demand.

11           MEMBER HARDY: Future skills, yes.

12           MS. HILTON: The people were  
13 critical of O\*NET in terms of its ability to  
14 identify changes over time in the national  
15 different skill demands of work.

16           MEMBER HARDY: Yes.

17           MS. HILTON: I think that someone  
18 at the workshop did make that point. I do  
19 think there are some questions, you know, if  
20 you are looking at it strictly from a research  
21 point of view, whether the data in O\*NET could  
22 be used, if you could track it for 20 years,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which it hasn't even existed for 20 years --

2 MEMBER HARDY: Yes.

3 MS. HILTON: -- and compare  
4 versions of the database every five years, and  
5 look at what levels of the skills were  
6 reported in 1995, 2000, 2005. I mean, I do  
7 think it's theoretically possible that you  
8 could use O\*NET for that purpose.

9 But with regard to that question  
10 that you are talking about, I think that the  
11 discussion in Chapter 7 of our current report  
12 does a pretty good job of talking about how  
13 very useful O\*NET is for this kind of labor  
14 market research as things change and as  
15 economists try to understand what is growing  
16 -- not only what is growing and shrinking,  
17 but, you know, within jobs, within a given job  
18 title, what the demands are.

19 MEMBER HARDY: And I get that, and  
20 I guess what -- this is more of a discussion,  
21 truly. I am wondering if we go ahead with  
22 what we're doing, and get skills defined down

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to a job level, and are able to really anchor  
2 that and not use some of these O\*NET  
3 descriptors, which Dr. Spenner from Duke was  
4 talking about the O\*NET descriptors of skills  
5 as being --

6 MS. HILTON: Ken Spenner from Duke,  
7 yes.

8 MEMBER HARDY: Yes, being we'll  
9 just say unwieldy. If we were able to get to  
10 a better definition of "skill," take it to a  
11 job level, and then actually track that,  
12 wouldn't that be more useful than using O\*NET  
13 for those purposes, that this -- the other  
14 paper was talking about?

15 MS. HILTON: I don't know. Like I  
16 say, I mean, it is -- your question is very,  
17 very theoretical. I mean, we are talking  
18 about creating a whole new database, and the  
19 first -- what you're talking about is the  
20 first step. Then, is that database going to  
21 be representative, you know, broadly  
22 representative of the jobs in the national

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 economy? That's the second question.

2 The third question, you know, if it  
3 had a better -- if it had better descriptors  
4 of skill, yes, I think that could be useful.

5 MEMBER HARDY: Okay. My other  
6 question is more of a legal question, because,  
7 again, I'm an attorney, and I have to worry  
8 about these things. And this is more for you,  
9 Mr. Plewes. You were talking about doing some  
10 tweaking or nuancing, and trying to find ways  
11 where the marginal differences could be  
12 brought down.

13 In constructing your report, did  
14 you guys talk to any attorneys about legal  
15 defensibility issue?

16 MR. PLEWES: We recognized that  
17 there were those, but we -- no, we did not  
18 talk to -- if I had known that we were going  
19 to be here today, we probably would have gone  
20 --

21 (Laughter.)

22 -- to an attorney as one of our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 presenters, I can tell you that, and a  
2 vocational rehabilitation person, thank you  
3 very much. But no, we did not.

4 MEMBER HARDY: Okay. My concern is  
5 that, you know, everybody on the panel looks  
6 at me and goes, "Oh, you're the lawyer. Make  
7 sure we've got it right." And one of the  
8 things I always say back is, "If and when we  
9 develop -- or when we develop this system,  
10 every piece of it must be legally defensible,  
11 because if one piece fails the test, the  
12 entire system fails the test."

13 And in a broad sense, I kind of  
14 come back to you and say if we're looking at  
15 O\*NET and I see in your report you speak  
16 multiple times about areas that are flawed,  
17 how can we -- how can we work around that if  
18 there is a legal defensibility issue, in your  
19 opinion?

20 MS. HILTON: Well, I'm not sure if  
21 it's exactly the same thing, but I know that  
22 some of the panel members that work in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 field of selection and development of  
2 selection tests, which are very often subject  
3 to legal challenges, mentioned that they find  
4 O\*NET information very, very useful, but they  
5 use it as a starting point.

6 Like if they are trying to create a  
7 selection test, they start with an O\*NET  
8 occupational description, and that gives them  
9 the basic foundation of information. But  
10 then, they add a lot more specific  
11 information, specific to that organization,  
12 that more narrowly defined job title, and so  
13 forth.

14 MEMBER HARDY: Okay. I guess just  
15 so you understand, when we go to court,  
16 whether it's in Social Security or -- many of  
17 those cases then end up in federal court,  
18 which is subject to federal rules of evidence  
19 as well.

20 If you build something on any  
21 platform, that platform still must be  
22 defensible under the same rules of evidence.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And that is an issue that I have.

2 MR. PLEWES: And I think the  
3 question for your panel is to -- is to think  
4 about O\*NET in that case as a framework. And  
5 I think it's fairly clear that O\*NET is a  
6 framework. It would probably be preferable to  
7 the DOT as a framework in terms of some of the  
8 things that it offers in terms of its tying to  
9 the SOC and its updating, and so forth.

10 But that, as Margaret suggests from  
11 other areas, that there probably needs to be  
12 within that framework a lot of adjustment to  
13 meet the requirements that you have.

14 MEMBER HARDY: So you would still  
15 advocate O\*NET over DOT as a basis.

16 MR. PLEWES: I think that was done  
17 some time ago.

18 MEMBER HARDY: Okay.

19 MR. PLEWES: That decision was made  
20 in terms of a framework for looking at the  
21 issues.

22 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I have --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER HARDY: I could talk to you  
2 for hours.

3                   CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I have  
4 a quick question about that. In the days of  
5 PDF, it's very easy to search a report in  
6 terms of key word, so I did search the report  
7 in terms of "legal" and saw that there were  
8 only two references to it. One that Margaret  
9 just mentioned, page 7-3, in terms of a  
10 starting point, and the other one that Sylvia  
11 had mentioned.

12                   And in both of those instances it  
13 -- it indicates that the O\*NET is not  
14 defensible, and so those were the only  
15 mentions that I was able to find in the report  
16 in terms of the defensibility. And so I think  
17 Tom's question is, if when you look at pages  
18 11 and 12 of our report in terms of the must  
19 needs of an occupational information system,  
20 and the third one being legal defensibility,  
21 it becomes a really big issue, if, you know,  
22 there are aspects of the O\*NET that are not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       legally defensible.

2                       Mark, you had a question?

3                       MEMBER WILSON:       Yes.       Welcome.  
4       It's good to see you again.   It's a real honor  
5       to be here today speaking with you about very  
6       important issues.   And, as you see, I have to,  
7       as the IO psychologist along with Shanan, deal  
8       with very diverse sets of issues in terms of  
9       making recommendations about occupational  
10      information for this purpose.

11                      And as you know, we exchanged some  
12      correspondence, and so I -- and I know you  
13      might not -- because Mary and others were  
14      asking you some specifics about changes, but I  
15      just wanted to check to see in a couple cases  
16      if some of the things that we discussed might  
17      have gotten changed.

18                      The first one was early on in the  
19      report it -- and we discussed this as a  
20      potential typo -- refers to O\*NET as a system  
21      providing information about jobs when, in  
22      fact, it is really an information system about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 occupations. Do you remember if that got  
2 changed to occupations instead of jobs?

3 MS. HILTON: I know we went through  
4 the report before and after review, because we  
5 got comments about that also in review. And I  
6 think that in many places we changed the word  
7 "job" to "occupation." But I don't believe we  
8 changed it in every single place, and that was  
9 partly for purposes of readability by someone  
10 who doesn't know anything about occupations,  
11 occupational analysis, or anything.

12 The term "occupation" had not yet  
13 been introduced, so that you might still see  
14 in some of the early pages of the report  
15 references to "job."

16 MEMBER WILSON: Yes. And I think,  
17 you know, the reason we discussed that was  
18 because it is sort of -- O\*NET clearly doesn't  
19 provide, you know -- and it gets some of these  
20 others, but, you know, I certainly understand  
21 that.

22 The second question I had that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 discussed -- and this was kind of more of a  
2 wish, I don't know -- and you talked about and  
3 had a slide about the advisory panel, and in  
4 your report you refer to it as external, and  
5 we discussed the idea that we need to define  
6 the term "external." This is not contractors.

7           Were you able to make any changes  
8 there in your report to specify what you meant  
9 by "external," so that when the agency got  
10 this they would understand what that meant in  
11 terms of your intent, or --

12           MS. HILTON: I am not sure what we  
13 did there.

14           MEMBER WILSON: Sure. I completely  
15 understand. The other two things in terms of  
16 wishes -- and these I suspect you weren't able  
17 to do a whole lot about, but I thought I would  
18 ask. As other people have indicated, you  
19 know, we don't get someone -- the National  
20 Academies of Science prestige in work analysis  
21 very often to look at these issues and make  
22 these kinds of reports.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And so I was -- was as sort of my  
2 wish list saying that I wish you would have  
3 addressed evaluation issues and work analysis  
4 in terms of specifying what some of the  
5 criteria were that the external panel might  
6 look at. Did you make any changes there to  
7 say, you know, we want you to look at X, Y,  
8 and Z? Or, you know, these are the --

9           MS. HILTON: Well --

10          MEMBER WILSON: -- fundamental  
11 evaluation criteria that should be considered?

12          MS. HILTON: Right. As I  
13 mentioned, our policy is not to make changes  
14 to any major conclusions or recommendations.  
15 So, I mean, that would involve making a change  
16 to a recommendation with more detail, so --

17          MEMBER WILSON: Sure. No, I  
18 understand. And the other thing we discussed  
19 -- and some places you talked a little bit  
20 about panel formation, things of that sort.  
21 But it wasn't always clear what the  
22 methodology was in terms of how the panel went

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about -- you know, Tom mentioned that there  
2 were experts that were aware of the literature  
3 and did lit reviews and things of that sort.

4 But was there anything added more?

5 And I think this gets some to Shanan's  
6 question. We really want to understand what  
7 the mind of the panel was with regard to  
8 several of these specific issues, because we  
9 are struggling with them. If there is some  
10 methodological issue that we need to address,  
11 we want to know that.

12 Were there any expansion of, you  
13 know, here's how we went about coming to this  
14 particular conclusion in any cases? Do you --

15 MS. HILTON: Well, we did try to  
16 base our conclusions on all of the input we  
17 received in our two workshops.

18 MEMBER WILSON: Right.

19 MS. HILTON: And also, the panel  
20 members' own expertise and knowledge. We  
21 talked in closed sessions about what exactly  
22 we thought our major conclusions would be. We

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 basically went through several rounds of  
2 deliberation about our conclusions and  
3 recommendations, where we were talking about  
4 them in person, we talked about them in  
5 teleconference, and then we would send them  
6 out to the whole committee --

7 MEMBER WILSON: Yes.

8 MS. HILTON: -- trying to reach  
9 consensus. And, you know, we did not reach  
10 consensus on some issues, as you know.

11 MEMBER WILSON: Right. Absolutely.

12 And especially with regard to the disability  
13 issue, you know, you mentioned that it was a  
14 much more general panel, and this wasn't --

15 MS. HILTON: Right.

16 MEMBER WILSON: -- necessarily an  
17 area where you acquired experts. Were any  
18 disability experts, as part of the methodology  
19 you describe, which is sort of trying to gain  
20 consensus -- did you -- did they bring anybody  
21 with expertise in for any of those  
22 deliberations other than the panel meetings

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and --

2 MS. HILTON: No.

3 MEMBER WILSON: The next issue,  
4 which you had in your slides and I wanted to  
5 ask your thoughts on, is that the effective  
6 measurement error is unclear. And as you  
7 know, in the second panel meeting, Dr. Harvey  
8 made a presentation where, among other things,  
9 he looked at calculation of reliability  
10 coefficients in O\*NET data.

11 MS. HILTON: Yes.

12 MEMBER WILSON: And he made the  
13 point that -- which is unique to generic work  
14 analysis, that there are lots of "does not  
15 apply" responses in any sort of occupational  
16 level profile that would be generated. So in  
17 any individual case, a large part of the O\*NET  
18 descriptors in whatever domain are not going  
19 to be relevant to describing that particular  
20 occupation.

21 And so when you calculate  
22 reliabilities on the entire profile, you get

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 numbers that look pretty respectable, but he  
2 presented data that seem to -- when you  
3 calculate the reliability on just those things  
4 that are relevant, there are dramatic,  
5 breathtaking, shocking declines in terms of  
6 the stability of these data.

7 So I guess my question is: was  
8 there something unpersuasive about that data?

9 Or why is it that the panel seemed to come to  
10 the conclusion that there were unclear  
11 measurement effects?

12 MS. HILTON: Do you mean, how did  
13 we come to the conclusion that the effects on  
14 measurement error are unclear, because every  
15 new method adds to the uncertainty?

16 MEMBER WILSON: Well, I just meant  
17 that that data was pretty persuasive to me,  
18 and its impact in terms of the following panel  
19 discussions, you know, I mean, it just seemed  
20 like that presentation sucked a lot of air out  
21 of the room in terms of, you know, I mean,  
22 there were people that seemed shocked when

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they saw the reliability coefficients that  
2 were calculated on some of these data that  
3 people are using that appear to be almost  
4 noise.

5 I guess that's what I'm saying is  
6 is that why -- my question is: was there  
7 something about that presentation that was  
8 unpersuasive with regard to measurement error?

9 Or why was there the conclusion that  
10 measurement error effects were unclear? Is it  
11 just because of the multi-method, is that what  
12 you're saying?

13 MS. HILTON: Right. That  
14 conclusion is really focusing on the whole  
15 multi-method issue.

16 MEMBER WILSON: Yes.

17 MS. HILTON: It relates to the  
18 whole issue of using job incumbents, but also  
19 occupational analysts.

20 MEMBER WILSON: Right.

21 MS. HILTON: The fact that job  
22 incumbents have strengths and weaknesses as a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 data source.

2 MEMBER WILSON: Right.

3 MS. HILTON: They have the  
4 strength, they -- obviously, they work in the  
5 job, so they know something about it. But as  
6 you very well know, there is a tendency for  
7 job incumbents to inflate --

8 MEMBER WILSON: Absolutely.

9 MS. HILTON: -- you know, the  
10 abilities and skills of a job. Similarly,  
11 within occupational analysts, again, you have  
12 strengths and weaknesses, strengths that you  
13 are dealing with someone who is very well  
14 trained to do this kind of ranking --

15 MEMBER WILSON: Absolutely.

16 MS. HILTON: -- a weakness that  
17 they are not as familiar with the job, with  
18 the occupation, and depending on the quality  
19 of information you provide to them, or whether  
20 they would get a chance to actually go to the  
21 field, which in O\*NET case they do not  
22 actually go. So that's what that conclusion

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is really based on.

2 MEMBER WILSON: Those are all  
3 excellent points, especially that issue of  
4 inability to observe. In fact, what I would  
5 suggest is that that may be the reason why  
6 some of these data were presented -- are what  
7 they are, that these people aren't necessarily  
8 providing data based on direct observations of  
9 what actually occurred.

10 MS. HILTON: Yes.

11 MEMBER WILSON: And then, my --  
12 it's not so much a question. It is taking me  
13 a while, but I'm trying to learn from Tom and  
14 Nancy. It seems like the sort of crux of the  
15 discussion here, which your panel dealt with  
16 and ours dealt with, and that I described to  
17 you as sort of a fundamental distinction or a  
18 different way of thinking, I suspect I know  
19 who on the panel was more concerned about  
20 disaggregation, because IO psychologists have  
21 to deal with things at the organizational  
22 level, at the job level. And I described it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there as a distinction between the econometric  
2 and the ergometric approaches to doing work  
3 analysis.

4 And I'm just wondering about your  
5 thoughts. I understand the efficiency  
6 argument, and I very much understand the  
7 currency argument. Shanan and I made some  
8 presentations where there is good  
9 interreliability here between what you are  
10 recommending and what we said with -- you  
11 know, you can have the greatest data system in  
12 the world, and if it's not current, that is a  
13 problem.

14 And you're right, as the number of  
15 descriptors and the number of disaggregation  
16 increases, there is definitely more data cost.

17 But I'm just wondering, is it possible that  
18 the sort of top-down econometric, more  
19 rational, big picture is very different than  
20 the sort of bottom-up, here is work as it  
21 actually exists in the economy. I mean, do  
22 you have any thoughts on that?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Is that potentially an area where  
2 we can sort of find that there really maybe  
3 are two fundamental different approaches that  
4 can't be very easily reconciled, and that  
5 trying to reconcile them is always going to be  
6 a sort of lever between either making the  
7 econometric approach unhappy, because there is  
8 too much detail, or, you know, perhaps moving  
9 in the other direction now where there is  
10 simply not enough detail from a defensibility  
11 -- any thoughts at all on that or --

12           MS. HILTON:       Do you have any  
13 thoughts about that?

14           MR. PLEWES:   Just hearing you, when  
15 we had our meeting, and again now, we  
16 certainly wish we had invited you to give a  
17 presentation before the panel, because I think  
18 some of these thoughts probably would have  
19 been very valuable to them, and they would  
20 have been willing to address them.

21           In their saying that they -- that  
22 they like the idea, I'm putting words in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 there, but the recommendation is that if we  
2 don't change at least the linkage between the  
3 SOC and the O\*NET, that kind of they say that  
4 the top-down approach -- that is, that the  
5 importance of the linkage to the national  
6 databases is very, very important.

7 Now, what they didn't do is take a  
8 look at what you are suggesting, and that is  
9 that there may be another way of looking at  
10 this. I didn't see evidence that they had  
11 given that full thought.

12 MEMBER WILSON: Well, I certainly  
13 agree, and I think that the sort of -- there  
14 are a couple of questions here. One is the --  
15 how do you describe the work? And, you know,  
16 am I going to be able to defend whatever the  
17 analysis is when Tom hails me into court? You  
18 know, all those kinds of issues.

19 But I think you make an excellent  
20 point that linkage back to what Social  
21 Security is not going to be able to do is have  
22 their own Bureau of Labor statistics and make

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 projections about where -- you know, so I  
2 think that linkage -- and, in fact, we made  
3 significant recommendations in that area to  
4 link back to those systems. I think we are  
5 very aware of the value of the econometric  
6 approach and that -- from a sampling  
7 standpoint.

8 In conclusion, I just -- welcome to  
9 my world. I know that this is sort of a  
10 departure from how you normally conduct  
11 business and things of that sort. I very much  
12 appreciate you being here. I mean it when I  
13 say it -- you know, it has been an hour to  
14 interact with you on these issues, and I  
15 appreciate the expertise that you bring to  
16 this topic.

17 So thank you.

18 MS. HILTON: Thank you. Thank you  
19 for giving us an opportunity to share the  
20 panel's work with you all.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

22 Bob, do you have a question?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER FRASER:     No, it's really  
2 more of a comment.     I'm a vocational  
3 rehabilitation counselor and rehab  
4 psychologist also, and I and the folks -- the  
5 counselors in my unit, we do use O\*NET for  
6 purposes of vocational exploration and career  
7 guidance.

8                   But in responding to a company  
9 relative to the legal defensibility whether a  
10 person can do a job, we simply can't use it,  
11 because it's functionally and skill-related,  
12 etcetera, it's simply not discrete enough.  
13 It's relative. So relative doesn't work, you  
14 know, for us, and that's part of our charge  
15 here in SSA.

16                   And kind of going back to Dave's  
17 comment, you know, or the issue is, can we  
18 tweak these scales? Well, you know, we have  
19 that problem with aggregation, you know, so  
20 say we have 18 truck drivers in that  
21 occupation. So we have anybody from an access  
22 van driver to an interstate trucker, you know,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a wide variance in terms of the demands of  
2 that kind of -- for those different types of  
3 jobs.

4 So I just don't see how, in an  
5 interagency effort, how we could work on this  
6 tweaking with this core problem of aggregation  
7 being an occupation versus the range of jobs  
8 being represented.

9 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: In fact, as I  
10 was thinking further about it, I thought maybe  
11 I was not very clear in my question. But just  
12 sort of following up on that, I think the idea  
13 of what a modified O\*NET system might look  
14 like, I'm trying to envision that.

15 And it seems as though, based on  
16 the things that you have said in your report,  
17 the limitations of O\*NET that you have  
18 acknowledged or recognized, that at minimum a  
19 modified system would need to not merely add  
20 more specific jobs, but actually replace a lot  
21 of the occupations, because they are so  
22 broadly aggregated, or occupational units,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because Social Security simply cannot compare  
2 an applicant to an occupational unit. They  
3 have to compare them to jobs, specific jobs,  
4 or, you know, clusters of jobs.

5 So it would at least require a very  
6 broad supplementation, if not a complete  
7 replacement, of those occupations, that the  
8 abilities that are rated, the job  
9 characteristics that are rated would have to  
10 be more specific. And if they're more  
11 specific, you can't -- you would have to go  
12 back either to previously evaluated ones and  
13 add those, or start from scratch with new  
14 ones, and evaluate those new dimensions of job  
15 characteristics.

16 And in any case, you would have to  
17 go back, because the bars are problematic.  
18 And in a sense, you would have to revalidate  
19 all of the ratings across the entire system,  
20 and that's why I'm saying I just don't -- it's  
21 hard for me to imagine how -- I mean, we can  
22 use the word "modification," but it's a -- it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be a radically different system. That's  
2 the only thing that I can imagine. I mean,  
3 can you imagine -- can you help me imagine  
4 some way that it's not that?

5 MS. HILTON: I have a very weak  
6 imagination.

7 (Laughter.)

8 But I guess what I wanted to  
9 mention is that this whole issue of, you know,  
10 once you've created something, and O\*NET is  
11 very big, do you want to change it? Can you  
12 change it? If you change it, will it disrupt,  
13 you know, what we have in place?

14 And I guess I would just say that  
15 our panel felt that it was worth causing some  
16 disruption if it would result to longer-term  
17 improvements in the quality of the data. So I  
18 think that's true of any database. If you go  
19 ahead and create your own, I mean, that's  
20 something that you will always have to be  
21 thinking about, because it's not like you just  
22 create an occupational database at one point

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in time and just leave it. So --

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Nancy?

3 MEMBER SHOR: Thank you. I want to  
4 thank you very much for coming. This has  
5 really been fascinating. I am interested in  
6 what sort of response you have received  
7 formally, informally, that you expect to  
8 receive from the Department of Labor, that we  
9 -- we are kind of asking you questions about  
10 how O\*NET could be modified, how O\*NET could  
11 be changed, and I think in many ways those  
12 questions really are best directed to them.

13 But, you know, your process is  
14 extremely familiar to you, but not to me. Is  
15 there a role, has there been a role, do you  
16 anticipate a reaction from them?

17 MS. HILTON: Well, we had a  
18 briefing with them in late November, and they  
19 seemed really interested in a whole report.  
20 They are very surprised by some thing, like  
21 when we mentioned that green jobs might not --  
22 might be a distraction from the core database

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they all like were shocked, because they are  
2 very focused on green jobs these days.

3           Since that initial briefing, we  
4 haven't really heard from them. As Tom was  
5 mentioning at breakfast, we think that when  
6 the printed report comes out that they will  
7 pay more attention once again. I can say with  
8 specific regard to that recommendation for a  
9 joint interagency task force that they were  
10 very interested. They thought -- they seemed  
11 to think that that would be a great idea, that  
12 they would love to coordinate more closely  
13 with SSA.

14           CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And when I  
15 started the meeting, I talked about what the  
16 Commissioner has asked us to do in terms of  
17 the four points. And one of them was the  
18 recruitment, training, and certification of  
19 field job analysts. So I was looking for a  
20 lot of that information in your report to see  
21 how the panel came at that.

22           And the sense I get is that it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 wasn't really even a question addressed. And  
2 my question, because I'm a little intrigued by  
3 that, my question is, especially in light of a  
4 whole chapter on technology, when the APDOT  
5 was looking at data collection methods, and  
6 ruled out the use of field job analysts, the  
7 technology was very different then. There has  
8 been a lot that technology has done in the  
9 last 20 years.

10 So was there -- I'm just wondering  
11 why there has -- there wasn't even a question  
12 of the use of field job analysts and data  
13 collection with O\*NET, in light of the fact  
14 that it had been almost 20 years since the  
15 APDOT started their work that led to a lot of  
16 the decision-making and design.

17 MS. HILTON: I guess I would just  
18 say that the -- that issue appears slightly in  
19 Chapter 2 in the whole discussion of the data  
20 collection and the fact that the occupational  
21 analysts in O\*NET don't go to the field and  
22 don't -- you know, they only receive paper

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 descriptions.

2 But it wasn't something that our  
3 panel really looked at, because we were trying  
4 to look at O\*NET as it is now. Actually, I  
5 don't know whether it's still relevant, but if  
6 you are interested in this whole question  
7 about field job analysts you might want to go  
8 back and look at the 1980 report, because they  
9 found a lot of problems where those field job  
10 analysts were not following the protocols that  
11 had been developed nationally, and also they  
12 weren't even finding enough -- there were  
13 supposed to be at least three analysts I  
14 believe rating every job title, and in a lot  
15 of cases there was only one or two.

16 So it is a very complicated issue,  
17 and there might still be something in that  
18 older report that would be relevant, as you  
19 think about that now.

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.  
21 Dave?

22 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes, one other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question about the recommendation to focus  
2 resources on core database activities, leaving  
3 development of most new applications and tools  
4 to others.

5 If Department of Labor asked you,  
6 would you regard expanding the use of the  
7 O\*NET to make it suitable for disability  
8 determination a core part of the database  
9 activities, or is that one that you would  
10 advise them to farm out to others?

11 MS. HILTON: Well, that's one  
12 reason we suggested a user advisory panel to  
13 try to deal with some of those issues. But,  
14 you know, we definitely recognize that  
15 different users have different needs, and this  
16 whole area of application -- yes, it's -- you  
17 raise a very good question. That's all I can  
18 say. I don't have the answer to it, but it's  
19 an important point.

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom asked  
21 some questions about skills. And I noticed  
22 there was not a discussion about the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 application or the importance of skills and  
2 skills transfer within Chapter 8, but there  
3 was in other areas of the report a lot of  
4 discussion about skills.

5 As a matter of fact, Chapter 10,  
6 the number one priority in terms of all of  
7 your recommendations is conducting research on  
8 the content model, beginning with skills and  
9 knowledge demands.

10 MS. HILTON: Right.

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I know  
12 your report talks about that there were even  
13 problems of how to define skill, and I think  
14 there were like four or five different  
15 definitions, and then the one that was arrived  
16 at was -- which was sociotechnical skills, it  
17 indicates that there was a view that this was  
18 the most prominent. There was no underlying  
19 researcher data to bolster that decision. So  
20 what is currently being used as a theoretical  
21 framework for skills does not have a body of  
22 research.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Are you aware of how skills domain  
2 within the content model for the O\*NET is  
3 applied, or can be applied in disability, or  
4 any transferable skills assessment?

5           MS. HILTON: Not specifically with  
6 regard to disability, but in Chapter -- I  
7 think it's Chapter 6 in the workforce  
8 development chapter, we talk about a number of  
9 electronically created databases that link the  
10 various domains in O\*NET -- skills, abilities,  
11 knowledges -- and compare that with what an  
12 individual has, what they think their level of  
13 it is, and then it can be linked to other  
14 jobs. So there is some progress being made in  
15 that area.

16           CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think  
17 one that I saw on the O\*NET Academy was one  
18 called TORQ.

19           MS. HILTON: Yes.

20           CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And that  
21 talks about an RV team assembler in northern  
22 Indiana, where, through that system, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 transferable skill that is derived is a dental  
2 hygienist.

3 MS. HILTON: Oh, right.

4 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: But in  
5 disability determination, retraining cannot be  
6 considered when looking at transferable  
7 skills. We're looking at residual, not rehab  
8 potential.

9 MS. HILTON: I see.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So in that  
11 instance, I haven't found a way to be able to  
12 use any of the O\*NET data for transferable  
13 skills assessment, where we are looking at  
14 residual issues instead of rehab potential.  
15 Have you seen that application whatsoever?

16 MS. HILTON: I guess I -- I am not  
17 that familiar, but what is just popping to  
18 mind -- and I don't know that this is really  
19 ever done. I am more familiar with the  
20 applications that I mentioned to you, like  
21 TORQ.

22 It seems that, in theory at least,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that a person could use O\*NET, or a counselor  
2 working with a person could use O\*NET, and  
3 whatever jobs, occupations they had had in the  
4 past, jobs could be linked to O\*NET  
5 occupations, and then the level of the  
6 different skills, knowledges, and so forth,  
7 required in those previous occupations could  
8 be identified.

9 Then, it would be possible to  
10 identify other occupations that use those same  
11 levels of skills and identify a new  
12 occupation, without requiring any training in  
13 between, if you see what I mean.

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. And I  
15 think -- I think when we look at the  
16 occupational unit that is representative of  
17 the team assembler and the dental hygienist,  
18 and we look at the DOTs -- the aggregated  
19 initially under those OUs, they were pretty  
20 heterogeneous as opposed to homogeneous, and a  
21 lot of other --

22 MS. HILTON: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And so it was  
2 still -- it would be very difficult for me as  
3 a vocational expert to have Nancy or Tom  
4 cross-examine me and say, "How did I go from a  
5 team assembler to a dental hygienist?" in  
6 terms of transferability.

7 MS. HILTON: I see.

8 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Particularly  
9 if I can't consider retraining.

10 MS. HILTON: And proving that they  
11 really were capable of becoming the dental  
12 hygienist without any retraining, is that what  
13 you're saying?

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Correct.

15 MS. HILTON: Yes.

16 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Or  
17 licensing --

18 MS. HILTON: Yes, right.

19 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: -- in many of  
20 the states.

21 MS. HILTON: Right, right.

22 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 other questions? Deb?

2 MEMBER LECHNER: I get the  
3 underlying current from your report that one  
4 concern about maintaining two separate  
5 databases is the cost effectiveness issue of  
6 Social Security Administration maintaining a  
7 separate database from Department of Labor.

8 But I didn't see anything in the  
9 report that spoke to the cost effectiveness of  
10 the data collection methodology used by  
11 Department of Labor at the present time. And,  
12 you know, when you look at 100 occupations a  
13 year, and \$6 million a year to maintain an  
14 updated database, that sort of rounds out to  
15 \$60,000 per occupation, so -- which I find is  
16 really an astounding number.

17 So I just wondered if there was any  
18 consideration to the current cost  
19 effectiveness of the process.

20 MS. HILTON: I guess the -- we  
21 didn't really reach a conclusion here, but we  
22 did talk at least -- I think in two places in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the report we talk about the whole tradeoff  
2 question. There was certainly an idea that if  
3 some research was conducted on some of these  
4 domains and descriptors that perhaps not all  
5 of those descriptors were necessary, because  
6 there are 239, which is a very lot. Maybe  
7 that's why it costs \$60,000.

8 So if research would find that  
9 there would not need to be quite so many  
10 knowledges or skills or problem-solving, which  
11 appears in four different places, so that what  
12 -- it's called pruning, the idea of pruning it  
13 down a little bit, that would definitely  
14 improve the cost effectiveness of it.

15 But we didn't go specifically into  
16 the costs of, you know, doing surveying job  
17 incumbents versus using occupational analysts,  
18 and so forth. We didn't have the data to do  
19 that for one thing.

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other  
21 questions?

22 (No response.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Okay. I have one last question.  
2                   And you just heard from Deb Lechner. Deb is  
3                   the person that I mentioned when I met with  
4                   you, that she and Joe had done the study that  
5                   is mentioned in Chapter 8 in reference to the  
6                   IOTF. And that reference in Chapter 8 makes  
7                   it seem like the concept of the O\*NET D was  
8                   being tested by that study, and in reality  
9                   that was a study of field job analysts.

10                   And I -- is that an area of the  
11                   report that has been corrected in terms of a  
12                   clarification of what -- how that study is  
13                   represented?

14                   MS. HILTON: Yes, we did make that  
15                   change.

16                   CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.  
17                   Thank you.

18                   Any other questions from the panel?

19                   (No response.)

20                   Thank you. It has been a great  
21                   pleasure to have you here. I think our  
22                   discussions are really important. There are a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot of things that I learned in terms of your  
2 process, in terms of where the report was  
3 issued along that process. There were some  
4 conclusions that I was coming to in terms of  
5 what your report meant within that context  
6 that I think were clarified today.

7 And I do want to point out to  
8 everybody that there was a section of your  
9 report on page 1-11 that I thought was really  
10 important in terms of the distinction between  
11 what we're doing here and the fact that we are  
12 a panel that keeps on going, and that your  
13 panel was really time-limited. And so I think  
14 that's important to understand reports and  
15 context.

16 And in page 1-11, it says in some  
17 cases the evidence that could be assembled and  
18 considered with the available resources and  
19 within the timeframe of study was  
20 insufficient, leaving the panel with  
21 unanswered questions. And so I think that's  
22 really important for us to acknowledge, that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what you said at the very beginning of your  
2 presentation, that there were some areas that  
3 you just didn't have an opportunity to  
4 address.

5 And so I know some of our questions  
6 are way more detailed than you had the  
7 opportunity to cover. And so I thank you for  
8 the time that you have spent with us today,  
9 for answering our questions, and for the  
10 opportunity to speak with you.

11 It looked like Mark wanted to say  
12 something. Did you want to say something?  
13 Okay.

14 MEMBER WILSON: Just more of a  
15 comment in terms of this, because I think it's  
16 a very relevant issue, this sort of cost-  
17 benefit analysis, and the resources required  
18 to keep things current and up to date.

19 And if you look at it from a sort  
20 of classical occupational analysis standpoint,  
21 and you're the Department of Labor, where this  
22 is a relatively small, you know, potentially

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in some bureaucrats' minds, insignificant part  
2 of what the Department of Labor is all about,  
3 the resources that one might devote to that,  
4 and the justification for those resources is  
5 very different than, you know, I perhaps I  
6 should have, but it wasn't until fairly far  
7 into the process that I understood the scale  
8 of the operation on which Social Security  
9 operates, the underlying industries, in terms  
10 of private insurance.

11 So the costs in terms of  
12 litigation, the costs in terms of getting this  
13 right, are enormous. And so if you look at it  
14 as a percentage of DOL's budget, in terms of  
15 what might be devoted to this issue, you might  
16 come to a very different cost-benefit analysis  
17 than if you look at it in terms of the \$140  
18 billion, plus perhaps another \$140 billion in  
19 private benefits in terms of justifying the  
20 effort to do a more bottom-up, job-oriented,  
21 more detailed set of descriptors. Just a  
22 thought.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thanks, Mark.

2 And that was something we talked about when  
3 we met with you in January, the \$140 billion a  
4 year that is used -- spent by Social Security  
5 on disability for beneficiaries and their  
6 dependents, \$128 billion of that for  
7 beneficiaries.

8 And if we would take that  
9 equivalent amount of money and apply it to the  
10 federal budget, in terms of the discretionary  
11 spending, that it would equate to about 14  
12 budgets of federal agencies including NASA,  
13 including the federal courts, including the  
14 executive office, including Congress. When we  
15 started adding all of those up, it was pretty  
16 huge to see the impact of disability. And  
17 that was just the federal impact; it didn't  
18 include private insurance.

19 And so you could see that we are  
20 very passionate as a panel in terms of what we  
21 are doing, because this has huge implications  
22 to people we see on a daily basis.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So I want to thank you again. We  
2 recognize that disability determination, and  
3 its application in terms of the O\*NET, was but  
4 one of the many parts of the O\*NET that your  
5 panel evaluated. And there were time and  
6 resource issues that you could not control  
7 that caused limitations and delimitations to  
8 the scope of your work.

9           We want to thank you for your time  
10 to come here to St. Louis and be with us here  
11 to present in terms of the panel's findings.  
12 We recognize your hard work over there. We  
13 recognize it. And you worked for over a year  
14 on it, and I know that you continue to work.

15           One of the things we talked about  
16 over breakfast was how long after a panel  
17 finishes its work do you present, and you said  
18 it could be years that you might be presenting  
19 on this. So we know that it continues for  
20 you, although the panel has been disbanded.

21           So we want to thank you for your  
22 insights. They have been tremendously

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 helpful, and that you have provided to us as  
2 we report back to Commissioner Astrue in terms  
3 of our findings.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. HILTON: Thank you for inviting  
6 us.

7 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. We  
8 will take a 15-minute break and resume our  
9 meeting.

10 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing  
11 matter went off the record at 10:46  
12 a.m. and went back on the record at  
13 11:12 a.m.)

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Let's  
15 come back on the record, please.

16 I think that the meeting this  
17 morning was incredibly valuable. I learned a  
18 lot from the process. One of the things that  
19 most stood out for me was that although our  
20 report is referenced in Chapter 8, when I  
21 talked to Margaret about that and its  
22 reference in the very first page, the National

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Academies of Science panel did not deliberate  
2 on our report.

3 As a matter of fact, they got it  
4 after the panel was disbanded. And so their  
5 recommendations at the end of the chapter have  
6 nothing to do with the content of our report.

7 In fact, there is no contradiction between  
8 their conclusions and our report. There is no  
9 contradiction in terms of what they say in  
10 recommendation number one in terms of looking  
11 and analyzing the user needs for SSA, and the  
12 fact that that had already been done in our  
13 report.

14 So it was a timing issue, but the  
15 way it's reflected in Chapter 8 is it almost  
16 seems like our report having been referenced  
17 or cited in the first page, that it became a  
18 filter for the rest of the chapter when it was  
19 not the case. It was something they added  
20 later on to try to make it as complete as  
21 possible.

22 And so when I talked to Margaret

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the potential of making a clarification  
2 in Chapter 8 about that, as she was willing to  
3 make a clarification about Deb's research back  
4 when she was with IOTF and the fact that it  
5 wasn't testing the O\*NET D concept, it never  
6 got that far way back then, they are so far  
7 along in their process with the National  
8 Academies of Science in terms of the  
9 publication of the final report that they  
10 cannot make that clarification.

11 And so I indicated to her that that  
12 would probably be a clarification that would  
13 be included in our report back to the  
14 Commissioner, because I think it's a very  
15 important one. Particularly, we are very  
16 sensitive in this panel to how people read  
17 flat documents in context of time with what we  
18 experienced in January, some people going to  
19 subcommittee reports that don't reflect the  
20 final recommendations that appeared in our  
21 final report to the Commissioner.

22 So I wanted to -- I think we got a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot of information that we potentially have  
2 the need -- more than just the few minutes we  
3 have allocated for this meeting before we end  
4 or adjourn for the day to really discuss. And  
5 so I wanted to see if maybe we could talk  
6 about the implications of what we learned for  
7 a couple of things that we've talked about  
8 over the last day and a half and the agenda.

9 National Academy of Science  
10 roundtable, the OIS-1 study, but I think it  
11 merits a lot more discussion than we have time  
12 for. And so I would propose that we consider  
13 doing a teleconference at some point in the  
14 next few weeks to address the broader issue in  
15 terms of the takeaways and how this might  
16 affect our advice and recommendations back to  
17 SSA.

18 So let me open it up in terms of  
19 the implications to the couple of things that  
20 we have been talking about the last couple of  
21 days. First, the National Academy of Science  
22 roundtable, meaning not just dealing with the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 O\*NET issues, but we had discussed yesterday  
2 about the DOT issues, you know, the  
3 implications of this report overall, not just  
4 Chapter 8, and the implications of the Miller  
5 study from 1980 in terms of the overall design  
6 and recommendation issues.

7 Any thoughts about any changes, of  
8 whether we need to have that, how we need to  
9 have it?

10 MEMBER WILSON: Just a point of --  
11 are we still in a public meeting? I notice  
12 our name tags are gone.

13 (Laughter.)

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think the  
15 staff is just being a lot more efficient, but  
16 I think I know who you are. So, yes, we are  
17 in the public meeting.

18 Okay. Let me -- Sylvia, go ahead.

19 MEMBER KARMAN: Well, one thing is  
20 is that it -- as we are anticipating the  
21 National Academies of Science's final report  
22 at the end of April, depending on when that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report -- final report comes out, we may want  
2 to adjust the timing that we were thinking  
3 about for the National Academies of Science  
4 subject matter, at least roundtable.

5 So that may -- that just might be  
6 something that we may want to tackle, because  
7 we did talk about that yesterday in terms of  
8 possibly having that in June. All things  
9 being equal, that might be a good idea, but  
10 then again, on the other hand, if we don't  
11 receive the report until, you know, the end of  
12 April, possibly even May, we certainly want to  
13 have enough time for all of the people we  
14 would invite to that panel, as well as  
15 ourselves, to have time to read it and really  
16 reflect on it.

17 So, I don't know, I am just putting  
18 that out there. That's one thing.

19 MEMBER WILSON: I agree. I think  
20 there is no rush. I am not opposed to having  
21 some sort of teleconference on -- to sort of  
22 process some of the things that we heard here

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 today, but I think it's important to have the  
2 report in hand, the final report, have read it  
3 and digested it. You know, I saw a lot of  
4 people taking lots of notes and stuff, so, you  
5 know, I doubt that we will forget any of that.

6 So --

7 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank  
8 you. And Allan?

9 MEMBER HUNT: I was just going to  
10 point out that the final report is not going  
11 to be materially different from what we've  
12 seen, because obviously their process  
13 prohibits that. So --

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So  
15 what I'm hearing and seeing around the table  
16 is that the roundtable concept is on the  
17 table, very much so, moving forward. And  
18 there might be some variation in terms of what  
19 we had put the timeline to be within the road  
20 map that we discussed yesterday.

21 Shanana?

22 MEMBER GIBSON: I was going to say

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one thing we might consider, though, is based  
2 on the responses here, and our understanding  
3 of how the panel operates, I think we should  
4 probably, as part of this teleconference,  
5 discuss our expectations for what we will  
6 achieve through this roundtable.

7 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: The Four  
8 Square Document, excellent. Thank you.

9 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes, that's -- I  
10 was just going to say that it calls into  
11 question in my mind, what is the purpose of  
12 the roundtable? Do we need to visit that and  
13 ask ourselves as a panel what -- what we --  
14 what our goals -- what we want to accomplish.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

16 MEMBER KARMAN: I guess we should  
17 definitely consider that over the next few  
18 weeks. And then, when we meet again, we  
19 should, you know, talk -- discuss it and just,  
20 like you said, revisit the purpose, given the  
21 responses we had.

22 I do know that we have many more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 questions, but you're right, I mean, it may  
2 not -- it may not --

3 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: It raises in my  
4 mind the question of might our time be better  
5 served doing other things than a roundtable,  
6 like spending time talking about how to  
7 respond to this, or how this panel might  
8 advise SSA to respond.

9 MEMBER GIBSON: I would concur with  
10 that, and I would just say, though, I do want  
11 to -- that we mentioned the fact that the NAS  
12 roundtable will also be taking a secondary  
13 look at the original report, not just this  
14 report. So there does still leave that one  
15 particular issue on the table.

16 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think  
17 there were a lot of questions that were more  
18 technically oriented, where there were members  
19 of the National Academies of Science, O\*NET,  
20 and DOT roundtables that addressed more  
21 technical aspects beyond obviously Chapter 8,  
22 that might be beneficial in terms of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 research process.

2           You know, when we look at some of  
3 the things that have been -- we have been  
4 asked to provide advice and recommendations  
5 on, in terms of data collection and field job  
6 analysts, what they found with DOT and, you  
7 know, 30 years ago why it was addressed or not  
8 addressed, some of those scientists might have  
9 some thoughts about that in this report, you  
10 know, other methods for data collection, same  
11 thing with sampling, some of the linkage  
12 issues -- that might be helpful.

13           MEMBER SCHRETLEN:    If they would  
14 attend.

15           CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY:  If they would  
16 attend, absolutely.

17           Mark?

18           MEMBER WILSON:       Yes.     I think  
19 that's the issue, and it's an excellent point.

20           In terms of what the roundtable would be, my  
21 plans were always to recommend that it be very  
22 similar in format to the one I attended that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dave had organized, where we as a panel,  
2 certainly those interested would formulate a  
3 set of questions that the technical experts  
4 would be asked to address. And that wouldn't  
5 be the only thing, but that would be the start  
6 of the discussion.

7 And I think the area that remains  
8 unexplored, in terms of looking at various  
9 recommendations in the NAS report, were some  
10 of the issues that Shanan and I were -- you  
11 know, can you tell us about the reviews? Can  
12 you tell us who wrote this? There aren't that  
13 many experts, and so, assuming that they would  
14 come, the IO psychology panel members of NAS  
15 and some people who were involved in the  
16 original DOT report, are the obvious invites  
17 to this.

18 But if they were not -- if  
19 significant or all numbers -- or all of them  
20 were not able to attend, then I think it would  
21 potentially be something that we would have to  
22 reexamine as to whether or not it was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 valuable.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And maybe,  
3 you know, beyond the panel members, I remember  
4 reading Handel and his comment in terms of job  
5 complexity. There might be other aspects of  
6 other people who presented that might not  
7 necessarily have been on the panel who might  
8 be helpful to have as part of that process.

9 But so what I'm hearing is that we  
10 want to keep the NAS roundtable concept on the  
11 table, be a lot more specific in terms of what  
12 the Four Square Document would include, what's  
13 the purpose, and what we would learn from it  
14 in terms of cost-benefit, time analysis, and  
15 also timing.

16 Okay. Mark.

17 MEMBER WILSON: Well, and maybe one  
18 way to get at the issue that David raised, and  
19 also your initial comments about, you know, do  
20 we need a teleconference to discuss the  
21 process, you know, I would be very interested  
22 and would invite, as we did in terms of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Research Committee and reading the NAS report,  
2 what questions the various panel members have  
3 and, you know, that is kind of a moot point  
4 now, but I would certainly be interested in,  
5 well, were we able to assemble an august body  
6 of work analysis experts who are expert, what  
7 questions would you want to ask them? What  
8 issues should they address that were similar  
9 to the kinds of questions that, you know,  
10 David was asking his people?

11 MEMBER KARMAN: I appreciate that,  
12 because I am thinking that as we formulate the  
13 questions or purpose around what we might want  
14 to do in terms of a roundtable, and then ask  
15 ourselves, gee, you know, is there perhaps a  
16 better way for us to attain these answers to  
17 these questions than doing that? You know,  
18 perhaps there is some other method or  
19 approach.

20 Because, you know, to the extent  
21 that we would be asking additional questions  
22 and maybe -- specifically, with regard to that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 particular report, in its final form or pre-  
2 publication, is for us as a panel to be able  
3 to reconcile for Social Security the  
4 recommendation that, well, there is this  
5 modification notion on the table with regard  
6 to O\*NET, and its use -- possible use for  
7 Social Security, which Social Security has  
8 looked at.

9 And also, the recommendations in  
10 the report itself that really get at the data  
11 quality issues, and how can we deal with that  
12 as a panel moving forward and making  
13 recommendations to Social Security about the  
14 development of its occupational information  
15 systems.

16 And it may be, as David pointed  
17 out, and, Mark, you also seconded it, that  
18 maybe there are better ways of getting at  
19 that.

20 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And I just think  
21 it might be very useful for all of us to think  
22 about what we might do, in a sense kind of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 preemptively, or prospectively, and do we want  
2 to wait until the Department of Labor reaches  
3 out and makes some overture, or do we want to  
4 anticipate that with something and say, in  
5 case you are thinking about reaching out and  
6 making some overture --

7 (Laughter.)

8 -- here are some preliminary  
9 thoughts, before you decide whether or not you  
10 might want to form some kind of interagency.  
11 Just to make it clear what their -- how steep  
12 the mountain is.

13 MEMBER KARMAN: In fact, I am kind  
14 of glad you mentioned that, because one of the  
15 things that has come to mind is that in the  
16 discussion that we had earlier, David, when  
17 you had raised the issue of the bars, for  
18 example, the behaviorally-anchored ratings,  
19 and Tom Plewes had suggested that, well, you  
20 know, these are things that could be studied,  
21 you know, perhaps a comparison of the current  
22 anchors with things that may or -- may be more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 useful to Social Security, or measures that  
2 may be more useful.

3 I am thinking that that may be  
4 something that could be readily integrated,  
5 that kind of a study may be a point that may  
6 be readily integrated into the OIS design  
7 study, may give us some traction on that issue  
8 early on, at least to take a look at that, and  
9 be in a position to say to the Department of  
10 Labor, or whomever, "Well, you know, we  
11 actually did take a look at that and here is  
12 what we found."

13 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: So we could  
14 conceivably respond to that, both rationally  
15 and empirically.

16 MEMBER KARMAN: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: With  
18 something that is happening right now. So, I  
19 mean, what kind of became evident from the  
20 discussion this morning is that we are  
21 delivering on -- what has happened  
22 chronologically is beyond -- is happening

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 beyond what the recommendations imply. I  
2 mean, they implied something that is static in  
3 time for them in August of last year.

4 And we are -- we are, what, about  
5 seven months beyond that, and so, you know,  
6 they even mentioned in their -- I think it was  
7 Tom who said, "We anticipated you." And "you"  
8 meaning the recommendations that we had and  
9 the information that we had in our report. So  
10 I think it's kind of a timing issue.

11 Okay. So we've talked about the  
12 roundtable. We have talked about the  
13 implications for study. We have talked about  
14 a teleconference. I am going to ask Debra  
15 Tidwell-Peters to scan for dates for a  
16 teleconference for us to maybe process this  
17 particular topic further.

18 Anything else in terms of specific  
19 to this topic that we need to discuss at this  
20 point?

21 (No response.)

22 Okay. Then, I am going to take us

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through the rest of the agenda, so we can  
2 finish on a timely basis today.

3 Okay. We have a couple of things  
4 to include on the agenda, approval of minutes.

5 Elena e-mailed us all, and we got copies of  
6 the minutes earlier this week. I would  
7 entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

8 MEMBER GIBSON: So moved.

9 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan moved.

10 Do I have a second?

11 MEMBER WILSON: Second.

12 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Mark seconded  
13 the approval of the minutes. Is there any  
14 discussion?

15 MEMBER HARDY: Yesterday I gave  
16 some corrections to Debra Tidwell-Peters.  
17 They were purely spelling and editing things,  
18 and I believe that these minutes would be with  
19 those corrections. I just wanted to put that  
20 on the record.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So  
22 there were some typographical kinds of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 corrections. And I'm assuming what will go up  
2 on the website will be the corrected minutes.

3 Any other discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 All those in favor?

6 (Chorus of ayes.)

7 Okay. Opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 That was unanimous. The minutes  
10 have been approved.

11 Let's open up very quickly the  
12 discussion for the agenda for June. If we  
13 looked at our road map, there is probably a  
14 lot that is going to be going on. I know that  
15 there is going to be a lot going on between  
16 now and June in terms of the public feedback  
17 period from many different ways, probably the  
18 electronic collection of the information, the  
19 review of that information.

20 A lot of us are going to be on the  
21 road quite a bit over the next few months, and  
22 so we -- that is probably going to be a big

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 area that we are going to be reviewing in  
2 terms of the public feedback. We are going to  
3 be having probably a lot of organizations  
4 providing us feedback in terms of the report,  
5 so I anticipate that is going to be a big  
6 area.

7 I think there are going to be a  
8 couple of technical reports that may be  
9 offered at that time, so we will probably have  
10 presentations around those. I'm assuming  
11 research in terms of maybe some of what we're  
12 going to be talking about with the NAS at the  
13 teleconference we may need to include in  
14 there.

15 Any other thoughts? Allan?

16 MEMBER HUNT: Labor market.

17 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Labor market,  
18 yes, absolutely, the roundtable. That is  
19 going to be a big one that we will need to  
20 talk about in terms of consideration for the  
21 agenda.

22 Deborah?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER LECHNER:        I think we  
2 probably would have a report -- some sort of  
3 report on the recommendations for the job  
4 training and certification of job analysts --

5                   CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

6                   MEMBER LECHNER:    -- at that point.

7                   CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY:        There is  
8 probably going to be quite a bit happening in  
9 the next few months on that as well, yes.

10                   Tom?

11                   MEMBER HARDY:    You are looking at  
12 possibly having a draft content model by May  
13 from the workgroup?    Are we going to be  
14 looking at that, do you think, or will that  
15 still not be quite ready?

16                   MEMBER KARMAN:    Well, it certainly  
17 is on track for us to be working with the  
18 workgroup to finish our considerations around  
19 the person-side elements for the content  
20 model.    So I am not sure whether or not we  
21 will have something to share with the entire  
22 panel in June, but that's where we're headed,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anyway, as far as drafts are concerned.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think from  
3 an administrative standpoint I got a lot out  
4 of the training, the professional development,  
5 and I want to thank you again for doing that,  
6 Mark and Shanana. And so we will be looking at  
7 and might also kind of scan for other areas  
8 that people would really want to see  
9 additional training about.

10 I know we talked about the legal  
11 issues, in terms of defensibility, and, you  
12 know, is June a good timing, is there a lot  
13 going on in June, might we do it another time.

14 So we will probably scan for that as well in  
15 terms of professional development.

16 Okay. Any other considerations for  
17 the agenda for June?

18 (No response.)

19 Hearing none, I would entertain a  
20 motion to adjourn our second annual quarterly  
21 meeting for the OIDAP.

22 MEMBER HARDY: I make a motion to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 adjourn.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So moved by  
3 Tom. Seconded by Allan?

4 MEMBER HUNT: Yes, I second the  
5 motion.

6 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: All those in  
7 favor?

8 (Chorus of ayes.)

9 I'll note that was unanimous, and  
10 we are adjourned.

11 Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, at 11:34 a.m., the proceedings in  
13 the foregoing matter were  
14 adjourned.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

**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

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)