UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL

+ + + + +

QUARTERLY MEETING

+ + + + +

DAY 2

+ + + + +

Thursday, September 2, 2010

Boston, Massachusetts

+ + + + +

The Quarterly Meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel convened at 8:30 a.m., pursuant to notice, in the Terrace Ballroom, Boston Park Plaza Hotel & Towers, 50 Park Plaza, Boston, Massachusetts, Mary Barros-Bailey, Chair, Presiding.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY BARROS-BAILY, Chair, Ph.D.
ROBERT T. FRASER, Ph.D.
THOMAS A. HARDY, J.D.
JANINE HOLLOMAN
H. ALLAN HUNT, Ph.D.
SYLVIA E. KARMAN
DEBORAH E. LECHNER
ABIGAIL PANTER, Ph.D. (via telephone)
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
DEBBIE HARKIN, Staff
SHIRLEEN ROTH, Staff

PUBLIC COMMENTERS:

ANGELA HEITZMAN JEFF TRUTHAN LYNNE TRACY

NEAL R. GROSS

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

8:35 a.m.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Good morning, everyone. If you could please take your seats. We're about to begin. Good morning. My name is Debra Tidwell-Peters, and I'm the designated federal officer for the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel.

Good morning. This is the second day of the Panel's meeting here in Boston, and I'd like to turn the proceedings over to the Panel Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey. Mary?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Good morning. I would like to thank Debra. you all for your attendance, live or telephonically, to the second day of the fourth quarterly meeting of the OIDAP for fiscal year 2010.

Before we go through the activities today, I'd like to announce to those who are listening in remotely that to follow along,

NEAL R. GROSS

please go to our website, www.socialsecurity.gov/oidap, for a copy of the agenda.

For those who are attending our meeting for the first time, you might be interested in activities and deliberations of the panel from past meetings and those materials in terms of agendas and PowerPoint presentations are also found on the same website address, socialsecurity.gov/oidap.

You also look can at panel for technical and working papers, documents formal correspondence, our first and recommendations report delivered to the commissioner in September of 2009, as well as a final report discussed during the public meeting on June 10 in Memphis of our findings on the National Academy of Sciences review of the O*NET.

That report was deliberated upon again on June 9, delivered to the Commissioner on June 28, and available to the public since

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

June 10 -- or June 9.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As we indicate at the start of each meeting, the charter of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel provide the Social Security OIDAP is to Administration with independent advice recommendations for the development of occupational information system to replace the dictionary of occupational titles for disability adjudication.

Our task is not to develop the OIS itself. I keep on saying that, but I think that's an important point to delineate because there's a perception that we are developing the OIS.

Currently, I am assisting the User
Needs and Relations Subcommittee until I
appoint a chair to that subcommittee.
Therefore, I have requested Dr. Fraser deliver
the Subcommittee report this morning.

Following the Subcommittee's report, we will hear from Deb Lechner

NEAL R. GROSS

regarding the activities of the Job Analysts
Ad Hoc Group. As part of her report, she will
describe an exercise that I requested that the
ad hoc group do and engage in here in Boston.

That -- I will let her talk about the details of that project. I would like to publicly thank Amy Vercillo, a vocational expert here in Boston, who assisted the Ad Hoc Group and staff tremendously in arranging for the logistics associated with that exercise.

After the break, we have allotted a half hour for public comment. I understand that we have two people who have signed up for public comment, five minutes each. Should there be no other public comment, we will enter into our administrative meeting.

I would offer that time for the panel to engage in additional discussion on any topic we have discussed here at the meeting that arose as part of that agenda.

Finally, we will end our fourth quarterly meeting with administrative part,

NEAL R. GROSS

and as part of that, we will also discuss additional areas that the panel would like to have presented at the meeting in Baltimore in December.

Note that given the fact that we're entering into a period of our second year -the completion of our second year, I think it's really important for us to look at ourselves of where we have come as a panel, what has worked that's part of what we've been doing in terms of user needs, kind of a reflection and trying to plan ahead and that's an activity I would like to see that we look at as a panel all together.

I would also like to acknowledge that Drs. David Schretlen and Gunnar Andersson and Sha -- sorry, Shanan Gibson are not with us today either due to hurricane warnings or family emergencies.

Abigail Panter, Dr. Panter, are you on the line? I think she was teaching a class this morning, so she might be with us later

NEAL R. GROSS

today, so we might hear a voice from above that -- like we did yesterday with her piping in every once and a while.

So, at this time, I'd like to ask

Dr. Fraser if he would deliver the subcommittee report for user needs.

MEMBER FRASER: Thank you, Mary. We appreciate Mary's work as a temporary chair. Due to the excessive time on her hands, she wanted to act as temporary chair, and the work of Shanan and Tom and Debra and Debra Tidwell-Peters in support.

Basically, we're organized in terms of activities under two major categories of work, information collection framework for user stakeholders, etc., and information dissemination framework.

Our goal is to evaluate all of our panel's activities under this -- these two categories of work and refine an overall plan.

In terms of information collection, Shanan gave a great presentation yesterday, which was

NEAL R. GROSS

a summary report of the activity on public comment.

The public comment period closed at the end of June, 2010, obviously. A subcommittee recommendation to the Panel was that all future recommendations that are made receive public comment before a formal recommendation that was a major emphasis of our recommendations.

In terms of information dissemination, we continue reviewing user organizations and organizations with membership of interest, looking for people that we may be missing who would be interested in these activities.

In the past year, we received -- we reached approximately 3,500 attendees at different national conferences. The target is national organizations with a national conference presence.

We're also considering the toolkit of options with a PowerPoint, with a voice-

NEAL R. GROSS

1	over, possible live webinars, podcast
2	deliveries, etc. There's also been discussion
3	relating to providing more of an electronic
4	presence, e-mailing lists, more website
5	dissemination, etc.
6	As Mary mentioned yesterday, we've
7	completed articles for the several
8	different national groups to include the CRCC
9	group, NADR, and I think Mark and Shanan may
10	be working on another article for the I/O
11	Group.
12	So, our emphases have been
13	finishing the report that Shanan presented
14	yesterday, alternative communication and
15	dissemination plans, and to continually
16	evaluate our work in developing our next two-
17	year dissemination plan.
18	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any
19	questions?
20	I did want to bring something up
21	and make it kind of an action item for the

and Subcommittee group.

User

22

Needs

Since

virtually the beginning of this panel, we have been very cognizant of the fact that we are using words that sometimes convey different meanings to different people.

We had glossaries in our initial subcommittee reports and also our main report.

I would like the User Needs and Relations Subcommittee to work with the SSA staff in terms of developing a common list of definitions -- of words and definitions.

One that continually comes up and I think it's becoming problematic, highly problematic, is the understanding of the conceptualization between work side and person side.

I think that's central to what we're doing, and I think it would help avoid a lot of confusion if we had that common list and common conceptualization before us all. So, if we could add that to the list of future activities for the Panel -- for the Subcommittee to bring to the Panel.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MEMBER KARMAN: Mary, question. Is
2	this something that you want added to the
3	are we talking about this being added to the
4	User Needs and Relations report that Shanan
5	provided yesterday?
6	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: The report
7	that Shanan delivered yesterday was public
8	comment.
9	MEMBER KARMAN: Right. So, was
10	that part of that public comment report as we
11	talked about definitions?
12	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think
13	MEMBER KARMAN: Not that we need
14	person-side and work-side, but
15	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think it's
16	a variety of different things that have
17	brought us to this point. We just need to do
18	this, and so, yes, that's one of the areas
19	that it came out. It's come out in everything
20	we've done, and I think it's a task we just
21	need to do and if the subcommittee could work

with the SSA staff to deliver that --

1	MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. The reason
2	I'm asking is because that report is right now
3	under preparation to be finished quickly,
4	soon.
5	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I see what
6	you're saying.
7	MEMBER KARMAN: So, I'm wondering
8	what the timing is and if there was an
9	expectation among the panel members that that
10	those list those definitions should be
11	part of that report, I would want to know
12	that. So
13	MEMBER HARDY: AS a member of the
14	committee, I would think we I can't speak
15	for the committee, but I would think we'd want
16	that report to stand on its own and see this
17	as a new initiative and move forward and then
18	we could give something at the next meeting or
19	whenever we've completed it.
20	MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. Thank you.
21	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Tom?
22	MEMBER HARDY: And going to that,

1	I'm just going to suggest that we need to find
2	a new chair for the panel, for the
3	subcommittee panel, so somebody could take
4	leadership on this, and I am not volunteering.
5	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes, I
6	realize that, and I think as we were talking
7	about yesterday when one of the items came up,
8	it's been kind of hard to make some decisions
9	in terms of not only that subcommittee but the
10	executive subcommittee moving forward in light
11	of absence of a bigger plan, so I agree.
12	MEMBER FRASER: That was a joke in
13	terms of Mary's excessive time available for
14	these kind of activities.
15	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any
16	other thoughts or questions for Bob Fraser or
17	the Subcommittee?
18	Okay. I would now like to ask Deb
19	Lechner to present on the status of the Job
20	Analysts Ad Hoc Group.
21	MEMBER LECHNER: I'd like to first
22	thank my committee members, Bob Fraser and

Shanan Gibson, for participating on this committee, this subcommittee with me. The Job Analysis Ad Hoc Subcommittee has had five teleconference since our last quarterly meeting, June 2, June 16, July 6, July 14, and August the 25th.

We've also conducted a job analysis of the position of cashier at two different locations in the Boston area on August the 30th, just before the panel meeting.

The purpose of this project was to provide examples of job analysis approaches from three different disciplines that are involved in the field of job analysis: physical therapy, vocation counseling, and industrial psychology.

We don't mean to imply that these are the only disciplines that should be involved in this type of analysis, but we just wanted a sample of three different disciplines to look at the three different approaches.

We're going to be comparing and

NEAL R. GROSS

contrasting the three approaches presentation to the panel at the next quarterly meeting. We had SSA staff observers present during the job analyses and they were observing our processes and we'll be asking them to provide comments and observations at the next quarterly meeting, as well.

A secondary purpose of this activity was to elucidate the differences and similarities and some of the job analysis terminology and some of what we find just strikes me may be of interest to the User Needs Group that is working on the glossary.

Some of the examples of terms that have created some confusion in the past are the terms general work activity and the terms job tasks get operationalized differently by different disciplines performing job analysis, and so hopefully, our report or our presentation will help to elucidate some of those differences and help us to understand each other as we communicate about the OIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Our report will provide examples and associated definitions of the terms, and we have some future activities planned between now and the December meeting. We're going to prepare a written report describing the similarities and unique differences in our job analysis approaches and terminologies, and then we will also prepare a presentation to the panel that summarizes and highlights the main points of the report.

We were also planning to continue discussing information meeting and the presented to the panel at this meeting from the studies that were done -- that have been done by SSA and to talk about any potential needed activity from our subcommittee based on the information from the evaluation of 2008 occupations held by SSDI and SSI disability claimants, the occupational and medical voc claims review study, and then the user needs identification for the content model development.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, we'll take the information that we've learned at this meeting -- I think those, all three of those, presentations were -- provided some really excellent information for us as we consider the process of job analysis.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Could you talk a little bit about the Point A, B, and C in terms of future activities? What's anticipated for that within the context of the Job Analyst Ad Hoc Group?

I really can't MEMBER LECHNER: speak to -- because the committee really -the subcommittee hasn't even had a chance to talk about that, but I just felt that we received new information and as a subcommittee we need to look at that data and say is there -- are there any activities that make sense for our subcommittee to address based on the information that we received, and there may not be anything. There may be some things. discussed just haven't it We as а

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

subcommittee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. The ad hoc group was -- is a group that was put together to take a look at one of the bullets that was in that letter that we received from the commissioner on January 9, which is the recruitment training and certification of field job analysts, so anything that feeds back into that -- the mission for the group.

One of the purposes also for the JA project or the JA exercise that happened on Monday take is to and continue professional development that we had in March, which was looking at a variety of different Occupational Information Systems with occupation of grocery store clerk and looking at it from a different perspective actually on the ground of how different disciplines might develop a job analysis.

But, the purpose of the job analysis, I think, has to be really considered within this because a lot of times as

NEAL R. GROSS

practitioners the reason we take or do a job analysis might be to match a single person with a single job and the purpose for the field job analysts for this project would be to collect data in a standardized format for an Occupational Information System that needs to be defended.

So, using the methods that each discipline uses, how different would it be or would it be different if you were collecting data for an Occupational Information System?

So, I think we have to remain focused on what the purpose is and narrow it to within the scope of what we need to be doing and how it applies back to our advice and recommendations to SSI.

I've heard kind of on the side from a variety of different people involved in that exercise that it went really well and I'm really looking forward to a presentation in December from the Ad Hoc Group.

Are there any questions of Deb in

NEAL R. GROSS

terms of the activities of the group?

MEMBER FRASER: Just one comment.

I think the information on the most salient functional impairments that was provided yesterday would be very helpful to us in reviewing our job analysis methodologies. So, more information on that probably the better.

MEMBER LECHNER: I would also like to reiterate Mary's thank you for Amy -- to Amy for setting up the analyses. The organizations we worked with were very helpful and very supportive and dedicated considerable time and resources to making sure that we got the information that we needed.

So, thanks. Thanks to Amy for making that happen.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions? We are, as opposed to yesterday, running a little faster on the agenda. So, we just started so I am not inclined to take a break, although we have one on the agenda.

NEAL R. GROSS

I know that two people who have signed up for public comment are here in the audience. I don't know if they would be ready to offer public comment at this time, so -- and I understand that, Abigail, you're on the line?

Okay. She might be on mute, but I understand she's on the line, and I'm getting some heads nodding in the audience, so we have two people signed up from public comment who are both with the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals, Lynne Tracy and Angie Heitzman.

If you would introduce yourselves a little to the panel, and you each have five minutes. Thank you.

MS. TRACY: Thank you. My name is Lynne Tracy. I've been here before you many times. Angie Heitzman is with me. We represent the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals, also known as IARP.

NEAL R. GROSS

As you know, we have a liaison committee of IARP to the OIDAP. Angle and I are two of those committee members, as well as Scott Stipe, Ann Neulicht, Rick Wickstrom, and Pam Warren.

So, we would like to give you some public comment. As representatives of IARP, we would like to provide public comment on the presentations given yesterday. Overall, we agree with the following. Excuse me.

There needs to be protocol research plan with research questions before going much further. Not only does this provide direction, it provides work accountability and allows Social Security Administration to attract a top candidate to the scientific leader of the project. be. Critical to have this person.

We recommend focusing on BLS/OES data. Although it is highly aggregated, it is likely to be more accurate as it is developed by the BLS and the employers rather than

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

incumbent self-report. Although we are in favor of looking into utilization of ACS data, as well, we are concerned with this self-report issue.

A11 three studies yesterday presented agreed claimant files do not have enough data, and therefore, the use individuals who have expertise in classifying jobs remain a vital part of the disability adjudication process and is critical development of the OIS.

When we refer to the three, we mean the one that Renee presented, the one that Deb Harkin presented, and the data that IARP had collected. As you may recall, we developing -- we began collecting data October of Social Security VEs during -- at the hearing noting the past relevant work, what was in the file, how the VE classified job, whether there sufficient the was information in the file for the VE to classify the job, or the information had to be gathered

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

at the time of hearing, and preliminarily, that was provided to Social Security.

We would like to comment on the presentations from yesterday. We do not have issues with the psychometric aspects of the research presented by Renee Ferguson, but we believe that there are limitations to the usefulness of the data from our perspective.

The study relied strictly on selfreport data, which we know is unreliable. significantly 21,000-plus job titles are inflated is evidenced based the as inclusion of such titles as Burger King cashier, cashier at Burger King, etc.

These appear to be more data points than they are individual job titles. There is — there seem to be a confusion with terms. They were interchangeably using words like job, occupation, and industry, which is a significant issue in our opinion.

Some of the 20 classified occupations listed are actually industries

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

such as service, construction, etc. These are not occupations. A classification such as machine provides little usable information and then under construction, there's an example.

It includes all trades, all types of construction repair, and new construction. The -- regarding the assignment of DOT codes, we would like to know who assigned those, what their qualifications were for working with that data, did the people have experience, was this more self-report or what was it based on?

We are concerned about the amount of variation from the results of Renee Ferguson's data versus the results Deb Harkin and Mark Trapani gave, as well as the IARP study.

The top ten IARP on our preliminary data were cashier II, cashier checker, fast food worker, nurse assistant, cleaner, housekeeping, laborer, stores, home health attendant, kitchen helper, waitress, informal, industrial cleaner, sales clerk, construction

NEAL R. GROSS

worker, stock clerk, hand packer, telephone solicitor.

From the data, there was no -- from Renee Ferguson's in the top numbers, there were no sales clerks. There were no nurse assistants or home health attendants, which is pretty significant, and it was in Deb Harkin and Mark Trapani's information. So, there seem to be some pretty significant limitations.

It was said that industry information was gained from the forms filled out by claimants, and in our experience in doing hearings for over 20 years, you may see industry or you may see a job title or you may see a function, but you don't usually see a claimant writing down cashier and then their industry.

So, I'm not sure what she was referring to and I think this was one of the things that brought to our mind that maybe there was a mix of terminology going on

NEAL R. GROSS

between jobs, occupations, and industry.

One more thing. We are concerned that, as I said before, nurse assistant, our number four, and home attendant, our number seven occurring job, did not even make the list of the top third.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,
Lynn. As you can tell, I was giving you eye
contact that five minute was up. That goes
awfully fast, doesn't it?

Thank you. I will open it up to the panel to see if there are any questions for Lynn and we'll have five minutes of questions before we go to Angie.

MEMBER KARMAN: First of all, I have a -- wanted to thank the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals, both Lynne Tracy and Angela Heitzman, for providing us with the data from your survey of VEs on past relevant work. I really -- we very much appreciate that.

Just so I'm clear about the concern

NEAL R. GROSS

or question that you had with regard to the BLS data, could you perhaps restate that so that I'm clear about what your concern was?

MS. TRACY: Yes. Yesterday when there was a conversation, Allan was -- you were presenting on speaking with the Census Bureau, speaking with BLS, and looking at possibly using one set of data over another, we are just very concerned and looking at the Census Data we think that there's very good information in the ACS, but we think it's quite limited when it comes to the questions regarding work.

concerned about this We're incumbent survey, this self-report of employee as opposed to an employer, which is where the BLS data comes from because you've got employers who have -- except for the small ones, you've got human resource people who are familiar with occupational classification systems.

They usually -- they're not always

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on target as we know, but they do -- it tends to be probably better data, and we know it's aggregated, so we just think it might be a better starting place and we really encourage trying to work with the BLS on that.

But, that being said, we think that the ACS data also has some value, and I think Allan mentioned yesterday, looking at possibly finding a way to use both data set and any data set that you can find.

So, I think we're encouraging that, but we just want to highlight the fact that we think that data from the employers has more reliability.

MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. I just want to clarify then, and I thank you for that It's an excellent point because what point. we were discussing yesterday was the prospect of perhaps we need to test both, and so we may take into consideration then want to the effects of defining our sampling frame, example, using data that are derived

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	employers to locate the employers and entities
2	and the types of jobs we're looking for versus
3	trying to locate the jobs using Census data
4	that is supplied by essentially incumbents.
5	MS. TRACY: We
6	MEMBER KARMAN: So, but we are
7	planning on using their data, so I just want
8	to be clear about that, but I do appreciate
9	MS. TRACY: Yes. We understand
10	that.
11	MEMBER KARMAN: Okay.
12	MS. TRACY: I think one of the
13	questions becomes thinking about the employee,
14	trying to get the employee to get you to their
15	employer and there may be some issues just in
16	boots on the ground of getting to those
17	employers, so we just wanted to highlight
18	that.
19	MEMBER KARMAN: Absolutely. Thank
20	you.
21	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Allan?
22	MEMBER HUNT: I guess I would

regard the -- I won't say choice, but the two alternatives. This is an empirical issue in the sense that all right, employers are going to report essentially by job title or even larger classification according to the SOC.

I think it's an open question on how much care goes into that process. I mean, I've had a lot of experience with workers' comp data, and I know how casual these things are treated by employers. It's not a priority for them unless it goes to the bottom line.

On the other hand, I would say my first impression is favorable not having seen what results from the self-report at Census in the ACS, but the fact that they ask them where do you work, what's your job, what do you do on that job, and then, of course, they have the geocoding also of where's your employer, your place of employment.

I think we need to explore that to find out how good is that stuff and how helpful might it be, so I think we're in

NEAL R. GROSS

1 agreement that we want to look at both. CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Mark? 2 WILSON: Thank you. MEMBER I 3 appreciate your comments, and I just wanted to 4 echo what Allan said that this is an empirical 5 question and you'd mentioned some issues about 6 relative reliability or higher reliability of 7 the BLST. 8 you have any information on 9 that, I'd like to see it. So, if there are 10 any specific study -- don't want to put you on 11 the spot right here, but I think it would be 12 13 very helpful if such studies exist about relative reliability or just the reliability 14 of BLS data would be useful to have. 15 MEMBER FRASER: I just --16 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: 17 Bob? -- had one quick MEMBER FRASER: 18 19 question. Did you say home healthcare aide was a high frequency job within your own data? 20 Was that a review of cases that your 21 Okay.

membership performed VE activity on?

1	MS. TRACY: Yes, and I think what
2	that really goes to in my experience in doing
3	hearings is it's home attendants. It's a lot
4	of the IHSS stuff, at least in I think IHSS
5	is national, but so there's a lot of home
6	attendants.
7	It's one of those catch-all jobs
8	that a lot of people default to, especially
9	when they have health issues or they're taking
10	care of family members. So, I see it as a
11	high frequency job where I am, and it came out
12	as number five in our list. So, nationally,
13	it seems to be a trend.
14	MEMBER FRASER: Your sample is how
15	large? It's a couple thousand as I can
16	remember.
17	MS. TRACY: 3,600 in the first run,
18	the first half of it. We haven't completed
19	all of our numbers yet.
20	MEMBER FRASER: Okay. Okay.
21	Thanks so much.
22	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other

questions? Lynne, thank you. Angie, you will have five minutes and then five minutes for questions. Go ahead.

MS. HEITZMAN: The clock is on. Okay. In regards to the study conducted and reported on by Deb Harkin and Mark Trapani, we agree substantially with the findings and find the study to be well done and fairly indicative of our experience.

We agree that once the case has reached the ALJ-level that jobs are better documented, and we believe this is true in part to the involvement of vocational experts.

We also agree that substantial numbers of jobs used by the DDS are outdated and do not exist in significant numbers in the national economy such as Deb pointed out with addresser.

Addressing the issue of sufficient information in the claims file, their study found 11 percent had no job title or the job was unidentifiable. Renee's study found that

NEAL R. GROSS

only 63 percent had enough data for classification. Our preliminary results show that over a third did not have adequate information in the file.

Moving on to the report given by Shirleen Roth of staff activities regarded to the public comment, we wanted to clear the record on our past relevant work study conducted by IARP.

Preliminary data was provided to Social Security in January of 2010. At that time, we had not analyzed the data. There was an indication that those items or occupations that recommended endorsed were bу or by 50 percent or more of IARP respondents that that was indicative that it was endorsed by IARP as an organization and that is not the case.

We will be analyzing the data and issuing a report in the near future.

We are concerned that there appears to be a lack of standardization for decision

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

making regarding criteria on what 1 elements 2 concepts will be included in the model. 3 Terms such as self evident and --4 we believe inject judgment into and bring up 5 concerns of objectivity. 6 Additionally, it was stated that 7 when the panel or staff had questions about 8 that IARP was contacted for 9 our surveys, clarification, and to our knowledge, this did 10 not occur. 11 There that the 12 comment was а 13 mental, residual, functional capacities form identify mental or cognitive 14 was used to limitations on the basis of record review. 15 16 In our opinion, this is not a good source of data when looking at factors that 17 should be included in the new OIS given the 18 19 problems with the anchors. That's basically what we wanted to 20 say today. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any

questions of Angie? Allan?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER HUNT: Angie, can you repeat that last point? It got right by me.

MS. HEITZMAN: Sorry if I was going a little fast. There was a comment that the mental, cognitive functional capacity form was used to identify mental and cognitive limitations based on record review, and it's our opinion that's not a good source of data when looking at factors that should included in the new OIS, given the problems with the anchors.

Also, we wanted to bring up one more point regarding the job analyses that were conducted. Just wanted to point out the process that Amy Vercillo went through.

She said that it took on average of two and a half weeks to get approval from employers to go in the door and that not only did it have to go through the store manager, but it had to go through regional manager and had to go through legal.

NEAL R. GROSS

That's a concern in our minds far as how you're going to gain access the time of the DOT employers. Αt development, it was a much less litigious society than it is now, we really see so access as being a very large issue.

MEMBER KARMAN: Thank you very much. Deb, do you think that that's something that has an impact on presentation that we may thinking about in December? Do we want to investigate what Amy's experience was? I mean, obviously, we can't generalize that to what we may need to go through, but do we want to report on that? Thank you very much.

MEMBER LECHNER: I think that's a very good point, and that's something that I raised in my presentation on job analysis. I forget which quarterly meeting that was, but we had a couple of slides that talked about the feasibility and some of the challenges I think we'll face, not only from a legal perspective, but from a proprietary trade

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

secret perspective.

I think those challenges will be substantial. I think we're going to have to
- it kind of will go back a lot to our PR efforts really making sure that employers and large entities understand the purpose and how this benefits the entire country, as well as their industry in the long run, so I think we will have considerable hurdles to overcome in those areas.

I think we probably should, Sylvia, reiterate it in this report and bring it up as an issue because I think there will be some point in time where we'll have to -- SSA will need to create a major effort in that regard.

PARTICIPANT: I don't know if there's any way you can incent employers to participate.

MEMBER LECHNER: I think --

MEMBER KARMAN: We don't know. I think this is obviously something we're going to have to explore, especially if the federal

NEAL R. GROSS

government makes an effort to do something.

Perhaps there is -- if we're coming at it from
that perspective, there may be some other
things that may relieve the concerns,
possibly, or maybe not.

in the other Maybe it will go direction, but it's possible that there may be can do, but something we what Ι compelling about this is that we have actual example of an individual who is in a profession that frequently does job analyses and this is the difficulty this individual had and so while Deb is right, she brought that up as a concern, we now have an actual example, albeit it's one example or three perhaps in setting that up, but it's -- I think it bears discussion, so --

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I just want to point out one of the three groups went to an employer that was a union employer. There was concern coming in and they were effectively able to address that concern and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

be able to carry on that task, so I think -- I don't want to give away too much more than that because I want the subcommittee or the group to -- Ad Hoc Group -- to really address it, but I think access in general should be addressed.

There's one more thing in this If you go back to the Miller study, regard. at that time, the Department of Labor using field analysts to collect significant amount of information there's within the Miller study because access was an issue back then and they were dealing with the issue of being perceived as big government coming into private enterprise, and so this isn't new because of the generational political situation that we are now in the United States.

It was a concern back then, and so
I think if the Ad Hoc Group goes back and
looks at that information, I think there are a
couple of other articles about field job

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

analysts back at that time that might lend significantly to the group's processing of this information.

I had Mark and then I had Tom. Oh,
Tom and then Mark, I guess. Go ahead, Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: As always, I want to thank IARP for being here. You guys have consistently been wonderful people, not only to reflect back some things, which I think we need to hear reflected back, but as partners in doing research. Again, thank you so much for your interest and your time.

Going back to the comment about how long it took to set this up, I know you guys have done a lot of research for us, kind of, and one thing I was wondering, again, since your population does this on a regular basis, would there be a way maybe of pooling them on an industry level or some broader, higher level as to what barriers they encounter in specific industries, how long it might take to do so setups like this because as we move

NEAL R. GROSS

along, we're looking at a national rollout. 1 2 It may be one way we could think of classifying how approaching 3 we start the actual data collection by saying, "Well, you 4 know, we're going to have barriers in this 5 6 industry or area -- this industry or area that 7 may help us with our planning, our management, and things of that nature." 8 It's kind of just a wild thought, 9 10 but would you consider it? PARTICIPANT: Yes. That's 11 something we can look at. Typically, if we're 12 13 going in to do job analysis, it's with an employer that has a reason for us to be there, 14 15 so we're not going to run into obstacles. 16 There however, times when are, we're doing labor market research and surveys 17 where we may try to get into so we can survey 18 19 people in that regard. But, it's not as common as you might think. 20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I've --21

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER HARDY: I don't believe it

1	is, but it's more information than we have
2	right now.
3	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom, I think
4	we need to address the issue of even asking
5	IARP to do this. Sylvia?
6	MEMBER KARMAN: I appreciate this
7	as I think this is an important point to
8	consider. I just want to, from the
9	perspective of the agency, just say that we
10	need to be careful that we are not asking a
11	private sector organization to survey members
12	of the public.
13	The agency, all federal agencies
14	have a burden, a paperwork reduction burden on
15	the public that we need to be careful about,
16	so if, in fact, IARP perceives that this kind
17	of information may be helpful to its
18	constituents, then I just thought I would say
19	that. Thank you.
20	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: All those
21	things we have to consider, so Mark?
22	MEMBER WILSON: Thank you, and this

discussion we've been having about difficulty gaining access and concerns about intellectual property, things of that sort, very important. It needs to be thought out very carefully, and I think one of the potential advantages we have is that if we move in the direction of a sort of common metric approach to analysis as opposed to the kind of task level that DOL was using, that to some degree, it should allay some of the concern and that doesn't exist it's something that on national level at this point and may actually be useful to the employer and because it's not at the sort of task level, would be less likely to convey any sort of intellectual property, so it's kind of a level the playing field.

But, it's a little different than what people are used to and it may or may not be that the agency ultimately goes that way, but just wanted to say that.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

other questions of Angie by the panel? 1 2 Thank you, again, Angie and Lynne --MS. HEITZMAN: Thank you. 3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: 4 -- and IARP for your continued participation and presence 5 at meetings and through your public 6 our 7 comment. Let's go ahead and take a 15-minute 8 We are running ahead on the agenda, break. 9 10 and then we'll come back and finish up with the administrative meeting. 11 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the 12 record at 9:23 a.m. and went back 13 on the record at 9:41 a.m.) 14 15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. are heading into the administrative meeting, 16 and in the last tab, or almost the last tab, 17 of our folders here, so in front of tab three, 18 19 so still in tab two, we have the minutes to the quarterly meeting, June 9 and 10, and I 20 see Tom smiling at me, so that indicates --21

well, it's the kind of smile that indicates

that you want to say something. So, go ahead, Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: Thank you, I like that we're able to Dr. Barros-Bailey. communicate quickly now much more and statement and some efficiently. I have a comments on the minutes. First off, I would like to commend the support team who responsible for creating and promulgating the minutes.

I've noted over time an increase in quality and depth in the minutes that we are receiving and I believe personally on many levels this is an advance that really makes a difference for us.

We keep talking about transparency.

We keep talking about creating a record. We keep talking about making sure we acknowledge that we have discussed certain topics.

I believe that the more detailed and in depth our minutes are the more we are creating a record. Further, we are able now

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to point to different topics within our own minutes and say yes, we have discussed it.

Not only have we got a sentence that says it was discussed, we've got some of that discussion. So, I think it's a very good advance and I commend the support team for the work they've done on this and I'd like to see it continue in this fashion.

With advances in technology, knows how these minutes will be used some day down the road to cross-reference what we've done and what we've said about it. the minutes only give us three two or sentences on a topic, we now know when it was discussed and where in the record to go to get supportive detail, so Ι think it's an excellent improvement and I want to thank you for that.

That being said, I did go through and the issue you have with words is the more words you have the more chances you have to get the wrong word. So, I have spoken to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Debra Tidwell-Peters, our designated federal 2 officer. Ι noted problems in 3 have some and use of 4 syntax, spelling, periods and pronouns and we have discussed that. 5 I do not want to take the time of the committee in 6 7 discussing those things. I was referred to as Dr. Hardy once. 8 I'd love to be a doctor, but you 9 10 know. Small changes like that. I will communicate those changes to Debra as I often 11 do, so I will not go into that in detail. 12 13 would make a motion to approve the minutes as they stand with small changes as we often do. 14 15 MEMBER WILSON: Second. CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: We have a 16 motion and a second to accept the minutes with 17 small typographical changes. Any discussion? 18 Allan? 19 Let me just point 20 MEMBER HUNT: out, and I don't disagree with what you've 21 said, but the more complete and thorough the

1	minutes are, the more there is an obligation
2	on us to review them, and I confess I didn't
3	review them. I will do so subsequently, but -
4	_
5	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.
6	Because the minutes and the record are really
7	important and we do have a little bit of time,
8	do we want to take the time right now to make
9	sure before we vote? I think that might be
10	the responsible thing to do.
11	If we take five minutes to make
12	sure this is accurate and do it right, it's
13	well worth the time. So, let's hold the vote
14	for about five minutes until we get a chance
15	to review it to make sure that we vote
16	accurately. Janine?
17	MEMBER HOLLOMAN: And while they're
18	reviewing, I will be abstaining because I did
19	not attend that meeting.
20	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,
21	Janine.
22	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the

1 record at 9:45 a.m. and went back on the record at 9:50 a.m.) 2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Does anybody 3 need anymore time? We'll go about 30 more 4 seconds and then go call the vote. 5 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the 6 record at 9:50 a.m. and went back 7 on the record at 9:51 a.m.) 8 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: 9 Okay. I'm 10 going to go ahead and call the question and anymore discussion if there's the 11 Deb? minutes. 12 13 MEMBER LECHNER: There is one line on Page 7. There's a statement that might've 14 15 been a misinterpretation of what I said in a 16 presentation on job analysis that states in "In states, 17 sum, some trainers can independently charge for physical therapy." 18 19 I'm not sure that that's true, and so I need to go back to my presentation, and I 20 think probably the best thing would just be 21 for right now to just strike that sentence 22

because it's really not germane to job analysis.

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes, I think that would be probably be more efficient at this point. I mean, do you believe that there's something that needs to be added?

MEMBER LECHNER: No.

MEMBER KARMAN: We're taking something out. Is there something if we remove this, do you feel there's something that needs --

MEMBER LECHNER: Because we were discussing -- in that paragraph, we were discussing the use of athletic trainers for job analysis and what I had explained were that there are some groups of athletic trainers involved in job analysis and that I agreed with Dr. Andersson that SSA should expand the opportunity as widely as possible.

So, I think it doesn't really even fit in the flow of the discussion, and so I just think to delete that statement because as

NEAL R. GROSS

1	far as I know there are no states where
2	athletic trainers can independently charge for
3	physical therapy, so and I have to do some
4	research to see if there are, but I don't
5	think there are, so I think it might've just
6	been a misinterpretation of what I said.
7	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other
8	modifications? Would the Tom, would you
9	consider modifying your motion to include as
10	amended, minutes as amended?
11	MEMBER HARDY: I would.
12	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And Mark?
13	Okay. All those in favor of accepting the
14	minutes as amended?
15	ALL MEMBERS: Aye.
16	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Anybody
17	opposed? I know there's one abstention, and
18	the minutes are passed as amended.
19	It's my understanding there was
20	somebody else who was interested in delivering
21	public comment telephonically and that now we
22	are able to make connection with that

1	individual. Is that true, Debra?
2	MEMBER LECHNER: Yes.
3	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. The
4	individual making public comment is Jeff
5	Truthan with SkillTRAN. Jeff, can you hear
6	me?
7	MR. TRUTHAN: Yes.
8	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, Jeff.
9	Thank you for attending our meeting
10	telephonically from Spokane, Washington. You
11	will have ten minutes, and thank you for
12	calling in. Go ahead, Jeff.
13	MR. TRUTHAN: Okay. Thank you.
14	This is a most unexpected and greatly
15	appreciated opportunity. I want to express my
16	gratitude to the OIDAP committee for inviting
17	me to participate on the spur of the moment.
18	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Jeff, I'm
19	sorry. It was my understanding that you were
20	interested in providing public comment.
21	MR. TRUTHAN: Yes.
22	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So,

1	had you contacted us to do that? It was my
2	understanding during the break that that was
3	the case.
4	MR. TRUTHAN: I was invited to
5	participate if that's appropriate.
6	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, had you
7	scheduled to provide public comment?
8	MR. TRUTHAN: I did not formally
9	request that prior to the meeting.
10	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. It was
11	my understanding that you had requested to
12	provide public comment, so we can't invite
13	public comments specifically to any particular
14	organization or individual. So, we I know
15	that there's been some email problems, access
16	here, and so there was follow up with you to
17	make sure that we hadn't missed an email.
18	So, you had not requested to be
19	part of public comment before today, correct?
20	MR. TRUTHAN: Not prior to today;
21	that's correct.
22	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I

1	don't know if we can I don't know what to
2	do at this point.
3	MR. TRUTHAN: I would be pleased to
4	provide input and commentary at a time that
5	will work for you.
6	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.
7	MEMBER KARMAN: Should we ask the
8	DFO if we
9	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: For guidance
10	on this?
11	MEMBER KARMAN: Do you need to
12	provide some guidance offline or online? I
13	mean
14	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. If we
15	could get some guidance on this in terms of
16	public comment. It was my understanding that
17	you had wanted to provide public comment. We
18	didn't get an email, and there's been some
19	email problems recently with SSA.
20	We followed up, so I didn't
21	understand that was considered to be or
22	construed to be an invitation, so I just want

1	to make sure we clarify that.
2	MR. TRUTHAN: Okay. Yes, I'm not
3	familiar with public procedures.
4	MEMBER KARMAN: Hold on a minute,
5	Jeff.
6	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.
7	MR. TRUTHAN: Yes.
8	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: We're trying
9	to figure this out. At this point, we're
10	being advised that I mean, we can't we
11	invite public comment from everybody and
12	anybody. We publicize it and people are
13	welcome to contact us, but we don't invite
14	public comment from any particular
15	organization or individual.
16	So, absent having been contacted
17	ahead of time, we can't accept the public
18	comment, I think, at this point because it
19	would be construed as an invitation to any
20	particular individual or organization. So, I

MR. TRUTHAN: Okay.

apologize for the confusion.

NEAL R. GROSS

21

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank 2 you, Jeff. MR. TRUTHAN: You bet. 3 4 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. All these things that we're having to figure out 5 6 with technology second guessing us or us 7 second guessing technology, so I apologize for any confusion that's causing or has caused. 8 Moving on to the last part of the 9 10 agenda, the second bullet -- we're getting really close here. We have the agenda 11 discussion for December meeting in Baltimore 12 13 December 7 through the 9. If you'll notice, the dates are 14 15 pretty interesting. That's the second 16 anniversary of the charter of the OIDAP, which was, I think, December 8. Is that accurate? 17 So, it's going to be during that time that we 18 19 will be meeting. I would like to invite discussion 20 from the panel in terms of areas that you 21

would like to see on the agenda for December.

In terms of the different subcommittee or ad hoc groups, we have the standing groups that will be presenting the status of their subcommittees or groups.

We have discussed the job analysis piece in terms of the presentation by the members of the Ad Hoc Group probably as a separate point on the agenda. Other areas? Allan?

MEMBER HUNT: Well, I hope we can have a follow-up report on development of relations in terms of these two databases, but it's somewhat dependent on SSA staff and obviously, I'm not familiar with what that burden might be, but --

MEMBER KARMAN: Let me just clarify. Thank you, Allan, because I think that would be excellent if we could do that and the dependency that I'm perceiving at this point is how quickly we can arrange to have special sworn status which, of course, we have to pursue and then arrange that with the

NEAL R. GROSS

Census Bureau, so that's one aspect of it and then, of course, dependent on what information we get, that analysis may lead to require based on Allan's assessment of it additional work.

So, in any case, my point is I think that would be excellent and we will aim to that. I would really like to be able to do that. Okay.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: It would be great to maybe have Debbie and Mark give an updated presentation in terms of -they're still sorting through the results of their study. It would be great to additional information on that if you'd be willing to present on that. I know that the international OIS study is completed and is It would be wonderful to being written up. have a presentation on that, as well.

It would also be wonderful to know what is happening in terms of the next stage for the data elements. Specifically, we've

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

been asked by SSA to look at the data element list by each of the subcommittees that will complement the information that we have in terms of the User Needs public comment report that has gone out to the subcommittee chairs public that include information from the comment in terms of data elements and specific also to taxonomy and mental cognitive, the information specific to the mental listings that may lend to that review of the data elements or any discussion or any implications to that.

So, if we could have maybe an update of what is going on with that project at that time, it would be great.

MEMBER KARMAN: Yes. Absolutely. Also, we, of course, are going to work with the mental cognitive subcommittee and the physical subcommittee in particular to obtain their review, both subcommittees' review of the data elements.

I do understand that the mental

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cognitive subcommittee has another assignment before it to review some information and they may not be able to provide their review of our data elements document, the pre-decisional document, as quickly, perhaps, as the physical subcommittee, but that information would be very, very helpful to us as we move forward.

We will be working -- continue to be working on this tomorrow, so if I may receive at least a review of that document and in particular the data elements, just by October 1 from physical subcommittee in particular and anyone else on the panel who may, in fact, have some observations that they would like to be able to share with us, that would be fantastic.

I do understand, again, that mental cog may need more time, so we had talked -- I talked with Bob about the prospect of that possibly being as late as the middle of October.

Obviously, Abigail and Bob and

NEAL R. GROSS

David do need to speak and get back to about what is possible. I may also want to --I want to call to the attention of the panel did ask we for we had specific the pre-decisional questions that are in document on the data elements addressed to the panel.

will find that in You that I think it's right before you get document. to the actual chart, but nonetheless, you may want to call. You may take a look at that for of the subcommittees. Some of questions may be more relevant, for example, to mental cog or some may be more relevant to the physical subcommittee or in general.

Other panel members may have some observations or things for us to consider in light of those questions. They are not an exhaustive list of questions, but this was what has been on our minds over the last few months and certainly in the last stretch coming toward this panel meeting, so that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would be very helpful.

Also, I am going to be beginning to work with the physical and mental cognitive subcommittees to help us look toward what methodologies, what consideration should we be having and undertaking to begin our work for measures and -- developing measures and scales as we stabilize -- I don't want to say finalize, but as we stabilize this first list so that we can begin doing this development of measures and scales that we can test with users.

So, first, we obviously would want you to review the document and have some time to sit with it and then we will be wanting to work on that, so I will be -- we'll be in contact about that.

Then, finally -- you thought we were going to get out of here earlier, didn't you? I do want to just make an observation in response to the comments that we heard this morning from both Angie Heitzman and Lynne

NEAL R. GROSS

Tracy from the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals. We just want to have at least two points of clarification.

One of them was that with regard to the presentation on the status of the content model, when Shirleen was referring to information received from IARP, and I believe that -- and I don't have the exact quote in front of me of what was said and I'm not sure if it was either Lynne or Angie, but one of them had asked about or referred to a comment being made about the survey and I think that really what that was about was -- Shirleen was referring instead to the information that we received through public comment, so 50 percent was really in reference to public comments that we had received.

So, if that is not accurate, or if there's some questions about that, maybe we should talk afterward so that if I do need to correct anything on the record, I should do that at some point.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But, anyway, that's what that was about and with regard to the MRFC, we are not meaning to suggest that they are -- that the mental cognitive data elements are actually based on that MRFC or case review.

We are meaning that we ensure that the data elements met our needs in terms of what the agency needs to do to complete a mental cognitive residual functional capacity assessment and in particular also making sure that we are looking at what regulations go with of residual the assessment mental functional capacity and a lot of that is reflected in that form, it's but not necessarily the form.

It is the actual regulations that go to that and as well as the regulations with regard to basic work activities at Step 2. So, again, if there is a need for us to be clear on the record, perhaps we should talk and make sure that that occurs. All right?

So, that's it for me. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank 2 you. Tom? **MEMBER** HARDY: Just quick 3 I like the structure and format that 4 we have at this point. I think the way the 5 panel's working with the information gathering 6 7 day prior gives us а chance 8 information and move along quickly so that when we come to meetings, we're able to do 9 10 things that we need to get done. The only concern I have, and I say 11 it every meeting and I'm going to say it again 12 13 because that's my job, is I'd like to see us schedule little time for 14 а more panel 15 deliberation. 16 These meetings are jam packed, and I understand that. Everything that we have in 17 here, we have to look at. However, I feel 18 19 that we only had one hour. The only other time -- I believe -- I forget. 20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: We had, I 21

think, an hour and 45 minutes.

MEMBER HARDY: Okay.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And we ended up with more than that because of public comment, so over two hours. One of the reasons we kind of pack the second day light is to allow for overflow.

MEMBER HARDY: I understand. While I recognize all the pressures and all the requirements, the other thought I'm having is this next meeting will be our last meeting within the two-year cycle.

I know the report is coming out and a summarization of our activities will be due to the commissioner. While I know that you do a fabulous job, Mary, I think it would not be a bad idea to schedule a little time for the panel as a whole to review what we've done, discuss where we feel we're at, and be ready to give you some feedback about where we think we need to go to go into part of that report, and I see that as a separate agenda item as opposed just being lumped to into

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deliberation. That's my opinion.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So you're talking about the December meeting? I'm planning strategic planning that would allow us to have reflective time to consider. That's what it sounds like. Yes. Okay.

I agree. I think as we're going along and more information comes out at us and that time to deliberate becomes more important. So, other items for the December meeting? We mentioned the mental listings. There was another group cited in the mental listings that is also currently doing work with SSA.

I think it would be interesting to have a presentation by that group, the National Institutes of Health, and maybe, Sylvia, you can talk about whatever you know about that group besides what was listed in the mental listings.

MEMBER KARMAN: I think -- first of all, I think we will want to contact the

NEAL R. GROSS

office within Social Security Administration that manages the -- not the contract, but the interagency agreement between this group at NIH and Social Security.

understanding is МУ that the information that they're -- that the work that they are doing to assess or to individuals who are applying for benefits to describe their function in a way that would provide the agency with much information coming in the front door could be very valuable for us to hear about. like to contact the individuals in Social Security to find out how we could arrange for that.

I also had a -- just a question, and this may be procedural, about the prospect of the panel or some panel members discussing the report. Is that something that we need to do on the record maybe? I don't know, especially if there are recommendations in it, so I'm wondering if that maybe needs to get

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	resolved and maybe we may need a
2	teleconference in between now and December
3	then.
4	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I thought we
5	decided yesterday that the annual report is
6	just a report of activities and anything with
7	recommendations is separate from the annual
8	report.
9	MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. Are we
10	anticipating not having any recommendations in
11	that report? That's what I want to know.
12	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Correct.
13	MEMBER KARMAN: So, I that's why
14	I'm that's all.
15	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: It's just a
16	report of activities.
17	MEMBER KARMAN: Okay. I'm just
18	trying to get planned because we would want to
19	be out in front of that to make sure that we
20	would schedule time for a panel meeting and
21	that means we have to do a whole canvassing,
22	all the panel members, to make sure we've got

quorum and all that if we need it. 1 2 all. CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Correct. 3 4 MEMBER KARMAN: Thank you. CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: 5 Okay. I had a point -- a MEMBER LECHNER: 6 7 question about clarification on the annual Is this a report of activities that 8 report. will be -- the report will be submitted at our 9 10 December meeting. Will the report be already prepared -- supposed to be prepared by our 11 December meeting or are we going to prepare it 12 13 after the December meeting? CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Technically, 14 think from the letter we got from the 15 16 commissioner in January, November was the time I believe that maybe that got set 17 period. because when I was part of the briefing last 18 19 year, it was in November. So, I'm assuming that's why the November time period got set in 20

NEAL R. GROSS

don't

21

22

that letter.

But,

that's

if

know

1	something that's a little flexible. I
2	remember we were meeting in November
3	initially, and we changed that because that
4	was a holiday week before Thanksgiving, before
5	the other holiday week and so we were really
6	restricted by when we could meet in November
7	and so we moved it so December so it kind of
8	messes a little bit with the time line for the
9	annual meeting.
10	So, let us try to figure I mean,
11	annual meeting the annual report, sorry.
12	MEMBER LECHNER: So, the report is
13	due prior to that?
14	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Right, and we
15	may have a little flexibility there. I mean,
16	it's a report of activities. It's not a
17	findings report or a recommendations report,
18	so there's some flexibility there.
19	MEMBER LECHNER: So, do the
20	subcommittees need to provide a summary or our
21	activities?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY:

22

That would be

great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER LECHNER: Submit that to --

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I would send it to Debra Tidwell-Peters. She's our DFO. Go ahead.

MEMBER FRASER: Ι just was wondering whether Renee and her group would be reporting further their statistical on analysis of the claimant job data and maybe would she have an opportunity -- the group to have opportunity maybe reconcile an differences with IARP's data, that kind of thing, to take it a step further.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

MEMBER KARMAN: I think what we may want to do then is I'll -- I can speak with the group that prepared that particular study. It wasn't our team. It's another team in Richard Balkus' office and I'd be happy to talk to them about that if perhaps we can get -- maybe by that point the report will have been peer reviewed and we may be able to share

NEAL R. GROSS

a copy of that at that point and discuss the differences to the extent that there are -- thanks.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other topics for the December meeting? It's going to be a very full meeting. We're going to have a very full meeting. Okay.

Any other topics to bring -- or to discuss under the administrative meeting? Okay. So, I find myself at the end of another quarterly meeting, and this meeting in particular has been very full. It's spanned a huge range. We've had before us presentations that are very exciting. All of them are very exciting.

Despite -- I'm about foiling white elephants in the room. I don't want to minimize the incredibly hard work that the work group and the staff put in to putting together the list of data elements.

I think it is incredibly important to recognize how much time was put in. The

NEAL R. GROSS

work group, a lot of people don't understand, they have full-time jobs, and this is a little part of their job. They're like us around this table, that we don't spend our full time around this panel. This is extra work for us.

Their input into this process is incredibly important. The staff's work and dedication in terms of putting together the data elements, I think, needs to be recognized.

This is a very important process, and I think that everybody's very passionate about it and we need to recognize and start at that place and say, "Okay, what are the lessons learned? What are the opportunities and how can we move forward from this space?"

It's been very exciting to see he results of some studies that we've been talking about and to see okay, this is what it's starting to feel like. It's starting to kind of mold itself. Where does it go from here?

NEAL R. GROSS

It is not -- it has not -- it is not passing before me that when we dealt with this five and ten years ago, there was a question out there why do these people need this data? The question's no longer there.

It is very clear to everybody, even people who are maybe opposed to this project, that something needs to be done and there is nothing that deters me from believing that this needs to be done.

Doing it right, being integral to the -- or having total integrity to this project I think makes it really important. We're at a crossroads. I don't think it's a crossroads. I think we're at a point of opportunity to move together and really launch this.

It's a very exciting time, so we need to kind of take a 360. I mean, it really is a 360 at this point. We're at the end of two years that the commissioner said we need to do this. We need to take this on.

NEAL R. GROSS

I know, Tom is kind of shaking his head. Who would've known when we started thinking about this ten years ago and everything that's gone through that would be at this place?

So, I think this is a time for us to all come together and to say, "Okay. We've learned a lot." I -- there are a lot of pressures on SSA. SSA is being asked to create and deliver at the same time, and being from the place where I've sat for the last year and a half, that's a lot of pressure on SSA, but I really believe that if this is created the way it is anticipated to be created, this will do the right thing for the right reason.

So, I would like to close this meeting, have everybody kind of take away with you the thought of what can we do in terms of making this a time for opportunity to move forward together to make sure we get this done.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	So, with that said, I would like to
2	adjourn this meeting, the last of our
3	quarterly meetings for fiscal year 2010.
4	Thank you, all, for being in this process.
5	MEMBER HARDY: I'd like to make a
6	motion to adjourn, and I'd like to also thank
7	you for your leadership up to this point.
8	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,
9	Tom.
10	MEMBER HARDY: You're welcome.
11	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Second?
12	MEMBER KARMAN: I will second that,
13	and I second what he said.
14	CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you,
15	Sylvia. Have a good day, everybody.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
17	concluded at 10:21 a.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

NEAL R. GROSS

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