

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION  
OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT  
ADVISORY PANEL TELECONFERENCE MEETING

JULY 14, 2009

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WOODLAWN, MARYLAND

\* \* \* \* \*

DR. MARY BARROS-BAILEY

INTERIM CHAIR

S R C REPORTERS  
(301)645-2677

- 1 M E M B E R S
- 2 MARY BARROS-BAILEY, Ph.D., INTERIM CHAIR
- 3 GUNNAR ANDERSSON, M.D.
- 4 ROBERT T. FRASER, M.D.
- 5 SHANAN GWALTNEY GIBSON, Ph.D.
- 6 THOMAS A. HARDY, J.D.
- 7 SYLVIA E. KARMAN
- 8 DEBORAH E. LECHNER
- 9 LYNNAE M. RUTTLEDGE
- 10 DAVID J. SCHRETLEN, M.D.
- 11 NANCY G. SHOR, J.D.
- 12 MARK A. WILSON, Ph.D.

13  
14

15 C O N T E N T S

16 ITEM:

17 -----

18	Welcome, Review of Agenda	5
19	Draft Core Recommendations and Next Steps	
	Subcommittee Reports	
20	Taxonomy - Mark A. Wilson	7
	User Needs & Relations - Sylvia E. Karman	13
21	Mental/Cognitive - David A. Schretlen	27
	TSA - Thomas A. Hardy	38
22	Physical Demands - Deborah E. Lechner	41

S R C REPORTERS  
(301)645-2677

1 C O N T E N T S (CON'T.)

2 ITEM:

3 -----

4 Project Director's Report 44

5 Panel Discussion 49

6 Administrative Business 52

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

2 OPERATOR: Good afternoon, and welcome to  
3 the Occupational Information Development Advisory  
4 Panel teleconference meeting. I would like to  
5 introduce Debra Tidwell-Peters, the Designated  
6 Federal Officer for the Panel.

7 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Good afternoon.  
8 Thank you, Tanetha.

9 Welcome to the first full Panel  
10 teleconference of the Occupational Information  
11 Development Advisory Panel. Before we begin, I will  
12 do a scan to ensure that we have a quorum of  
13 members.

14 Gunnar Andersson.

15 DR. ANDERSSON: Yes.

16 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Mary Barros-Bailey.

17 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Here.

18 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Robert Fraser.

19 DR. FRASER: Here.

20 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Shanan Gwaltney  
21 Gibson.

22 DR. GIBSON: Present.

1 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Thomas Hardy.  
2 MR. HARDY: Here.  
3 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Sylvia Karman.  
4 MS. KARMAN: Here.  
5 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Deborah Lechner.  
6 MS. LECHNER: Present.  
7 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Lynnae Rutledge.  
8 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Here.  
9 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: David Schretlen.  
10 DR. SCHRETLEN: Here.  
11 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Nancy Shore.  
12 MS. SHOR: Here.  
13 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: And Mark Wilson.  
14 DR. WILSON: Here.  
15 MS. TIDEWELL-PETERS: Showing a quorum, I  
16 will now turn the meeting over to the Panel Interim  
17 Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey. Mary.  
18 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Debra.  
19 I would like to thank you, everybody, for  
20 making themselves available for this first  
21 teleconference that we're having. I just want to  
22 mention that we are spanning nine time zones, and

1 it's very exciting to be able to do this and  
2 continue our work.

3 I just wanted to review the agenda that we  
4 have all gotten copies of, and mention there is one  
5 modification to the agenda, and I will go through it  
6 in detail. So we are going to be having draft core  
7 recommendations and next steps by various  
8 subcommittees. As we go through those status  
9 reports or draft core recommendations, we will give  
10 a little bit of time, about 10, 15 minutes for  
11 deliberation and Panel discussion. And then we have  
12 added a Project Director's report; and then the  
13 administrative business. We will be voting on the  
14 Minutes for the April and June full commission  
15 meetings.

16 I would like to just say that this is  
17 being recorded, and in terms of the procedures for  
18 recording, because our court reporter cannot  
19 visually see us, if we can first say our name before  
20 we make a comment so that the record will be clear,  
21 that would be great. And we have all gotten copies  
22 in terms of the voting procedures, and when we get

1 to that part of the agenda I will go through those  
2 in detail.

3 I would like to start off by asking  
4 Dr. Mark Wilson, the Chair of the Taxonomy and  
5 Classification Committee to provide us with an  
6 update in terms of the draft core recommendations  
7 and next steps for his subcommittee.

8 DR. WILSON: Yes. Thank you, Mary. This  
9 is Mark Wilson speaking on behalf of the Work  
10 Taxonomy Subcommittee. We're in the process of  
11 completing the major activities that we have  
12 outlined in order to write our recommendations back  
13 to the Panel as a whole. Our last activity is going  
14 to take place next week in Falls Church, Virginia  
15 where we're going to be interviewing and observing  
16 Administrative Law Judges in their National Center.

17 After that -- hopefully not too long after  
18 that, we will be able to release our -- a draft of  
19 our recommendations to the entire Panel. I have  
20 been working on that draft for a little while.  
21 Basically, it's going to be written as a technical  
22 report that begins with an executive summary,

1 describes the purpose of our Panel, and our  
2 subcommittee, lays out the assumption that we made  
3 in the Work Taxonomy Committee as we began,  
4 identifies all the procedures and steps that we went  
5 through to come to the recommendations; and then  
6 lays out what the recommendations are -- the primary  
7 recommendation, which won't be a surprise to anyone  
8 on the Panel is that we're going to be about  
9 somewhere roughly in that level two, level three  
10 generalized work activity area in terms of  
11 describing how work should be analyzed.

12           We also have enumerated a number of  
13 concerns that have been expressed at Panel meetings  
14 and to us in meetings with end users so that we will  
15 identify what those concerns are, and how our  
16 recommendations are meant to deal with each of those  
17 concerns.

18           We will also identify any research that we  
19 think would be useful or helpful in terms of guiding  
20 Social Security. This is an area, unfortunately,  
21 that there is not always good, empirical research  
22 because very few organizations have conducted

1 research on this level, sort of national work  
2 analyses, if you will. So we will make some  
3 recommendations about studies, provide suggestions  
4 as far as evaluation criteria, you know, list of  
5 references, things of that sort. And that's pretty  
6 much where we are at this point.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Was there anything  
8 within your status at this point that you wanted to  
9 bring to the Panel for deliberation? Any questions?

10 DR. WILSON: No, I think as of the last  
11 Panel meeting and the fact finding we did prior to  
12 the last Panel meeting, I think I have gotten pretty  
13 good input. There will also be several Panel  
14 members at Falls Church. So hopefully, if there are  
15 any last minute issues and concerns we will be able  
16 to take those into account there.

17 At this point I'm certainly open for any  
18 questions. I don't want to speak for Shanana, but as  
19 far as I'm concerned, I think I have a pretty good  
20 understanding of the Panel's concerns and interests.

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. This is Mary.  
22 Do any of the Panel members have any questions?

1           Okay. In terms of further steps beyond  
2 anything that you articulated, was there anything  
3 else you wanted to mention, Mark?

4           DR. WILSON: I'm sorry, Mary, what was  
5 that?

6           DR. BARROS-BAILEY: You had indicated some  
7 next steps, some things that you were doing right  
8 now. And our deliverable in terms of the  
9 subcommittee reports to the Panel are the 20th of  
10 August. So between now and then, are there any  
11 other next steps that you wanted to mention that you  
12 haven't in your initial report?

13          DR. WILSON: I think in terms of process  
14 the visit to Falls Church is the last major  
15 activity. After that, you know, we will generate a  
16 draft of our technical report and make that  
17 available for review and try to get it out to the  
18 full Panel as quickly as possible. Obviously,  
19 they're going to have to be edits and integration  
20 issues and things of that sort; but my goal is to  
21 try to get it out as quickly as possible. I think  
22 that, as has been acknowledged at the last Panel

1 meeting, the Work Taxonomy Group was moving pretty  
2 rapidly and was probably a little farther ahead.  
3 And so part of the goal is just to get our work out  
4 as quickly as possible, and you know, the hope is  
5 that that might help some of the other subcommittees  
6 in terms of what they're doing to have a copy -- at  
7 least a draft copy of what our recommendations are  
8 as quickly as we can get them out.

9 MS. SHOR: Mark, this is a Nancy Shor. I  
10 just had a quick question. You had mentioned that  
11 you had a very enthusiastic response from the PDF  
12 folks in North Carolina on your field visit.

13 DR. WILSON: Yes.

14 MS. SHOR: I'm wondering if your report  
15 will contain whatever materials you presented to  
16 them, or Power Point, or whatever you did; but is  
17 that something that you plan to include in your  
18 report?

19 DR. WILSON: Thank you, Mary. Yes, it is.

20 Obviously, our interviews are all  
21 confidential so we won't be identifying specific  
22 individuals and what they said; but we will describe

1 what that process was and what the reactions were to  
2 it. And in general, just so the Panel is aware, we  
3 described, as I have in previous Panel meetings, the  
4 idea of generalized work analysis and how this might  
5 work, and showed them some examples very similar to  
6 what we did in some of the fact finding of, you  
7 know, some sample items from a work analysis  
8 taxonomy, and got their reactions to it. And as I  
9 said, they were, too, very positive; and they seemed  
10 to like the idea.

11 As I said, one of the goals for us is to  
12 try to get this technical report and recommendations  
13 to the entire Panel out as soon as we can. You  
14 know, if they're areas where we need to elaborate or  
15 things that need less detail, we're certainly  
16 willing, you know, to try and get that accomplished.

17 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you,  
18 Mark.

19 Are there any other questions from Panel  
20 members -- and just to keep the record straight that  
21 last question came from Nancy Shor.

22 Are there any other questions from Panel

1 members?

2 MS. KARMAN: Yes. Hello, this is Sylvia.  
3 Mark, I was wondering is it too premature for you to  
4 give us a sense of the topics, perhaps, or that --  
5 the areas that you and Shanan will be making  
6 recommendations, you know, at some of the key issue  
7 areas that you guys are going to be targeting?

8 DR. WILSON: Well, sure. Generally what  
9 we're going to do is -- as we described in the last  
10 Panel meeting is we have gone through a process  
11 where we've looked at all known empirical work  
12 taxonomies. We have gone through a sorting and  
13 evaluation process of all those.

14 I think, you know, the primary  
15 recommendation is that the result of that process  
16 will be a list of taxonomic descriptors that would  
17 be the stimulus for -- a work analysis instrument  
18 that would be used to develop items. Such that, you  
19 know, a particular work analysis taxonomy descriptor  
20 might generate, you know, only a couple items or  
21 perhaps several. But this exhaustive review of the  
22 existing literature, we think, has provided us with

1 a pretty good basis to say, these are the underlying  
2 work descriptors that should probably be covered in  
3 the system.

4 Then, pretty much the rest of the report  
5 would describe, you know, how you might go about  
6 doing that. What options you might have in terms of  
7 how the information might be written and collected,  
8 and what concerns -- how you would evaluate that  
9 information; those sorts of things.

10 I don't know if that's addressing your  
11 question or not, Sylvia.

12 MS. KARMAN: Thank you very much. Yes.

13 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thanks. Any other  
14 questions from Panel members to Mark?

15 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes. This is David  
16 Schretlen. Mark.

17 DR. WILSON: Yes.

18 DR. SCHRETLEN: I haven't made the field  
19 visit yet, but I'm just wondering how did you use  
20 that visit? What were your goals to accomplish on  
21 that visit?

22 DR. WILSON: Thanks, David. Yeah, it's an

1 important question, and if you haven't done that  
2 yet -- and I know some of you are considerably more  
3 experienced with that aspect of this project than I  
4 was; but I found it to be a highly useful, even  
5 exhilarating meeting. And got to meet with several  
6 examiners, vocational experts, things of that sort.  
7 And the kind of questions -- mostly one on one  
8 interviews where I asked them how do they use  
9 occupational information. What problems -- what  
10 kinds of concerns do they have with the current  
11 information? In the best of all scenarios, what  
12 would their dream system look like? Focused a lot  
13 on can you give me concrete examples.

14           And I would say that took up about 90,  
15 95 percent of the time. Most of these interviews  
16 lasted somewhere between 90 minutes to two hours.  
17 So fairly detailed.

18           Then the last part of the interview, as  
19 Nancy eluded to earlier, I took out some of the  
20 materials that I presented at one of the fact  
21 finding sessions prior to our last Panel meeting  
22 where, you know, I showed them some examples of

1 generic work analysis items and said well, what if  
2 you had a profile of, you know -- that was exactly  
3 the same profile for every job on items like these,  
4 you know, would that be something that would be  
5 useful to you?

6           Would that be -- and it was up-to-date,  
7 and it included all jobs in the work place; and to a  
8 person, they reacted very positively to that. That  
9 seemed to excite them to some extent that we seemed  
10 to be going in that direction. So I just found the  
11 entire experience -- these people work extremely  
12 hard, and are using tools that are not particularly  
13 user friendly and have, you know, in some cases some  
14 issues, and things of that sort. So it was a very  
15 good experience. I would strongly recommend it to  
16 anyone who hasn't.

17           I don't know, on my end I keep hearing a  
18 beep. If I need to repeat anything, let me know.

19           DR. BARROS-BAILEY: You are coming clear  
20 through to me.

21           DR. WILSON: Great.

22           DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions of

1 Mark?

2 Okay. Thank you, Mark, for your  
3 presentation, for your work.

4 I would like to pass on to the next  
5 committee member, Sylvia Karman, the Chair of the  
6 User Needs and Relations Subcommittee.

7 MS. KARMAN: Hello, everyone. This is  
8 Sylvia.

9 Our subcommittee just met last week and we  
10 are planning to continue meeting a few more times as  
11 we pull together our final draft recommendation that  
12 will go -- final draft -- recommendations from the  
13 subcommittee that will be given to the interim chair  
14 on August 20; but before I get into what -- just in  
15 a general way what type of areas we're making  
16 recommendations about, we're going to just go over  
17 some of the current efforts.

18 Right now there are user needs analysis  
19 efforts ongoing. You all probably by now have seen  
20 the results from the Chicago U and A. We submitted  
21 them to the Panel several weeks ago, and we thank  
22 the Chicago region for -- their assistance in this

1 was really terrific help since we were moving so  
2 quickly, and had a really short time frame.

3           For the next three weeks the Occupational  
4 Information Development Project staff, as well as  
5 our several workgroup members are conducting  
6 interviews and focus groups at Social Security  
7 offices in the Philadelphia region, including DDS  
8 adjudicators, the Office of Quality Performance  
9 Disability claims reviewers, Office of Disability  
10 Adjudication and Review, ALJs -- Administrative Law  
11 Judges, and Administrative Appeals Judges, and  
12 senior attorney staff.

13           That information that we're gathering will  
14 feed our recommendations -- that is the Panel  
15 recommendation. The User Needs and Relations  
16 Subcommittee will make that information available as  
17 it is synthesized. So we're going to get that to  
18 you as soon as we possibly can.

19           And also, again, we wish to acknowledge  
20 the tremendous support that we have received from  
21 the regional offices that we have had -- that we  
22 have contacted so far, and including the DDSs and

1 Office of Quality Performance, and ODAR. We really  
2 want to thank them for working with us to make those  
3 UNAs possible.

4           Then another item that I want to let  
5 everyone know about or just give you some status on  
6 that is -- of course, Mark has already mentioned --  
7 the Panel member visits which are underway. Several  
8 Panel members who have expressed interest have  
9 already visited DDSs. There are still another  
10 couple of visits to DDSs that are scheduled over the  
11 next few weeks. And we have additional visits  
12 scheduled the end of this week and next week with  
13 the Office of Disability Adjudication and Review for  
14 Panel members to meet with judges, and to observe a  
15 hearing at the National Hearing Center in Falls  
16 Church, Virginia.

17           So, again, we thank both the DDS and ODAR  
18 staff, and those in the Office of Disability  
19 Determinations for working with us to make that  
20 possible.

21           And then, also, we have had several  
22 requests from stakeholder organizations who have

1 asked for information or asked to provide some  
2 suggestions and comments and input on the -- to the  
3 Panel on development of the new Occupational  
4 Information System. And so we had prepared a letter  
5 for Mary Barros-Bailey, the Interim Chair to send to  
6 those organizations so that they could actually go  
7 out to their membership and post on their list  
8 serves or send e-mail to their membership asking  
9 them for any input or ideas that they might have.

10 They might get them back to the person  
11 coordinating for their particular organization, and  
12 we are now beginning to see some of those responses.  
13 So again, thank you. That certainly is very helpful  
14 to us.

15 Then, finally, the status of the User  
16 Needs and Relations Subcommittee preparation for  
17 recommendations. We have identified in our  
18 outlining key issues in preparation for a  
19 subcommittee report that's due to the Interim Chair  
20 by 8/20. And by way of status, we can report that  
21 we have -- can see, at least right now, three areas  
22 that we're going to be making recommendations to

1 Social Security about, and also to assist the Panel.

2           So one area is communication, and that  
3 would involve identifying the type of audience, you  
4 know, which users might best benefit from what kinds  
5 of communication and modalities, and the type of  
6 content that we think would be useful or appropriate  
7 for, perhaps, our staff to develop, and then work  
8 with the Panel on that; and then delivery, you know,  
9 and format of same kind of information. So we're  
10 exploring a number of ideas that we're hoping will  
11 be useful.

12           Also, in the communication area we're also  
13 looking to provide some general guidance to Panel  
14 members regarding public speaking and any formal,  
15 written communications. A number of you have asked  
16 for that, and that will be also part of our  
17 recommendations.

18           Of course as we make this information  
19 available, we've already given some generic text to  
20 a number of you who have asked for it. So if any of  
21 the Panel members have a need for that or an  
22 interest in that, please let me or one of the other

1 subcommittee members know. We will be more than  
2 glad to, you know, give you whatever we have already  
3 prepared. You certainly don't need to wait for our  
4 recommendations for that.

5           And then the second area that we have  
6 identified is information gathering and outreach.  
7 And we kind of see that as different from  
8 communication in the sense that this might involve  
9 sort of coordinating with other entities, either  
10 within Social Security, or in this case -- I think  
11 in many cases -- external to Social Security.

12           So, for example, we're looking at areas  
13 such as our Panel presentations. You know, when we  
14 have our Panel meetings or our face-to-face  
15 meetings, you know, we may want to have an organized  
16 way in which we are requesting people to make Panel  
17 presentations or presentations to the Panel based on  
18 whatever the Panel is taking up in its deliberations  
19 at that point during the project.

20           Also, we are looking to provide a number  
21 of suitable venues for individuals and organizations  
22 to provide information and/or inputs. You know,

1 federal agencies, for example, use the Federal  
2 Register Notice process. I think we need to make  
3 more and better use of that. Also, through public  
4 comment see what other ways we can, perhaps, expand  
5 that as that need arises, and of course, our  
6 conference attendance.

7           And then a number of organizations are  
8 making their list serves available. You know,  
9 basically they would like to be able to use their  
10 list serves to canvass their membership about  
11 concerns or ideas. So to the extent that we can  
12 coordinate with them to, you know, be -- receiving  
13 some of that information as they see fit -- as those  
14 organizations see fit to share with us, that would  
15 be really a helpful thing.

16           And then the last area, or at least the  
17 third area that we have identified so far is applied  
18 research. And you know, I have been reporting on  
19 the user needs analyses that our staff and the  
20 workgroup has been engaged in over the last couple  
21 months, and will -- hopefully for content model  
22 purposes will be finishing up in the next two or

1 three weeks.

2           So under applied research we're thinking  
3 of studies that involve the user needs analyses, as  
4 well as any future studies involving claims analyses  
5 and possibly SSA adjudicative staff, or even  
6 possibly others to test, for example, instruments on  
7 the person side of physical, mental attributes.  
8 That's an example of an area where we could really  
9 expand and develop applied research. So the User  
10 Needs and Relations Subcommittee sees that as  
11 something that is necessary for the Panel and for  
12 the project.

13           So another reason for our bringing that up  
14 at this juncture on the 14th of July is that we  
15 would be interested in integrating any possible  
16 recommendations that other Panel subcommittees might  
17 have even now, or as we move past September. You  
18 know, we would be looking to you all to help us  
19 identify the kind of studies that you think might be  
20 necessary in an applied fashion. So you know, any  
21 time you think that we may need to look at claims  
22 for example, do comparisons, or any kinds of

1 studies.

2 So that's it for now. We're -- you know,  
3 we're looking to be able to provide a report by the  
4 20th. Thank you. Are there any questions?

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Sylvia.

6 MR. HARDY: Excuse me, Mary.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

8 MR. HARDY: Hi, this is Tom. I was trying  
9 to unmute, and I got cut off for a second. Is there  
10 still time for questions?

11 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

12 MR. HARDY: I have a quick one, Sylvia. I  
13 was just curious, with public comments that are  
14 coming in, how is that being collated and stored?  
15 And as Panel members, how do we kind of access that?

16 MS. KARMAN: Okay. Well, for the most  
17 part the public comment that we have been receiving  
18 has been along the lines of people either calling in  
19 at our face-to-face Panel meetings or actually  
20 attending the face-to-face Panel meetings and  
21 providing their input. If we were to receive other  
22 public information from the public, we would be

1 sharing that with the full Panel. We have not to  
2 date received anything that is outside the actual  
3 Panel meetings.

4 MR. HARDY: Okay.

5 MS. KARMAN: Most people have reserved  
6 their comment and waited until the actual --  
7 face-to-face Panel meetings have occurred.

8 Also, we will -- are looking into  
9 establishing a -- an internet method of actually  
10 posting the information that we will be receiving  
11 from the public, and actually any information that  
12 we think we would want to be making available to our  
13 Panel, as well as to our SSA staff who are involved  
14 in this project.

15 We are working with the General Services  
16 Administration to establish a secure web site that  
17 is available both to people with the Social Security  
18 e-mail address, as well as those of you who have a  
19 private sector e-mail address. So that's another  
20 way in which we will be -- you will be able to go  
21 back and access that information; but for right now,  
22 we have not received anything that you would not

1 already be aware of.

2 MR. HARDY: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.

3 MS. KARMAN: Sure.

4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Are there  
5 any other questions for Sylvia from the Panel?

6 Okay. Thank you, Sylvia, for your update.

7 I would like to now go to Dr. David  
8 Schretlen for an update on the Mental/Cognitive  
9 Demands Subcommittee.

10 DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. Thank you, Mary.

11 Let me first begin by --

12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Can I stop you very  
13 quickly. Are you on a speaker phone? I think we're  
14 getting some feedback. At least I am.

15 DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. Is that better?

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: That's much better.

17 Thank you.

18 DR. SCHRETLEN: Thanks, Mary.

19 Let me begin by noting that since the last  
20 full Panel meeting, we have not had a subcommittee  
21 meeting, and I have asked Debra to help coordinate a  
22 telephone conference call for next week. One of the

1 reasons is that I have been out of town for a couple  
2 of weeks, so it really has made it difficult to stay  
3 in touch with other committee members, although, I  
4 have spent a lot of time working on information that  
5 came out of the roundtable meeting we had at the  
6 beginning of the last full Panel meeting.

7           And in terms of changes, I should note  
8 that Mary Barros is stepping down from participation  
9 in the Mental/Cognitive Subcommittee, and we will  
10 miss her input; but she has agreed to informally  
11 stay in touch.

12           The main thing that I have to report, I  
13 think, for our subcommittee at this point is to just  
14 sort of reiterate and expand a little bit on some of  
15 the initial comments I had made at the end of the  
16 last Panel meeting about the results of our  
17 roundtable.

18           First, we had a roundtable meeting. We  
19 asked participants to address four questions, and  
20 the participants included a number of SSA staff  
21 members, and we had a number of OIDAP Panel  
22 observers. But the outside participants included

1 Gary Bond who is a chancellor, professor in the  
2 Department of Psychology at Indiana University,  
3 Purdue University; Sally Rogers, who is the Director  
4 of Research at the Center for Psychiatric  
5 Rehabilitation at Boston University. Lynda Payne, a  
6 psychological consultant for the Maryland State DDS.  
7 Susan Bruyere, who is the Director of The Employment  
8 and Disability Institute at this -- for the School  
9 of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell.  
10 Pamela Warren, Clinical Instructor in the Department  
11 of Psychiatry at the College of Medicine, University  
12 of Illinois; and Bob Fraser and I who all responded  
13 to a set of four questions that -- before the  
14 meeting that we then spent the day discussing.

15           And the outcome of that was -- in response  
16 to question one, that there was essentially  
17 universal agreement that the mental RFC assessment  
18 can be improved by revision. We discussed problems  
19 that were identified, and they included things like  
20 a paucity of items that assess cognitive  
21 functioning, overly simplistic items, items that  
22 combine dispirit abilities into single, you know,

1 questions; sort of inconsistent waiting of items,  
2 the lack of direct observation, and the lack of  
3 longitudinal assessment. Those were some of the  
4 main areas that were highlighted by virtually all of  
5 the panelists.

6           In response to question two, which was --  
7 we asked each participant to identify what they  
8 considered kind of core psychological abilities or  
9 interpersonal abilities that can be impaired by  
10 disease or illness, and that by virtue of their  
11 impairment can compromise a person's ability to do  
12 work.

13           There, again, was much more consensus  
14 actually and agreement across members of the Panel  
15 than I anticipated going into it. What I have done  
16 is I have spent quite a bit of time trying to  
17 synthesize each participant's list, and you know,  
18 sort of match them up as closely as possible on a  
19 large matrix that I just circulated I think  
20 yesterday or this morning to members of the  
21 Mental/Cognitive Subcommittee.

22           And we also asked people at the end of the

1 roundtable to revise their list in light of the  
2 discussion, and I received a number of those back;  
3 but a couple of panelists have not yet responded,  
4 and I am still hoping that they will. But based on  
5 either the final list or the initial lists for the  
6 couple of people we haven't heard back from, I have  
7 taken the liberty of trying to develop a tentative  
8 list of core characteristics that need to be  
9 refined; and that I'm hoping in the next  
10 subcommittee meeting that we can discuss and try and  
11 refine and, perhaps, expand upon.

12           And then our goal -- our plans are two  
13 fold with that. We will take that list first and  
14 circulate it back among roundtable panelists and ask  
15 for their feedback about the items, whether they  
16 perceive the items as essential; whether they  
17 perceive the items as capable of being assessed  
18 reliably and validly, either by ratings or by direct  
19 assessment; and then, secondly, to also circulate  
20 this list to the Work Taxonomy Group.

21           So I'm hoping that the folks in the Work  
22 Taxonomy Group will be willing to look at this list

1 that we -- that we developed tentatively and compare  
2 it to work demands; and try and sort of do an  
3 initial cross walk and let us know -- give us some  
4 feedback about whether or not the characteristics  
5 that the Mental/Cognitive Subcommittee are  
6 characteristics that map onto job demands where they  
7 can discern obvious connections.

8           And also, if there are any major aspects  
9 of job demands that don't appear to be complimented  
10 by a psychological or interpersonal capacity that we  
11 have identified, that they could alert us to, to  
12 include.

13           We also at the roundtable talked about  
14 the -- discussed question number three, whether or  
15 not there are any large or national databases that  
16 we can draw on to identify psychological and  
17 interpersonal rate limiting factors in work  
18 performance or the ability to do work. And it  
19 doesn't appear that we have been able to identify  
20 any very large databases. A number of panelists had  
21 suggestions in terms of particular studies or  
22 reviews of studies, and have sent in PDFs, and we

1 will begin reviewing those shortly.

2           And finally, at the roundtable we  
3 discussed -- the fourth question we discussed had to  
4 do with measurement issues. And there was -- this  
5 actually -- though it was at the end of the day --  
6 sparked a lively discussion about limitations in the  
7 current mental RFC assessment, and things that ought  
8 to be considered; and the major areas that were  
9 brought up were the lack of longitudinal assessment.  
10 That it's clear that -- that all the panelists or  
11 several of the panelists at least thought it was  
12 very important to better capture fluctuations in a  
13 person's cognitive psychological and interpersonal  
14 capacities over time.

15           Secondly, a number of people suggested  
16 that it could be helpful to specify behavioral  
17 anchors rather very coarse categories. In fact, one  
18 of the other issues is that a number of people felt  
19 that the categories for assessment of these  
20 abilities are just too coarse.

21           Then, finally, Sally Rogers made a rather  
22 impassioned plea for the value of situational

1 assessment. I think most people on the panel agreed  
2 that while this may not be something that's very  
3 feasible for Social Security, it certainly is a  
4 desirable way to assess psychological and  
5 interpersonal capacity.

6           So again, you know, the Mental/Cognitive  
7 panel I think -- I'm hoping that we will meet next  
8 week, and we will be discussing further the  
9 responses to all these questions, as well as  
10 refining lists of characteristics to be evaluated by  
11 roundtable participants in a second round, and by  
12 the Work Taxonomy Group.

13           I don't think that I have anything else to  
14 report at this point.

15           DR. BARROS-BAILEY: This is Mary. Just a  
16 question. Are there any -- in terms of next steps  
17 or needs that the subcommittee has that we need to  
18 address at this point?

19           DR. SCHRETLEN: I think the main things  
20 are the two that I outlined, that we want to reach  
21 out to the Work Taxonomy Group and get feedback from  
22 them about the characteristics that we have

1 identified; and then, secondly, we have talked about  
2 having a second roundtable. I think that just for  
3 lack of time, if nothing else, it is not very  
4 feasible; but that it could be very helpful to go  
5 back to the roundtable members with this -- with a  
6 tentative list and ask each of them to comment on  
7 the completeness, the essentialness, and the  
8 suitability for reliability -- potential for  
9 reliable and valid assessment of the items on the  
10 list.

11 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, David.

12 I would like to open it up to the Panel to  
13 see if there are any questions.

14 DR. FRASER: David, this is Bob. You  
15 still got one or two people out that haven't  
16 responded to you?

17 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes.

18 DR. FRASER: So maybe if you can get --  
19 make an appeal to get those lists -- the input from  
20 those folks. Then maybe before our telephone  
21 meeting, just to kind of go over and be able to  
22 comment; more scrutiny than what we got here.

1 DR. SCHRETLEN: That would be great, Bob.  
2 That would be terrific. So maybe we could even do  
3 that before the next -- you and I before the next  
4 meeting.

5 DR. FRASER: Yeah, we could. Maybe -- if  
6 everybody involved could take a look at it. Those  
7 that are going to be on the call anyway.

8 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes.

9 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you, Bob.  
10 Any other questions?

11 DR. WILSON: Yes, this is Mark Wilson.  
12 And I just wanted to make sure I understand what  
13 Dave was considering in terms of Work Taxonomy's  
14 input into his process. So if you would like to  
15 sort of give us a tentative cognitive side taxonomy  
16 and have us respond to that -- to your subcommittee,  
17 right?

18 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes.

19 DR. WILSON: Okay.

20 DR. SCHRETLEN: What I would like you to  
21 do, Mark, is look at what you see are the major  
22 dimensions of work demands, and compare those.

1 You're sort of -- at this point your overall  
2 impressions with capacities on the person side that  
3 we are identifying and just take a look at that and  
4 see how well they match.

5 DR. WILSON: I am glad you brought this up  
6 because for those who weren't at the fact finding --  
7 we did something similar to this in a tentative way  
8 with some of the initial sorts that we had of work  
9 taxonomies. So in terms of making sure that the job  
10 side work taxonomy dimensions would allow us to tap  
11 into, you know, potential dimensions that either the  
12 physical or the cognitive subcommittees might come  
13 up with.

14 So I think we would be happy to do that  
15 both in sort of an informal way and depending upon  
16 when we get them, we might be able to do even a more  
17 formal sort of -- goes back to the recommended  
18 dimensions that we come up with and include that in  
19 our technical report.

20 DR. SCHRETLEN: Thank you. That would be  
21 terrific, Mark.

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

1                   Are there any other questions of

2 Dr. Schretlen? Okay. Thanks, David.

3                   I would like to move on to Thomas Hardy,  
4 the Chair of the Transferable Skills Analysis  
5 Subcommittee.

6                   MR. HARDY: Good morning. Thank you.

7                   This is Thomas Hardy. TSA Subcommittee  
8 has not had a full meeting since last month when we  
9 had the Panel meeting. As of yesterday we did have  
10 a conference call, which I will address momentarily.

11                   At this point we are still in gathering of  
12 literature. Believe that job has pretty much been  
13 completed at this point; and we now have what I  
14 think is a full enough listing of articles --  
15 journal articles and books to be reviewed.

16                   Additionally, I have been provided with  
17 documentation from several states regarding their  
18 procedures, their directions for procedures from the  
19 DDSs. I have gotten 12 of those so far. I have yet  
20 to review and see what is contained in those. That  
21 will be part of my next steps.

22                   At this point -- I would recommend this to

1 all Panel members. I have completed my DDS site  
2 visit and found that extremely illuminating.  
3 Considering my area, I spoke a great deal with my  
4 DDS regarding transferable skills analysis, how it's  
5 utilized, what they consider to be the way to  
6 performance, what it is; and found that it would  
7 just be a fascinating conversation. And I would  
8 again urge anybody that has not done a DDS visit to  
9 do it, because it's wonderful.

10 To echo other Panel members, it is very  
11 enlightening, very exciting. I will be part of the  
12 group going down to Falls Church next week, and we  
13 will be interviewing the ALJs and also, again,  
14 concentrating on TSA's particularly.

15 I have begun a draft of the roundtable  
16 that was held a few months ago. That should be done  
17 within the next few weeks. I am considering sending  
18 that around to the roundtable for comments or  
19 additions so we have a complete record of that  
20 activity. Beyond that, we have worked as a  
21 committee yesterday in a conference call with the  
22 Taxonomy Subcommittee. Beyond that, we have not had

1 a formal meeting. I'm anticipating doing that some  
2 time in the coming months as we start working on the  
3 recommendations.

4 I think right now it's kind of premature  
5 to discuss what recommendations are going to be  
6 coming out of this committee until we complete the  
7 literature review, and then start putting pens to  
8 paper.

9 Additionally, my understanding is growing  
10 that we're going to be working more closely with  
11 Taxonomy in the coming months; and I think the  
12 process is going to be very, very dependent upon  
13 what happens in Taxonomy as we move forward. Beyond  
14 that, I don't really have much else to report at  
15 this time, and I would be happy to answer any  
16 questions.

17 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any  
18 questions from the Panel members to Tom? Okay.

19 MR. HARDY: Thank you.

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Tom. And  
21 at this point I would like to move on to Deborah  
22 Lechner, the Chair of the Physical Demands

1 Subcommittee.

2 MS. LECHNER: Thank you, Mary.

3 Can everyone hear me all right?

4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

5 MS. LECHNER: I am speaking on behalf of  
6 my Physical Demands subcommittee, which includes  
7 Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey, Dr. Gunnar Andersson, and  
8 Sylvia Karman, as well as myself.

9 We, of course -- all of the -- our  
10 subcommittee members have attended the Panel  
11 meetings in February, April and June of this year.  
12 We have also had three separate subcommittee  
13 meetings. One at the April meeting in Atlanta, one  
14 teleconference in May, and then our last meeting  
15 being the June Panel meeting in Chicago.

16 In addition to our meetings, we have -- we  
17 are doing some visiting to the DDSs and ODAR, and  
18 appellate counsel. We have reviewed six Social  
19 Security Administration prepared papers. We have  
20 reviewed three occupational taxonomies, and nine  
21 ergonomic taxonomies that address the physical  
22 demands of work.

1           We, in the process, also reviewed about 30  
2 different published papers. And we are currently  
3 also examining the feasibility of performing some  
4 exploratory factor analysis on the physical demands  
5 of work.

6           The things we are considering in our  
7 deliberations are, of course, the needs of the  
8 Social Security five step process for disability  
9 determination.

10           We are also examining the efficacy, or  
11 lack thereof, in the current DOT "slash" SCO  
12 Physical Demands Classification System. And then,  
13 we are also considering the affects of change of the  
14 current system on the medical and rehab community;  
15 and we have listened to input from stakeholders at  
16 the various Panel meetings, February through June.  
17 We also are considering input that we had from  
18 stakeholders in 2002 when some of our members were  
19 involved in a research -- a small research study  
20 with the Department of Labor on the physical demands  
21 aspects of work.

22           And at the present time, we are looking at

1 about six different -- having about six different  
2 categories of manual -- of physical demands in our  
3 taxonomy. One being manual materials handling. The  
4 second being posture and positions; the third being  
5 mobility and repetitive movement; fourth,  
6 psychomotor; fifth, sensory; and six, environmental.  
7 And so those are the major categories under which  
8 there would be additional items identified. And I  
9 think that's all I have at this point and time.

10 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Deborah.

11 Are there any questions from Panel  
12 members?

13 MS. KARMAN: Hi, yes, this is Sylvia.  
14 Deborah, I was just wondering, is there some  
15 assistance that we may be able to give you with  
16 regard to the factor analysis? So if there is,  
17 please, let us know.

18 MS. LECHNER: Right. And part of what we  
19 have been doing is just looking at trying to give --  
20 we want to give Social Security Administration sort  
21 of an estimate of the amount of work that would be  
22 involved in that, and we are -- I think we have just

1 about finished gathering that information. So I  
2 should be e-mailing you in a day or two to let you  
3 know how much time would be involved in getting that  
4 data in a form that could be analyzed.

5 MS. KARMAN: Okay. Great. Thanks.

6 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other  
7 questions from any other Panel members?

8 Okay. Thank you, Deborah.

9 At this time we're just going to move on  
10 to Sylvia Karman with the Project Director's report.

11 MS. KARMAN: Okay. This is Sylvia again.  
12 And I just have an update on just a few items. Just  
13 to give people a little status on what we call our  
14 short-term projects.

15 Our office did, in fact, receive the final  
16 report from ICF International on June 30th,  
17 documenting the results of it's evaluation of the  
18 occupational information and methods used by Career  
19 Planning Software Specialist, Incorporated.  
20 Currently, the report is under review in SSA. That  
21 would be including senior executive review and  
22 review by our general counsel, as is our usual

1 protocol. As soon as the report finishes its round  
2 of reviews, we will be providing the Panel with  
3 information about the outcomes.

4           The second point is that -- regarding the  
5 Occupational and Medical Vocational Claims  
6 Information Study. Social Security, as you all are  
7 no doubt aware, published a presolicitation notice  
8 May 15th, 2009, for services to collect and evaluate  
9 Social Security's claimants. The claim information  
10 regarding their occupations and medical vocational  
11 decision outcomes for use in our research efforts to  
12 get at the -- to help us with the development of the  
13 Occupational Information System. More specifically,  
14 to help us get at what kind of past work or what  
15 sorts of work history do claimants tend to have.  
16 And what -- what do we know about their residual  
17 functional capacity outcomes and those assessments,  
18 and how that is taken into consideration in the  
19 vocational outcomes at either step four or step  
20 five.

21           And so that information would be very  
22 helpful for us in terms of, you know, honing in on

1 what type of -- for example, what areas of  
2 occupations we might want to pursue first.

3           So -- but since the time of this notice,  
4 it has become apparent to us that there are, in  
5 fact, claims review resources available within the  
6 Agency. And so Social Security has decided to  
7 perform the work within SSA in the Office of Medical  
8 and Vocational Expertise. So we are working now  
9 with OMVE, the Office of Medical and Vocational  
10 Expertise. We expect that study to be under way  
11 later this summer. We have already met with the  
12 staff, and are, you know, in the beginning phases of  
13 setting up the protocol and the instruments that we  
14 are going to use to collect the information.

15           The good news is we're probably going to  
16 get done sooner than we thought with this. So I  
17 think that would be really a positive for the  
18 project. And we thank OMVE for stepping up to this.

19           And then also, just because I am thinking  
20 you guys are probably going to ask, we are still  
21 working out with our Office of Acquisition and  
22 Grants for a location for the September meeting. We

1 have one in mind, but we are not ready to release  
2 the information. It is still to be determined. You  
3 all will be the first to know.

4           And also, just to let you know that the --  
5 for our team on your project staff, any of our staff  
6 leads are, in fact, available and hopefully in  
7 circumstances where it's already been identified,  
8 they are, in fact, working with the subcommittee  
9 Chairs. Certainly, they are available to work with  
10 the subcommittee Chairs to assist in the preparation  
11 of reports or materials for those reports that are  
12 due to Mary by the 20th of August. So do let me  
13 know.

14           Some of our staff, as I mentioned earlier,  
15 are conducting these user needs analyses. So  
16 they're in and out of the office and there is a lot  
17 of activity going on; but we -- you know, we do want  
18 to make sure that your staff leads are available to  
19 support you guys.

20           And I only had one action item resulting  
21 from the June meeting in which Dr. Gunnar Andersson  
22 had asked about the denial rates for claims --

1 disability claims in the Agency. And we did locate  
2 that information and make that available to the  
3 Panel; and of course, to Dr. Andersson. So just to  
4 let you all know and to make it clear on the record  
5 that we did, in fact, supply that information. And  
6 that's all I have, unless there are any questions.

7 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Sylvia, this is Lynnae.  
8 If you could just clarify, you said you are looking  
9 for the location for the September meeting. Is it  
10 still going to be in Denver?

11 MS. KARMAN: No, not at the moment. We're  
12 not in Denver right now. We're not in Kansas right  
13 now.

14 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Okay. Can you give me a  
15 hint, is it East Coast or West Coast?

16 MS. KARMAN: Right now we're looking for a  
17 West Coast venue, because you all have been so  
18 patient.

19 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Yes. Just think about it.  
20 Right now it's only 10:00 o'clock.

21 MS. KARMAN: There you go.

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Are there any

1 other questions of Sylvia?

2 Okay. Thank you, Sylvia.

3 MS. KARMAN: You are welcome.

4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We have done  
5 individual Panel discussion, deliberation with each  
6 subcommittee; but I want to open that up to the  
7 general Panel, in terms of general Panel discussion  
8 or deliberation. If anybody wants to bring anything  
9 to the Panel at this time. Going once. Okay.

10 Okay. Then we are ready to move on to --  
11 was there somebody about to say something? I don't  
12 want to cut anybody off.

13 MR. HARDY: Hi, Mary. It's Tom Hardy.  
14 Can you hear me?

15 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

16 MR. HARDY: I feel like a commercial. Can  
17 you hear me? Can you hear me?

18 Just kind of a broad question, I'm not  
19 sure. As we move toward trying to get these  
20 documents done for next month, is there any way we  
21 can discuss or think or consider sharing information  
22 regarding what the drafts look like? Because as I

1 said, my work is going to rely heavily on taxonomy,  
2 and I would love to see where they're going. Or are  
3 we going to just sort of wait until they all come  
4 out at one time?

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We are going to be  
6 having an executive subcommittee meeting on the  
7 23rd, so it is my understanding -- maybe Mark could  
8 talk about this, that he was going to try to get his  
9 out as soon as possible. We will be processing  
10 through that, I think, through the Executive  
11 Subcommittee.

12 Mark, is there anything you wanted to add  
13 too on that?

14 DR. WILSON: No, I think that's accurate.  
15 And that was exactly my intent is we want to get a  
16 draft of the recommendations of our group; and  
17 obviously, this is going to be iterative as Dave's  
18 subcommittee and Deborah provide us with  
19 information. We may want to update various  
20 sections.

21 Other than that, a lot of the substance we  
22 should be able to get out a certain structure, and a

1 lot of the content, things of that sort will be in  
2 fairly good shape. And like I said, my goal is to  
3 get that out as soon as possible. I am working on a  
4 draft right now, and hopefully, over the next few  
5 days there will be a draft, which I will share with  
6 Shanan and our SSA staff member, and kind of get  
7 their input. Then, I think we will escalate it up  
8 to the Project Director and probably you, and get  
9 your input. And as rapidly as possible then get  
10 that draft out to the rest of the Panel.

11           You know, at what -- one of the questions  
12 that I have in my own mind is at what point is our  
13 report sort of released or finished? I suspect we  
14 can deal with that in an executive subcommittee  
15 meeting in terms of, you know, at what point do  
16 edits stop, and it goes from being a draft to the  
17 official report? But the basic goal is to get it  
18 out as quickly as we can.

19           DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I think procedurally  
20 if anybody wants to have me review anything, I would  
21 be happy to do that.

22           The timeline that we're looking at is to

1 have the reports to me by August 20th, so I can take  
2 a look at them, if I have questions of feedback and  
3 that type of thing. So by the time we get to  
4 August 31st, our next Panel teleconference, that  
5 the Panel has had the opportunity to review the  
6 draft reports by the subcommittee chair so we could  
7 go to a vote on the recommendations. So does that  
8 help, Tom, in terms of timelines?

9 MR. HARDY: Yes, it helps me very much.  
10 Thank you.

11 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Are there any  
12 other questions regarding that particular topic or  
13 anything in general within Panel deliberations that  
14 anybody would like to bring up?

15 Okay. Thank you for bringing that up.

16 I would like to move on to administrative  
17 business, and at this time everybody got a copy of  
18 the voting procedures. So I just want to review  
19 those before we start going through the votes, just  
20 because we are doing this a little bit differently,  
21 and Stella needs to be able to record our vote as we  
22 go through this process.

1 I just want to confirm, first, that  
2 everybody has a copy of the April and June Minutes.  
3 Is there anybody who does not?

4 Okay. So I will -- when I get to each of  
5 the Minutes I will ask for a motion for the vote and  
6 a second, and we need to go through this verbally.  
7 And so then we will move to -- if there are any  
8 discussions, any modifications to the Minutes, and  
9 then I will call for a vote. I will ask for people  
10 to -- I will go by name, yay's and nay's or  
11 abstentions in terms of your vote, so we can record  
12 that.

13 So at this time I would ask for a motion  
14 on the April Minutes.

15 MS. RUTTLEDGE: This is Lynnae. I so  
16 move.

17 MR. HARDY: This is Tom Hardy, I second.

18 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Let me clarify. Move  
19 to accept.

20 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Move to accept the April  
21 Minutes.

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. So

1 we have a motion by Lynnae to accept the April  
2 Minutes. And Tom.

3 MR. HARDY: Tom. I second the motion.

4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Is there any  
5 discussion on the motion?

6 Then I will go through each individual for  
7 yay's, nay's or abstentions. Gunnar -- oh, actually  
8 Gunnar at this point because he was not a sworn in  
9 member of the Panel would be voting on the June  
10 Minutes. So I apologize for that.

11 Bob.

12 DR. FRASER: Yes.

13 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan.

14 DR. GIBSON: Yay.

15 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Tom was a  
16 second, so I am assuming --

17 MR. HARDY: That's a yay.

18 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia.

19 MS. KARMAN: Yay.

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Deborah.

21 MS. LECHNER: Yay. Yay. I had myself  
22 muted.

1 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Lynnae.  
2 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Yay.  
3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: David.  
4 DR. WILSON: Yay.  
5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Nancy.  
6 MS. SHOR: Yes.  
7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And Mark.  
8 DR. WILSON: Yes.  
9 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So we have an  
10 unanimous acceptance of votes on the April Minutes.  
11 Moving on to the June Minutes. I would  
12 entertain a motion on those Minutes.  
13 MS. KARMAN: I so move.  
14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We have a motion by  
15 Sylvia to accept the Minutes. We have a second?  
16 DR. WILSON: I will second that, Mark  
17 Wilson.  
18 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Mark seconded it.  
19 Is there any discussion on those Minutes?  
20 Okay. Then I will go ahead and go through  
21 the call. Gunnar.  
22 DR. ANDERSSON: Yes.

1 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So yes on the  
2 motion. Bob.  
3 DR. FRASER: Yes.  
4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Shanan.  
5 DR. GIBSON: Yay.  
6 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom.  
7 MR. HARDY: Yay.  
8 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia.  
9 MS. KARMAN: Yes.  
10 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Deborah Lechner.  
11 MS. LECHNER: Yes.  
12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Lynnae.  
13 MS. RUTTLEDGE: Yes.  
14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: David.  
15 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes.  
16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Nancy.  
17 MS. SHOR: Yes.  
18 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And Mark.  
19 DR. WILSON: Yes.  
20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So the June  
21 Minutes are approved and submitted. I think that we  
22 are through the administrative business.

1 MS. KARMAN: Mary.

2 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yes.

3 MS. KARMAN: I'm sorry. This is Sylvia.

4 It's come to our attention that maybe you might need  
5 to enter in a vote on both the Minutes.

6 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So in terms of  
7 the April minutes, we have a motion. We have a  
8 second. We have approved in terms of the motion.  
9 So we have -- in terms of entering in a vote,  
10 Deborah?

11 MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia. What I was  
12 saying is we need you to vote.

13 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Oh.

14 MS. KARMAN: Sorry.

15 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: As Chair I could  
16 either decline or accept a vote. I don't have to  
17 vote. I will yes, go ahead and register my vote as  
18 yay on both of those.

19 You are saying for me?

20 MS. KARMAN: Yes. You are fine.

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So to move on  
22 to the rest of the administrative business, there

1 was no other administrative business besides the  
2 vote of the two Minutes.

3           Just a reminder that we have the reports  
4 due by the subcommittees on the 20th of August, and  
5 we will be having another teleconference on  
6 August 31st. We have planned, the committee, for  
7 potentially another teleconference after we meet  
8 face-to-face in September, and that date is  
9 September 25th. That is a hold the date in case  
10 coming out of the face-to-face meeting we feel like  
11 we need to have another teleconference for any final  
12 work we need to do on the committee -- on the Panel  
13 report that is due to the Commissioner at the end of  
14 September.

15           I think that's it for our first  
16 teleconference. And at this time I would entertain  
17 a vote -- or a motion -- I'm sorry, I missed that.  
18 I couldn't hear you.

19           DR. WILSON: This is Mark Wilson. It's  
20 very simple. If someone could send me -- Deborah  
21 read out the list of her proposed dimensions. I  
22 didn't get them all. If someone could just send me

1 a list of what they are, that would be great.

2 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

3 DR. WILSON: In fact, Deborah, could you  
4 circulate -- I would like a copy as well, could you  
5 just circulate it maybe.

6 DR. ANDERSSON: It was actually circulated  
7 at the last meeting.

8 MS. LECHNER: Yes, yes.

9 DR. WILSON: Okay. It's unchanged from  
10 what you did at the last meeting?

11 MS. LECHNER: Yes.

12 DR. SCHRETLEN: Fine. Fine.

13 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other  
14 business before I call for a motion to adjourn?

15 Okay. So at this time I would entertain a  
16 motion to adjourn the meeting.

17 MS. RUTTLEDGE: This is Lynnae. I so move  
18 to adjourn the meeting.

19 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Second?

20 DR. GIBSON: Shanan will second.

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I will go  
22 backwards on this. Are there any nay's or

1 abstentions?

2           Then I will assume a yay, and ending this  
3 meeting of our first teleconference. Thank you all  
4 for joining us.

5           (Whereupon, at 1:11 p.m., the proceedings  
6 were adjourned.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Stella R. Christian, A Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report in stenotype notes the foregoing proceedings, and that thereafter my stenotype notes were reduced to typewriting under my supervision.

I further certify that the transcript of proceedings contains a true and correct transcript of my stenotype notes taken therein to the best of my ability and knowledge.

SIGNED this 20th day of July, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
STELLA R. CHRISTIAN