

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT

ADVISORY PANEL QUARTERLY MEETING

JUNE 10, 2010

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

REPORTED BY: STEPHEN P. ANDERSON
Free State Reporting, Inc.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY BARROS BAILEY, Chair, Ph.D.

ROBERT T. FRASER, Ph.D.

SHANAN GWALTNEY GIBSON, Ph.D.

THOMAS A. HARDY, J.D.

H. ALLAN HUNT, Ph. D.

SYLVIA E. KARMAN

DEBORAH E. LECHNER

DAVID J. SCHRETLEN, Ph. D.

MARK A. WILSON, Ph. D.

GUNNAR ANDERSON

ABIGAIL PANTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Call to Order	3
Overview of Today's Agenda	4
Deliberation and Closeout of Feedback on NAS Report	16
Break	
Public Comment	--
Administrative Meeting	55
Adjourn	62

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:38 a.m.)

1
2
3 MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Panel, good morning. This
4 is Day 2 of the Panel's Quarterly Meeting. I would now
5 like to turn the meeting over to the Panel Chair, Dr.
6 Mary Barros-Bailey. Mary.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Debra. Good
8 morning, everybody. Hope you had a good night last
9 night.

10 And I would like to thank you for your
11 attendance live or telephonically to the second day of
12 our Third Quarterly Meeting for the OIDAP.

13 Before we go through the Appendix for today,
14 I'd like to announce to those who are listening in
15 remotely to follow along you can visit our website,
16 socialsecurity.gov/oidadp for a copy of our agenda. Also
17 at the website you can go to the meeting information and
18 obtain copies of past agendas and the PowerPoints that go
19 along with those agendas. You can also go the Panel's
20 documents web page for technical and working papers for
21 formal correspondence and our first report that was
22 delivered to Commissioner Astrue in September 2009.

23 And as we indicate at the beginning of each
24 meeting, the charter of the Occupational Information
25 Developmental Advisory Panel, or OIDAP, is to provide the

1 Social Security Administration with independent advice
2 and recommendations for the development of an
3 occupational information system to replace the Dictionary
4 of Occupational Titles and Disability Adjudication.

5 And I know I've said it for the last few
6 meetings that to clarify that the task of the Panel is
7 not to develop the OIS itself. But as our name implies,
8 it's to provide advisory recommendations.

9 And lastly before we get into the agenda today,
10 just reminding all those present live or telephonically
11 that we are in the middle of receiving public feedback
12 through regulations.gov through the June 30th, 2010
13 period. We will accept public feedback at any point, but
14 that will consolidate a lot of the feedback to help with
15 our process.

16 So let's go ahead and look at today's agenda.
17 We will start this morning by looking at the draft report
18 in terms of the feedback for the National Academies of
19 Science report on the O*NET. We will go into a break.

20 Debra Tidwell-Peters, do we have anybody signed
21 up for public comment? Okay. Then we have nobody signed
22 up for public comment today.

23 So we will go into the Administrative Meeting
24 and then we will adjourn for today.

25 Before we get into the agenda, it came to my

1 attention that we have in our folders a copy of the
2 minutes for the Research Subcommittee. One of the
3 aspects of those minutes was some activity that has
4 happened between SSA and DOL. I think that's important
5 to maybe talk about before we get into the deliberation
6 and closeout on the feedback on that NAS report.

7 So I'm going to ask our Chair for Research to
8 maybe talk about that a little bit, Mark.

9 MEMBER WILSON: Yeah, we have had some
10 involvement and rather than try and summarize that, I'd
11 rather ask either Sylvia or Allen, who were directly
12 involved, to maybe give us a briefing on that.

13 MEMBER KARMAN: Good morning, everyone. We,
14 Allan Hunt and I and Shirleen Roth, met with people from
15 the Bureau of Labor Statistics in May. And initially our
16 intent there was to begin discussions with -- certainly
17 with BLS for starters on how we can actually access or
18 get to the entities. When we begin conducting job
19 analyses, how are we going to sample for jobs across the
20 nation and how are we going to get to the entities?

21 And so there were a number of things that we
22 had been considering in terms of either getting to the
23 entities -- in other words, conducting -- finding the
24 jobs through the entities or finding the jobs through
25 individuals who may have reported types of work that they

1 do through the Census Bureau American Survey. So in any
2 case we did meet with them. It was a very good
3 discussion.

4 Perhaps Allan can give us some background on
5 what we learned about the type of data that they do
6 collect from employers and what our next steps are going
7 to be.

8 MEMBER HUNT: Yeah, these are the people who do
9 the occupational employment statistics, gather the
10 numbers that we see. There were two main reasons to go
11 to see them. One obviously to get some benefit from
12 their experience. They've been doing this for a while.
13 And second to explore the possibility that they might
14 have some kind of data that we could use as a test bed to
15 supplement the BOACH (phonetic), that study anyway, from
16 a broader perspective, not just claimants. Dixie Summers
17 runs that program and her boss, Jack, Jack -- I forget.

18 MEMBER KARMAN: Jack Gelman.

19 MEMBER HUNT: Jack, okay.

20 MEMBER KARMAN: And George Stamos is the person
21 that works for Dixie.

22 MEMEBER HUNT: Coincidentally Jack is the Chair
23 of the SOC Revision Committee for the federal government.
24 So he was also a good contact to make. The bad news is
25 that the way they collect these data from employers

1 specifically is to send out essentially a list of SOC
2 titles that they believe are relevant to the industry of
3 the organizational unit. So they sort of pre-judge what
4 they think the people have. And then they just basically
5 kick the numbers according to SOC categories. That means
6 there is no sub-level detail available.

7 However, there are another group of employers,
8 particularly larger employers, who have said that's too
9 much trouble for us. We will send you our payroll
10 listing which includes the job title. Therefore, these
11 are not already SOC classified. So there is some sub
12 detail available potentially. We didn't ask specifically
13 if they could make those available, but we expressed some
14 interest in that possibility.

15 I second the judgment that it was a very good
16 meeting. They seemed very receptive. You know, these
17 things always have complications that aren't apparent on
18 the surface or on the first exposure. But it seemed to
19 me it was very, very productive. They also, which we
20 already knew, but urged us to talk to people at the
21 Census Bureau, who gather data from individuals and
22 process it differently of course. And it's much more
23 promising if you think about the possibilities here.

24 Census is going to be asking us and other
25 people, well, what is it that you do. So they are going

1 to get those direct job titles as reported by
2 individuals, the really messy stuff. But that might be
3 exactly what we want and that would provide again a way
4 to explore the feasibility of collecting these kinds of
5 data from individuals.

6 So we had actually hoped to have made the
7 connection to Census before this meeting, but neither
8 Sylvia nor I were available. And so it turned out we
9 haven't done that yet.

10 But that's the next step is to figure out --
11 talk to the analogous people at the Census Bureau about
12 their collection and processing of data. Presumably
13 they've got a bunch of people in a basement somewhere
14 taking these raw data and classifying them into SOC
15 categories. And we want to talk to those people and gain
16 from their experience. So that's the report.

17 MEMBER KARMAN: One of the things that did come
18 up in the discussion with BLS was that -- and I think
19 this is a really good point that they made was even if we
20 go to Census and talk to them about the data that they're
21 collecting, perhaps the American Community Survey, that
22 if we could get the data before they roll it up into SOC
23 code, that would be really helpful to us especially if
24 there's any description. Even if it's a one-line
25 description, that kind of gives you the sense of what

1 perhaps the industry, you know, the associate was
2 working in or whatever. That might be helpful. But they
3 did point out that eventually you're going to have to
4 knock on the door of an employer. So then we had some
5 discussions about how can we leverage or triangulate or
6 what other verb I can come up with to take perhaps Census
7 data and the Bureau of Labor Statistics information and
8 see if we can get to the -- I don't know. But anyway
9 that -- so there's more to be explored there on that,
10 that discussion.

11 So anyway, thank you.

12 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I understand that
13 there was also some interest on SSA data in terms of
14 potential sharing of data sets?

15 MEMBER KARMAN: Yeah, there was. And actually
16 we opened the meeting by saying we'd like to talk with
17 you all a little bit about the data that you all oversee.
18 And what is available that you can share with us? And so
19 that's what we were talking about with BLS. And of
20 course there was some questions around, well, what kind
21 of data did we have available that may in fact be of
22 interest to them.

23 So we've gone back to take a look at an
24 inventory of the kind of data sets that Social Security
25 has both in terms of primary data that we collect as well

1 as for our -- for a variety of program purposes, not
2 just disability program, as well as any secondary data.

3 And then what exactly, you know, what are the
4 protocol and agreements around those data sets?

5 Certainly I think that that kind of information is
6 certainly also going to be helpful to us. So we're
7 already aware of the need for that.

8 And there was a RAND study about 10 years ago
9 that compiled a lot of -- it did at least a pretty good
10 inventory what Social Security data sets are already
11 available. So we've got that and we're using that to
12 determine if there are other things that haven't been
13 mentioned that have occurred over the last 10 years that
14 aren't reflected in that.

15 And one of the things that we had an assignment
16 for with the Research Subcommittee was to get that
17 information to the Research Subcommittee, which of course
18 we made available the rest of the Panel.

19 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Mark.

20 MEMBER WILSON: I just wanted to say that this
21 whole sampling issue is very important. The Research
22 Subcommittee is focusing on a number of efforts. And
23 we're very appreciative of the work Sylvia and Allan did.
24 And we're planning potential roundtables, professional
25 development and things of that sort as we get into this.

1 To me one of the exciting things is the issue
2 that you were talking about last, the possibility of both
3 increasing the accuracy of data through sharing and
4 cooperation and perhaps reducing costs of some of these
5 other data efforts, having potentially one source to get
6 at some of these issues. Social Security may very well
7 have a much larger sampling of what we might call raw job
8 title data of the population than these other agencies
9 are ever able to get access to. And were that the case,
10 we may be able to get much more accurate results.

11 And I get excited about the idea we may be able
12 to cooperate and improve the quality of everyone's data
13 here. And so it's tangentially related to our efforts,
14 but I think it's an area of potential greater efficiency
15 and accuracy. CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Are
16 there any questions or Mark, Allan, or Sylvia? Okay,
17 thank you for doing that.

18 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: I guess I do have one
19 question. You talked about you met with Bureau of Labor
20 folks. But are there plans yet in place to meet with the
21 Census Bureau?

22 MEMBER KARMAN: We haven't had any discussion
23 with Census staff as of coming here. So we met with
24 Bureau of Labor on May 11th. So the next step is for us
25 to locate the appropriate staff at Census Bureau and meet

1 with them hopefully sometime during the summer when we
2 get our schedules together. So that's next.

3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom.

4 MEMBER HARDY: A quick question. I think you
5 started out by saying there was -- have we had any more
6 conversation with Department of Labor at any level at
7 this point since the last meeting?

8 MEMBER KARMAN: The Bureau of Labor Statistics
9 is in the Department of Labor. And we've also had
10 meetings with the ETA. Is that what you're talking
11 about, Tom? Do you mean Employment Training
12 Administration people who are responsible for developing
13 the O*NET?

14 MEMBER HARDY: That's exactly right.

15 MEMBER KARMAN: Yeah, a good question because
16 we have actually had a number of teleconferences, -- 2, a
17 number and it was two. So and that was -- one was at the
18 end of April. Pam Frooley and Janet Sten and I were
19 trying valiantly to get together at the end of April.
20 And then through a series of other issues that were
21 coming up for both ETA and for Social Security, we were
22 unable to get physically together. So we did have a time
23 to talk by phone. And that was very helpful sort of just
24 to get caught up with what they're working on and what
25 we're -- mostly in terms on what we're working on since

1 we're really in a developmental stage. And
2 then we did speak with ETA again on Monday to catch up
3 with here's where we are with our process and talk
4 further about the type of that work we're engaged with
5 right now and what -- give them some background about not
6 only what we're working on but also the fact that we've
7 been talking with BLS.

8 Because I think that anything that we can do in
9 terms of exploring other ways of getting to entities and
10 sampling information as they are also engaged in
11 obviously needing to get to entities, albeit they are
12 using a different data collection processing we have
13 discussed using. Nonetheless, they can certainly benefit
14 from that as well. So it's sort of, I think, some value
15 in all three groups kind of sharing that conversation.

16 So does that answer your question, Tom?

17 MEMBER HARDY: It does. Thank you. I talked
18 to Mary about this. I have a concern that we need to
19 keep communication open with Department of Labor, not
20 Bureau of Labor Statistics. But that department
21 particularly I think there's a lot of potential interface
22 that we have coming up in the future and I just want to
23 make sure that we have that open.

24 MEMBER KARMAN: Yeah, and this has been
25 ongoing. We have ongoing discussion with the folks in

1 ETA, so I think that's been really -- that's been
2 helpful all along.

3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Allan and then Deb.

4 MEMBER HUNT: Just want to add that the OES
5 program, the people that we talked to at BLS provide the
6 sampling frame from which the O*NET people work
7 apparently. We didn't have time to get into that in
8 great depth. But O*NET comes to these folks to figure
9 out which employers should we try to sample. So that
10 makes them doubly valuable in my mind.

11 MEMBER LECHNER: And this is just a point or
12 question of information because I don't know what DOL is
13 doing currently. But are they currently sending out
14 folks to analyze jobs to collect further data for O*NET.
15 Or what's sort of the status on that, Sylvia? And who is
16 doing that? Is it being done internally by Department of
17 Labor, or have they outsourced it to a contractor to do
18 that?

19 MEMBER KARMAN: I have no information from ETA
20 that indicates that they're conducting job analyses on
21 site if that's your question.

22 Is that your question?

23 MEMBER LECHNER: Yes, I mean, you know, I know
24 they don't conduct job analysis like what we're talking
25 about. But their interview process and -- are they

1 continuing to collect data for O*NET?

2 MEMBER KARMAN: My understanding is they are.
3 Perhaps Mark actually may know more about that.

4 MEMBER WILSON: Yeah, and this is just by
5 happenstance. The O*NET center is in Raleigh, where I'm
6 based, and some of our former graduate students work for
7 there. And there are activities going on. And I don't
8 want to conjecture too much, but I know there are efforts
9 underway in terms of not so much adding new jobs but
10 maybe adding detailed work activities, things like that,
11 to existing descriptions. So as far as I can tell,
12 Deborah, there is work going on and efforts underway.

13 But my limited knowledge is that it's not
14 adding new jobs, it's not worrying about the framing and
15 things of that sort. I don't know anything about refresh
16 rates in terms of how and at what point if we decide a
17 description is no longer accurate and needs to be updated
18 and that sort of thing.

19 So I think there are some efforts underway, but
20 they seem to be more on the periphery or adding new
21 information at a different level of specificity to
22 existing descriptions, using very different methods in
23 terms of web searches and things of that sort to find
24 information about work as opposed to going to primary
25 sources.

1 MEMBER LECHNER: Thanks.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, any other questions
3 around this topic? Okay. Thank you.

4 At this point I'd to go into the Deliberation
5 and the Closeout of the Feedback on the NAS Report. As
6 everybody may recall, in January Commissioner Astrue
7 further requested our assistance to provide SSA with
8 recommendations in four areas. And the first three have
9 to do with different parts of the Research and
10 Development agenda, such as the data collection and
11 sampling plans, the field job analysts. We talked about
12 that quite a bit yesterday.

13 The fourth area was to review relevant
14 documents or reports that the SSA identified that might
15 affect or inform SSA's work on the development of the
16 OIS. And in January also the SSA asked -- I think it was
17 January 22nd -- SSA asked that the OIG review such a
18 report, the prepublication copy and corrected proofs of
19 the National Academy of Science's report on the O*NET.
20 This is the first time that an independent group had
21 reviewed an occupational information system in 30 years
22 since the Dictionary of Occupational Titles was -- a
23 review was conducted by the National Research Council in
24 1980 in what we often refer to as the Miller Study.

25 We'd like to commend the U.S. Department of

1 Labor for commissioning the National Academy of Science
2 Panel to independently review the O*NET upon the O*NET's
3 tenth anniversary. It's a really important process.

4 During our last meeting, as you recall,
5 Margaret Hilton and Tom Plewes, who were the Study
6 Director and Assistant Director for the O*NET Panel with
7 the NAS, presented to our Panel. The final copy came out
8 on May 11th and was disseminated to each of you by link
9 and Margaret Hilton also sent us the paper copies of the
10 books generously. And if you didn't bring your copy I do
11 have extra copies if we need to refer to it this morning
12 and you wish to take a look at that.

13 The goal for this morning is to discuss some of
14 the lessons learned from that report. And so you all got
15 a kind of a pre-deliberation copy that was sent out.
16 This was reviewed yesterday with Executive Subcommittee.
17 Thank you for all the feedback. Based on that review,
18 the Executive Summary was updated. You should all have a
19 copy of that.

20 Did everybody have a copy of that? Okay.

21 And what I'd like to do is go through these
22 kind of findings or lessons learned and then open it up
23 for discussion as we go through. So, okay.

24 So how did we go about this process? After we
25 had requests from Social Security, you'll all recall that

1 you were sent out an e-mail by me, kind of a lengthy e-
2 mail. Sometimes I can't be short. And it included the
3 link. And we were asked to all come prepared to the last
4 meeting and read the report.

5 And we had a very productive couple of hour
6 discussion with the NAS staff that I thought was very
7 beneficial in terms of clarifying some areas that we had
8 different concepts about.

9 And then we initially thought that their final
10 report was coming out on April 22nd. And I know they
11 have some delays in their publication. We had thought
12 that we might go to a teleconference to be able to
13 process what we are doing today. But because of some of
14 the publication delays, we pushed that out further.

15 And I developed the report based on a variety
16 of input from different sources. Also discussion with
17 some -- with Mark and Nancy when she was with User Needs
18 in terms of some of the thematic areas and brought it to
19 the Executive Subcommittee yesterday and then today. So
20 this is really a rough format as we're going through.

21 So let's look at the first finding. One of
22 the, I think, big findings that came out of the March
23 report was an understanding that many of us around the
24 table did not have which was that there were two
25 different panel processes going on by the timing of the

1 release of the OIDAP and the O*NET's reports were
2 materially different. And put into context, it clarified
3 some of the confusion.

4 Maybe before I go on, we're talking different
5 Panels in different entities. So I want to make sure as
6 we're discussing this that we're trying to be as clear as
7 possible. So we're talking two different Panels, the NAS
8 Panel, what I will call the O*NET Panel, and their
9 report. And then the OIDAP.

10 We also have the difference between yesterday
11 as we were going through. Sometimes when we use the word
12 we, we're referring to the Panel. Sometimes
13 particularly, Sylvia, if she's saying we, she's referring
14 to SSA, sometimes to the Panel. So we might want to be
15 aware of that as we go through.

16 Sometimes when we refer today, we're referring
17 to the staff or we're referring to the NAS Panel, we're
18 referring to DOL. Just as we're going through these
19 discussions, there are a lot of players. And for us to
20 try to be as clear as possible going through. And I'll
21 try to do the same.

22 So I think that was a big understanding for us
23 was that the NAS O*NET report came out five months before
24 our report came out. And so it put their recommendations
25 into context. I think Tom Plewes at one point said, you

1 know, Recommendation No. 1, where we recommend that an
2 interagency task force be developed. And one of the
3 first orders of business is to look at SSA's Occupational
4 Information needs. Well, that's what you guys are doing.
5 You know, that's being delivered upon.

6 And so put into context, it made a lot more
7 sense that it was a recommendation was coming out five
8 months before our recommendations even came out. They
9 were already disbanded by the time that we came out with
10 our recommendations. It wasn't something that they
11 looked at our recommendations and said, well, we still
12 think this interagency panel needs to be developed. So
13 that was one big finding.

14 And also that there were a lot of working
15 papers, a lot of materials we looked at that they didn't
16 have access to along with our report.

17 Finding No. 2 was that at their level of review
18 that they came up with the same conclusion that a lot of
19 people have come out with for the last 12 years was that
20 in terms of the way the O*NET is designed as a general
21 purpose database that it does not gel with the needs in
22 terms of the SSA needs for disability adjudication.

23 So that was consistent with findings from all
24 sorts of groups. The GAO that even back in 2002 had
25 anticipated that a new Occupational Information System

1 might be needed to the Institute of Medicine to a
2 variety of other folks had come out with the same
3 conclusions. So that was consistent with that.

4 And Finding No. 3, the NAS Panel did not have
5 somebody with a disability background. That wasn't their
6 purpose. They looked at the needs or the users,
7 potential users for it. Said this disability question is
8 something that wasn't met between the creation of the
9 O*NET and the decision to abandon DOT. And this needs to
10 be looked at further. So they looked at it very cursory.

11 They looked at it and said this needs to have a
12 more in-depth discussion. But they didn't have anybody
13 with the disability expertise or adjudication expertise
14 to then go beyond that question of let's look at this, or
15 this needs to be looked at from a disability perspective
16 or disability adjudication prospective to a lot more
17 detail of is it possible that this design might work.

18 Okay, Finding No. 4 -- and I've mentioned
19 before and this is -- we kept on hearing this in terms of
20 the O*NET being a general purpose database. It was
21 something that was discussed extensively within the NAS
22 report. That was extensively discussed by Margaret and
23 Tom. It is a starting point for a lot of different users
24 that are for the most part using it for workforce
25 development.

1 I know there was a discussion with -- that Tom
2 and I had, Tom Plewes and I had, and it started with when
3 I met with him in January that as a Vocational Rehab
4 Counselor I can use the O*NET for a starting point in
5 terms of vocational exploration kind of similarly to how
6 it is being used.

7 Are we having some technical problems? Okay,
8 I'm going to hold a little bit so people on the phone can
9 listen in. Are we back on? Okay. I'll just hold for a
10 couple of minutes. (Pause)

11 For those listening in telephonically, I
12 understand the call got dropped. So I will start with
13 Finding No. 4 again. Hopefully that will cover what we
14 might have lost.

15 In terms of Finding No. 4, the discussion that
16 we had extensively in March and also that is described in
17 quite a bit of detail in the NAS or the O*NET Report was
18 that the O*NET is a general purpose data base. Was
19 created for that way to be addressing the needs of a lot
20 of different users that are the primary users for
21 workforce development, economic development, crew
22 development, academic and policy research, and human
23 resource management.

24 And when you are creating a database for a lot
25 of different users, you have to a lot of times be a lot

1 broader. Because if you are trying to tailor it for a
2 lot of the secondary users, you can -- it can be very
3 expensive and you might not be meeting the needs of the
4 primary users. And so with the mission and the goals in
5 mind of why the O*NET was developed, those became very
6 important in terms of how it was designed.

7 And I was mentioning how I do both. I do Rehab
8 Counseling which is more in line with what the Career
9 Development aspect of the uses. And I do forensic. And
10 so for Career Development, you want to do exploration.
11 You want to start very broad. You want to look at the
12 world of possibilities. You can look at the issues
13 dealing with retraining where you're developing an
14 intervention or a plan to get somebody to do something.
15 It's more of a creative developmental process and a very
16 broad base. So the O*NET can be one of tools used in
17 that and that I do use for that.

18 But when we're looking at forensic, that you're
19 looking at the data for a residual analysis, it has to be
20 a lot more definite, a lot more what we call ergonomic
21 as opposed to very broad econometric. Then the design of
22 that system is very different. And one isn't necessarily
23 a subset of the other. So it's important to understand
24 from the get go that the designs are very different for
25 each of the purposes.

1 And when you just look at the goals and the
2 users, and they're likewise very different. So that was
3 another finding within this process.

4 No. 5, the Evaluation Criteria for Work
5 Activities that comprise the O*NET occupations. These
6 differ fundamentally from those required for an
7 occupational information system. They'll be helpful to
8 the -- to adjudicate disability claims. So that was
9 another finding that evolved throughout that process.

10 No. 6, the NAS and OID reports reached common
11 conclusions that significant changes would need to be
12 made to the O*NET in order to be suitable for disability
13 adjudication. And the one discussion that we had quite a
14 bit about during the March report was the whole issue
15 about the Behavioral Inward Rating Scales and how those
16 are very differently needed or conceived for disability
17 determination.

18 I think the one descriptor that we typically
19 use is that of static strength and what happens with
20 those bars. In that one we used that as an example of
21 how that doesn't fit to what we need in disability. And
22 when we looked at that in terms of the scope of the
23 changes that would need to be made and the implication
24 for that is that you would have to revalidate the whole
25 O*NET system and potentially as a secondary user

1 compromise that system for the primary users that were
2 identified and all the purpose for which it was created.

3 And so that was a discussion we had and came
4 back to in March. And it's also a discussion also within
5 the NAS report.

6 Finding No. 7 was a discussion also that
7 happened quite a bit in March about skills and the way
8 that those are conceived. And sometimes I wish we had a
9 different word for skills because it's one of those words
10 that means different things to different people. And
11 then you take that concept and you try to apply it in a
12 transferability model. And then you apply it to
13 different designs. You come up with different
14 conclusions.

15 And for example, we talked about the torque and
16 how that might be useful for an econometric perspective
17 in terms of the design perspective or maybe career
18 development where you're looking at very broad
19 associations and transference of skill. But that does
20 not work at all for disability determination because
21 we're looking at residual analyses. And we can't go from
22 a team assembler, an RV team assembler, and come up with
23 a conclusion that that person has transferability to
24 dental hygiene for disability determination.

25 And so looking at the definition of skills and

1 also how skills are represented and trying to apply that
2 to the system, the Social Security System, and the way
3 that skills are defined, it would change the definition
4 of skill. And not only that, we could not find a way
5 that skills are represented there that would fit into the
6 regulatory definition of skills that exists within SSA.

7 No. 8 is something that we're all aware of is
8 that the OIS has to fit a forensic purpose. It's one of
9 the three main -- it has to be legally defensible, one of
10 the three main requirements for the OIS. And although
11 that was something that was mentioned as a need for legal
12 defensibility, it wasn't something that was really
13 considered or processed by the NAS Panel.

14 And No. 9, there were a variety of things as we
15 went through the different chapters and the
16 recommendations that were very consistent with some of
17 the conclusions we came to ourselves. And they were
18 things such as focusing on collecting, maintaining, and
19 publishing high quality data, including the input of the
20 scientific and user communities into research and
21 usability processes that very much reflects the way that
22 we are even structured as a Panel with the two main very
23 active subcommittees, being the Research Subcommittee and
24 the User Needs and Relations Subcommittee. So it was
25 kind of nice to see that the two main advisory groups

1 that the NAS Panel recommended for DOL and for the O*NET
2 included those two concepts as the main concepts as well.

3 Development plans or procedures for refreshing
4 the occupational database was something that came out of
5 the recommendations from work taxonomy back in September.
6 So that was very consistent. They had a whole chapter on
7 technology and using technology for communication or to
8 deliver the platform to users that could be helpful in
9 the process. And it also went along with some of the
10 recommendations that User Needs and Relations made their
11 subcommittee to the Panel that was included in our
12 September report. And also explained the use of Internet
13 based methods for developing online user community is
14 something that we have talked about and were part of our
15 recommendations. So some very consistent themes with
16 what we've talked about and discussed in general.

17 And then as going through the report, there
18 were for me the contextual was very helpful in terms of
19 really remembering because I was part of the process as a
20 potential user. I remember when the O*NET was being
21 developed and waiting in anticipation for it to come out.
22 And so I remember the AtDot being created. And I
23 remember their first report and all of that. And just
24 putting it in the context that the Atdot got traded in
25 1990 and their report in terms of the recommendations to

1 DOL came out three years later in 1993. And then there
2 was further development and the prototype came out in
3 1998, as I remember. And I think data collection start
4 in 2000.

5 And so contextually I know that for me it was
6 kind of a nice anchor to remember how long the process
7 takes to do something like that. And looking at the
8 enormity of their task in terms of the development of a
9 huge content model that they really have and comparing
10 that content model to the content model that is being --
11 that we recommended in terms of the content model and
12 classification recommendations back in September. That
13 if we look even at the DOT content model, I mean we are
14 really looking at as a subset of that. So much more
15 detailed content model for what we need in terms of the
16 ergonomic design, but not to the huge level that the
17 O*NET was created.

18 And so there was things that came out of the
19 process that were helpful to me in terms of looking at
20 the marquee and saying we are here. But we are here in
21 the context of how do these things get developed overall
22 and whether some of the areas that might be helpful to
23 take a look at. So reflecting back to our
24 recommendations, some of the lessons that I think were
25 learned by looking at the process that DOL went through

1 was to look at some areas of consideration.

2 And General Recommendation No. 4 from the
3 September report was the development of internal and
4 external expertise for the creation of the OIS. And kind
5 of an understanding that really the progress on the R&D
6 agenda needs to be cautious until that unit is put
7 together. I think we all want the OIS to be done now as
8 soon as possible. But let's do it right and so to be
9 able to make sure that expertise is in place. And it was
10 also something that Margaret Hilton had thought was
11 important for the O*NET as well.

12 No. 2 is the continued SSA and DOL cooperation.
13 That's mutually beneficial. We've talked about some
14 discussions that have been ongoing, dealing with sampling
15 and/or potentially data collection into the future. And
16 one of the things that may be helpful to SSA within this
17 process is in the past DOL has been in the position of
18 creating its own occupational data for adjudication
19 within its own agency in terms of some of the labor
20 related adjudicative needs. And so how do -- how have
21 they historically been able to separate out those two
22 tasks in terms of creating data for their own internal
23 needs. There might be lessons learned there.

24 And then yesterday we had a great session that
25 Abigail in terms of professional development and how that

1 relates to ethics for research and assessment. And so
2 it was one of the additions from the Executive
3 Subcommittee to also look at the potential ethics issues
4 applied by repurposing O*NET and applying the aging DOT
5 to the disability adjudication process.

6 So at this point I would like to maybe open it
7 up for discussion. That was a lot of materials, a lot of
8 different topics.

9 Abigail, go ahead.

10 MEMBER PANTER: Thank you for this review. In
11 looking at the eight findings, I am struck by the fact
12 that there might be a more optimal ordering of the
13 findings. And they may be chunked in a way that
14 potentially could bring content areas together. So I
15 just wonder if there's another kind of way of ordering in
16 terms of priority.

17 For example, I think No. 2 is a particularly
18 important one and might be important to just put out
19 first as a key one. There are other kind of issues that
20 are about the system versus the message versus other
21 issues. For me time line was least important. And I
22 don't think it should be premiered in this way. It may
23 be important to you, but just looking at it it seemed
24 that it was -- maybe it should be lower on the list.

25 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I'm open to any

1 recommendations on anything, so... So system methods
2 and then other areas, is that how you would categorize
3 it?

4 MEMBER PANTER: I think that might work. You
5 have an opportunity to present the most important first.
6 And that's where the most attention will be on the first
7 findings that are put out there.

8 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Dave?

9 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: You know I agree that it's
10 not among the most important findings. But it is a bit
11 sort of foundational. You know what I mean? It sets
12 the stage. It says that -- although I would also
13 consider rewording that one a bit.

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

15 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And I don't know whether
16 it's -- talk about that or sort of stay with this. Maybe
17 we should stay with this.

18 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Let's go ahead and talk
19 about it from the conceptional organization aspect of it.

20 MEMBER PANTER: I can see -- you know, we don't
21 need to wordsmith at this point, but I think about what
22 is the most important finding of this set of eight. And
23 to me it's No. 2. Other people may disagree. But I
24 think that the time line is a contextual one and
25 important, but it's not the most important reason why

1 there's a problem with the report that was just issued
2 in my view and the review that was conducted with NAS on
3 the O*NET.

4 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia.

5 MEMBER KARMAN: Would it be -- given, Abigail,
6 your point, which I completely understand and think it's
7 an excellent point, and what David has suggested in order
8 of priorities, the first one may be foundational with
9 regard to context for the report and its recommendations
10 -- the NAS Report and its recommendations. Would it be -
11 - make sense to you, Abigail, given what you're
12 perceiving, to just flip them? Because then you have
13 that -- the issue of O*NET meeting the needs for other
14 areas but not for disability evaluations right up front.
15 And then followed by a contextual point.

16 MEMBER PANTER: For me a list of eight is hard
17 for me to process unless it's chunked in some way. So
18 and we have knowledge about these eight and how they go
19 together. So I was thinking either there should be some
20 subheader that says History, Finding 1, and then major
21 issues, next set of findings. But I think that there's
22 an opportunity in ordering findings in a way that you
23 want the reader to accept those findings and perceive
24 those findings.

25 MEMBER KARMAN: Yeah, I like the idea of the

1 headings. I think that -- like categorizing them.

2 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yeah, I think that would
3 be very helpful.

4 I think we had Mark and then Allan and then
5 Deb.

6 MEMBER WILSON: Yeah, I like the
7 categorization, too. I'm not so sure about flipping 1
8 and 2. If we start to categorize, then it looks like 2
9 and 3 go together and then maybe 1. But whatever the
10 categorization scheme might dictate that.

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. And just a
12 reminder. I was handed a note that there are people on
13 the phones. So as we are talking about 1, 2, and 3, we
14 might just want to mention thematically what they are so
15 people could follow along.

16 MEMBER HUNT: I was just going to ask the
17 question, 10 years from now when the next Panel or
18 subsequent group comes back to look at this, how
19 important is it going to be that, you know, that we were
20 quicker to get our report out and therefore it's a
21 trivial detail to the historical record. It's critically
22 important to our feelings about how they didn't
23 incorporate the work that we had done. But I mean it's
24 kind of whining frankly in a historical, academic
25 context. I think that's why I agree with Abigail. I'm

1 not sure what exactly the right grouping should be. I
2 think that's interesting.

3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think that as
4 you're talking one of the things that's occurring to me
5 is that if it's contextual maybe it's not a finding.
6 Maybe it's the opening context to the findings. And so I
7 think it anchors us to this is what happened. This is
8 where we are right now. But these are the findings.

9 I'm getting a lot nod, okay. Then that's what
10 we'll do.

11 MEMBER LECHNER: You've read my mind, Mary.
12 That's just what I was going to say that you could put
13 that into an introductory paragraph to sort of set the
14 stage of here's how this evolved sequentially.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think that works.

16 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: In fact it looks to me that
17 No. 1, the point No. 1, that there were differences in
18 the timing and Panel time lines and processes. Gives a
19 sort of process commentary. And a lot of these others
20 are about the content of the O*NET and its usefulness for
21 disability adjudication. So that I think it provides a
22 good rationale for either taking it out or putting it
23 elsewhere.

24 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, I think I can
25 provide a -- I'm all about context. But I understand

1 that the context has to also be on a historic time line.
2 So I agree with Allan. So I think I'll modify it that
3 way. I think that will work.

4 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Can I make one other comment
5 about that?

6 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Absolutely.

7 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: In the text as it's written,
8 it said that the release that the NAS prepublication
9 three months after OIDAP's report is causing considerable
10 confusion about the implications of both panels. And
11 that sort of presumes that we know what people are
12 thinking and that they're confused.

13 And so I would just suggest that we might want
14 to reframe that and just say that the release of this
15 prepublication could lead to the mistaken impression that
16 the NAS Panel took OIDAP's findings and recommendations
17 into account when it actually did not. It'd just make
18 the point that they didn't have the information when they
19 -- prior to reaching their conclusions.

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think that builds upon
21 it. And you'll send me that wording?

22 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes.

23 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, wonderful. So as
24 we go through this, any wording, anything like that, if
25 the person proposing the final wording would send it to

1 me, I think it will help the process quite a bit.

2 Do we have a -- okay, Tom and then Shanan.

3 MEMBER HARDY: As you know we had a long
4 discussion yesterday, you and I. I had some very strong
5 objections to the way the draft report worked. And I
6 wanted to thank you, because I see a lot of changes in
7 here that greatly increase my comfort level with this
8 report. So I want to thank you for being responsive to
9 the suggestions that I made, number one.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: You're welcome.

11 MEMBER HARDY: Thank you.

12 Number 2, I would like to suggest that we look
13 at No. 9 which is O*NET report included a variety of
14 important conclusions regarding the database that were
15 similarly reached by -- what are we calling ourselves?
16 OIDAP (Odap) at this point?

17 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Some people say OIADP
18 (Oyeedap).

19 MEMBER HARDY: OIDAP (Oyeedap).

20 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Some people just call us
21 OI (Oyee).

22 MEMBER HARDY: OI, oyee. Well, it's similarly
23 reached by Oyee. I'm very pleased to see this section in
24 here because I want to go on the record as saying I think
25 the NAS report is a very good report, very solid. And I

1 find myself in agreement with many of their conclusions.
2 I think that as we go along we're going to find that our
3 conclusions and their conclusions are so close that that
4 should actually be something that we should be looking at
5 and incorporating. And some of it is already
6 incorporated in our own recommendations.

7 But I'd like to see that expanded a little bit
8 more because we're pointing out where we have
9 disagreement. But I also think in the spirit of full
10 evaluation of their report, we should also really take a
11 close look at what they said that is good, that we do
12 need to apply. And I know that there is consideration of
13 doing that down the road. But if this is the first
14 document coming out from OI, I would like to also see
15 that kind of punched up a bit.

16 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I guess I should have
17 articulated and verbally -- it's in the report. But
18 there are issues discussed in the NAS report that deal
19 with more technical aspects that we're heading into in
20 terms of research and development. And it was premature
21 to really tackle those kinds of questions. A lot of
22 what's in Chapter 4, for example, I think some in Chapter
23 6, you know, those kinds of things. And so as those need
24 to be tackled throughout the process, I think that the
25 NAS report will be revisited from the technical end of

1 it.

2 Is that what you meant?

3 MEMBER HARDY: Yes, and I recognize that these
4 are down-the-line issues. But if this is the first
5 document coming out from us regarding the NAS report, I'd
6 also like to see us at least reference that there are
7 these things that we will be reviewing in the future.
8 But we find ourselves at this time looking at them with
9 what we think is agreement. And I'd like this report to
10 be a little bit, you know, fleshed out in that --

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And we talked about that
12 in the Executive Subcommittee meeting yesterday. And I
13 think in the introduction of the very end I do note that.
14 And I'd probably just need to make that stronger.

15 Mark?

16 MEMBER WILSON: I agree with Tom. In fact I
17 was -- while Tom was talking, I was playing around with
18 this in terms of Abigail's idea of reordering this. And
19 if 1 is moved up into some sort of process or context
20 argument stage setting, if you look at No. 2 becomes 1,
21 No. 3 becomes 2, No. 9 becomes 3. And then No. 4
22 remains No. 4. And No. 6 remains -- becomes 5. Those
23 are all areas of agreement where I think it would be
24 important to emphasize that. And then the rest becomes
25 sort of areas for continued exploration or where, you

1 know, and that might be too simple of a categorization.

2 But I really like Tom's idea that two separate
3 Panels looked at various aspects of this and agree about
4 a lot of things.

5 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for that. I
6 think this is really helpful. Sylvia -- and let me go to
7 Shanan first, Sylvia, and then Deb.

8 MEMBER GIBSON: I'm also building on what
9 Abigail said in terms of reorganizing. I have to
10 disagree a little bit with Mark's reorganization scheme
11 but not necessarily his categories. I actually really
12 like that categorization. But looking at what is
13 currently No. 2, which states that we reached the same
14 conclusions. I think we need to be more specific about
15 what they said, so that we're not accused of
16 misrepresenting them that the conclusion they came to was
17 that the O*NET in its current format cannot be used for
18 disability adjudication which then leads very nicely into
19 No. 6, the significant changes would need to be made.
20 And this is what will happen if you do it. Which then
21 leads nicely back into Mark's No. 3, which is they left
22 that to us to figure out.

23 MEMBER HUNT: What order? Two?

24 MEMBER GIBSON: Two, six, three.

25 MEMBER HUNT: -- six, three.

1 MEMBER LECHNER: Yeah, I think I like that
2 order, Shanan. The other thing I wonder is about putting
3 No. 9 in the beginning to sort of start out with, here's
4 where we agree. And then have sort of an introductory
5 and then having a closing paragraph that might sort of
6 summarize again at the end, we agree on multiple things.
7 Differences of opinion on these things. But leading in
8 with here's where we have common ground.

9 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Sylvia?

10 MEMBER KARMAN: Before we get further along
11 with how we may want to frame this, and this being the
12 Executive Summary, because Mary's Report was like there's
13 more to it. Then we may need to also take a look at what
14 the implications would be there. The benefit, I think,
15 of us going through NAS O*NET report is to look at what
16 the implications are for SSA's development of an OIS and
17 not be concerned with, you know, a value judgment with
18 regard to whether it's a good thing or bad.

19 I mean I guess I'm wondering there for Tom
20 reading through this or anyone else on our Panel who is
21 reading through this may have had the sense that there
22 was a -- you know, here are the things that were good.
23 Here are the things that weren't so good or whatever.
24 That we may want to be clear that that's really not what
25 we're attempting to do here. But this is really about

1 what are the implications on this -- from this report
2 for Social Security's development of an OIS?

3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think in the
4 conclusions I tried to bring that theme about that this
5 was not an evaluation of the O*NET by us in terms of an
6 overall evaluation. It was looking at the report and
7 what are the implications. That's our task.

8 MEMBER GIBSON: Maybe we should lead with that
9 and end with it. I mean if I want to make --

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Lead in with it and
11 include it --

12 MEMBER GIBSON: Lead in and end with it, yeah.

13 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I have that as part of
14 the background in the report. I mean I spent a whole
15 page kind of on our task. So I do start with that. And
16 I try to end with that as well.

17 Allan?

18 MEMBER HUNT: I just want to reiterate the
19 point that there's a lot more detail and it's much more
20 artfully presented in the body. So we're dealing with
21 two pages which makes it very difficult. But given that,
22 I still think it's critically important that we organize
23 those to create the impression not that we are reacting
24 defensively or, you know, attacking O*NET or attacking
25 the National Academy. It's exactly as was stated. We are

1 trying to derive implications for our mission and by the
2 way explaining why their mission is not the same as our
3 mission.

4 So I just think kind of avoid that
5 confrontational aspect of it will make it much more
6 receptive all the way around and make us some friends
7 instead enemies.

8 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I have that talk all
9 ready, yes. I think another thing that came out, I
10 remember, in the March meeting was the whole concept of
11 the framework in terms of the O*NET being a conceptional
12 framework. And I keep on going back to our September
13 report. There's a lot that we have in that report. It's
14 amazing how foundational or seminal that is to our work
15 in many ways.

16 And one of the things that I did add to the
17 section of -- I won't even try to guess where it ended up
18 right now. But the section that is associated with No. -
19 - the original No. 4 was the concept that the O*NET and
20 SOC was considered in the initial -- in its full force
21 was considered in the initial work taxonomy
22 recommendations.

23 And I think if we look at that list of
24 recommendations, they included 100 percent consideration
25 of the O*NET. Thirty percent out of the 82 Generalized

1 Work Activities, starting stimulus list, is the O*NET
2 framework. And so that's already considered in the
3 process. And I think that's something that's sometimes
4 lost within this.

5 Was that accurate? I added that in, and I just
6 wanted to make sure it represents. I think it was in the
7 original. It got added in.

8 I don't know if you have the updated report
9 that I've added that in to. Do you? Okay.

10 So the top of Page 9 where I talk about the,
11 you know, that you give an opinion that you don't just
12 start development of an OIS from scratch. There are a
13 lot of other examples out there. There's the O*NET.
14 There's the DOT. There's other occupational information
15 systems.

16 You know, reading that RAND report that Tom
17 Plewes was talking about was very helpful to me in
18 understanding not only that there are four main
19 occupational information systems in the military, but
20 they actually use 15 systems, different systems, when
21 they also include in all the civilian and OPM and all of
22 that.

23 And also looking at it from the terminology he
24 was using in terms of what he meant by using the O*NET
25 framework. And that has already been considered in the

1 process in our seminal document, so... So one of the
2 areas basically that the NAS Panel was recommending,
3 we've already done with our September report.

4 Other thoughts, in general? Tom, you look like
5 you want to say something.

6 MEMBER HARDY: I always want to say something.
7 I'm trying not to.

8 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, go ahead.

9 MEMBER HARDY: I guess this is not so much
10 about this document which is the work in progress. But
11 as I said, I'm so pleased with the progress in the work.

12 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

13 MEMBER HARDY: And it really a comfort also to
14 hear other Panel members reflecting some of the things
15 that I have brought up. So I'm very pleased that we're -
16 - we are all working together, and that's a good thing.

17 One thing that I'm just sort of going to
18 mention so that we keep it in mind is that on the last
19 page, No. 2, continued SSA and DOL cooperation. As you
20 know I've been concerned about this all the way along.
21 And I'm very comforted to know that Sylvia is now doing
22 some conversation because for me DOL is talking to people
23 who do O*NET work. I understand there's other pieces
24 there.

25 But I would like to suggest that as we start to

1 implement and continue with No. 2 that it becomes a more
2 formalized relationship with those people with DOL. I'd
3 like to suggest that we find some way of establishing it
4 as not so much as an ad hoc conversation, but as a formal
5 communication between our group and DOL that we can see
6 reflected in the record that we can actually track
7 progress with and get a little more of a formalized thing
8 going here. It's a suggestion for ongoing communication.

9 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: It seems to me that
10 that's already happening a bit through the research and
11 what Allan is doing. And I think it's very helpful to
12 have somebody who's got that relationship in mind.

13 So, Allan, did you have some comments on that?

14 MEMBER HUNT: Well, we're obviously not ready
15 to go to Richard and say, okay, let's do some sort of a
16 cooperative agreement. But I mean hopefully that's where
17 we end up. You know, I think that would be ideal. And
18 maybe it's a three-way. Maybe the Census Bureau is a
19 party to this too and we have one common effort among the
20 three agencies. And maybe there are others. But I would
21 hope that that's in the future.

22 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think we also need
23 to understand that we're providing advice and
24 recommendations and what SSA does is -- you know, they
25 can take all our advice or recommendations from the

1 September report and have different needs. So I think
2 we need to be aware of that.

3 Is that what you meant in terms of more
4 formalized?

5 MEMBER HARDY: Yes, I think we're moving in
6 that direction and I'm very pleased with that. I'm just
7 suggesting that we keep that in mind as we keep going
8 forward that this needs to be a very important liaison
9 that we have there.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Mark, did you
11 want to say something?

12 MEMBER WILSON: With the exception of 1, which
13 seems to be sort of moved out into a sort of part of
14 setting the context or whatever, it seems like there's
15 some wordsmithing with the rest of them and various views
16 as to order. But I wonder -- there's not really any
17 objections here in terms of the basic content. I mean is
18 there really more we can do with this at this point other
19 than start arguing about how to -- happy to do that if we
20 want to. But that could be time consuming.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia.

22 MEMBER KARMAN: I don't know if this is what
23 you're meaning, Mark. But I'm wondering do we want to
24 think about not just in terms of the findings but perhaps
25 in terms of the advice that while we have -- for example,

1 in terms of the second advice point or guidance,
2 continue it as the same DOL cooperation, might we want to
3 sort of take a longer view and perhaps as with Allan -- I
4 was hearing Allan's response to Tom's question. And also
5 say, you know, yes, SSA should continue the cooperative
6 work that it's been doing with DOL. And in this case
7 would have been ETA. Also we've opened the door now with
8 BLS. But there are really other federal agencies and
9 other government entities that would be of value to SSA's
10 process, such as entities within the military perhaps.

11 So I'm wondering if in fact that is that a
12 finding that the Panel would want to articulate. Or it's
13 not a finding, rather an advice point.

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Or is that kind of an
15 additional point to what we have here?

16 And I know that we didn't all read that RAND
17 report that Tom Plewes was talking about in March. I
18 know I passed it on to a couple of people. I'd highly
19 recommend people take a look at it. And I could send out
20 the link. I think from a conceptual standpoint it helps
21 anchor us and it gives us kind of a broader view of
22 occupational analysis in the U.S. economy, both civilian
23 and military. So it gives us kind of a real broad view.

24 Mark.

25 MEMBER WILSON: That was not what I was

1 thinking, but I like that in the sense that the DOD is
2 probably the other large government entity that is doing
3 large scale occupational analysis. And the attractive
4 thing about that is that they take a much more ergonomic
5 approach because of the applications they're using. So I
6 guess what I was suggesting is that if people are pretty
7 much in agreement with the recommendations or advice and
8 findings then share any wording issues with whoever is
9 writing this, you know, trying to write this document,
10 public might be difficult.

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yeah, I would rather not
12 get into the wordsmithing. I know that a couple of you
13 have already put the document in track changes mode and
14 want to send me copies. And absolutely I would love to
15 take a look at those copies.

16 So I'm more concerned the findings themselves.
17 Was it inclusive? I know we've kind of bifurcated the
18 technical aspect of it because of the process we are in
19 or the timing we're in now. And also just to kind of
20 make a distinction between recommendations and -- these
21 aren't at the level of the recommendations that we made
22 in September and why not? Because No. 1 is really kind
23 of a bump out of No. 4. It's something we learned
24 further that helps that recommendation that was already
25 out there.

1 And I didn't realize this, but from a FACA
2 standpoint when we make recommendations, there's tracking
3 that has to happen from that level. And so it becomes
4 really kind of cumbersome if we have a recommendation
5 that's already there and it's just an extension of it.
6 And we had already recommended a variety of things. So
7 these are just thoughts and advice and considerations
8 that SSA might need to have and not formal, what we call,
9 recommendations, just to make that clear.

10 Bob.

11 MEMBER FRASER: Just coming back to other
12 agencies, I know we've talked about the Bureau of the
13 Census and every two years they do that current
14 population survey. And there are questions in fact where
15 you can determine severity of disability. I don't think
16 it's a question of how -- on there about occupation. But
17 it certainly could be added. And we'd have people with
18 disability and what occupation. And that's a
19 representative sampling of the country.

20 MEMBER HUNT: I think the March supplement may
21 have a question on occupation, the one where they do
22 income. I'm not 100 percent sure of that, but I believe
23 that's the case.

24 MEMBER KARMAN: I thought they did too. In
25 fact I thought the ACS was follow on to that.

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think the ACS has four
2 questions.

3 MEMBER HUNT: ACS absolutely does, yeah. The
4 current population is actually a monthly survey. That's
5 what generates the unemployment statistic. But the
6 sample is what, 60,000 households? It's not totally
7 reliable, certainly for our purposes. The ACS was
8 designed to be a continuous census-like picture of the
9 population which is much more suitable to what we want.
10 And they are definitely collecting occupational
11 information. So I'm eager to talk to the people who are
12 responsible for that.

13 MEMBER KARMAN: You know the Census also -- and
14 I know we brought this information with us when we went
15 to BLS. So Allan may remember whatever brief discussion
16 we had about it. But from those surveys the Census
17 produces lists of 20,000 something job titles that --
18 again they're job titles, but that certainly gives you a
19 picture of what people are saying that they do. So
20 that's also helpful.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: There was a
22 recommendation or suggestion on the table from Sylvia to
23 maybe take a look at No. 2 and either expand it -- is
24 what I heard you say, Sylvia? Or the thought was to
25 include maybe other government entities, including the

1 DOD.

2 So is that something that people feel needs to
3 be expanded into or bumped out as a separate item?

4 Tom.

5 MEMBER HARDY: For the purposes of this
6 document I don't know that it needs to be expanded
7 further. Maybe if we're looking at doing that, it should
8 be something that comes out in a separate piece.
9 Suggestion.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Abigail.

11 MEMBER PANTER: I think the exploration into
12 other agencies is an important goal and I think it needs
13 to be expressed at this point. I mean it's very specific
14 with DOL and that's ongoing. But it's broader than that.
15 So I think it needs to be stated.

16 MEMBER GIBSON: I would say No. 3 is also
17 broader than what's here and therefore, there's a
18 precedent for that because No. 3 talks about
19 consideration of potential ethical -- and I've added
20 legal -- concerns that might arise from repurposing O*NET
21 and the DOT. And the DOT is not part of this report, so
22 we've already expanded.

23 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Right. I mean they have
24 a section about the DOT in Chapter 1 in terms of setting
25 the stage for the O*NET. But that's the extent of it.

1 MEMBER WILSON: I think it would be beneficial
2 to add DOD to No. 2.

3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

4 MEMBER KARMAN: You know we could add DOD --

5 MEMBER WILSON: And the Census.

6 MEMBER KARMAN: And, for example, the
7 Department of Defense that's just so that we're not --

8 MEMBER WILSON: Yeah.

9 MEMBER KARMAN: -- necessarily limiting Social
10 Security or whatever.

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

12 MEMBER LECHNER: Big groups that we haven't
13 yet.

14 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I mean something with the
15 RSA and those kinds of other agencies that need to be
16 considered.

17 Allan.

18 MEMBER HUNT: I still feel like a newbie, so
19 I'm not sure what the procedures are. But back to Mark's
20 point, I think he was hinting at should we approve this
21 document subject to some editorial revisions and maybe
22 circulate it by e-mail with response rather than holding
23 it for another Quarterly Meeting. I would favor
24 acceleration and trying to get this so everyone can sign
25 off in the next couple of weeks.

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Before we get to
2 that aspect of it, I just want to make sure because I --
3 the findings for the purpose of this document,
4 understanding that we're bifurcating the technical
5 aspects of it for further. So is there anything else
6 anybody thought was a finding or that it resulted in an
7 area of consideration for SSA that got missed?

8 Mark.

9 MEMBER WILSON: No, I like the list.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

11 MEMBER WILSON: I like the findings. I like
12 the point of making No. 1 contextual. Wordsmithing and
13 ordering, like I said, I suggested areas of agreement or
14 something like that, areas of continued exploration, or
15 something. But I'm generally happy with it with the
16 things that have been discussed here.

17 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So in terms of
18 next steps what I'm going to ask is all the Panel members
19 to get your wordsmithing, track changes versions to Debra
20 and I for us to process. And we will get what this into
21 final form from draft form. Does that sound good?
22 Fantastic, thank you.

23 And I realize that we were dealing with a very short
24 time line. I mean tomorrow makes a month that the final
25 report came out. And so processing and getting this

1 together. And I appreciate everybody getting on it and
2 processing it as quickly as we could.

3 Tom.

4 MEMBER HARDY: Point of clarification, I just
5 want to make sure. Apropos to what Allan was saying, I
6 don't know that we can approve anything until we have the
7 final document. And we're in agreement with that, right?

8 And can that be done just by a yes on an e-
9 mail?

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Let me double check,
11 triple check with our FACA expert. Debra, do you know
12 process wise if we can -- if everybody is okay with the
13 final document and we get a yes online if we're set to
14 go, you know?

15 Okay, then what we'll probably do is go to a
16 teleconference, very short teleconference, in terms of
17 the final. We'll take it to that level and get a verbal.
18 Okay?

19 MEMBER KARMAN: Mary, thank you for all of your
20 work on this, really.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: You're welcome.

22 MEMBER KARMAN: It's excellent.

23 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. I learned a
24 lot. It was a very important process to go through.

25 Okay, let's go ahead and take a break for about

1 20 minutes and come back to the Administrative Meeting.

2 Thank you.

3 (Off the record at 10:02 a.m. and back on the
4 record at 10:20 a.m.)

5 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I just want to
6 confirm with Debra Tidwell-Peters that we don't have
7 anybody signed up for public comment. Okay.

8 Then we'll go ahead and move into the
9 Administrative Meeting. I trust that everybody obtained
10 a copy of the minutes that were disseminated a couple
11 days ago and I think electronically last week as well.
12 Okay.

13 Does anybody need more time with the minutes at
14 all? Then I will entertain a motion in terms of action
15 on the minutes to approve the minutes.

16 Shanana.

17 Okay, do I have a second?

18 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Second it.

19 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Is there any discussion
20 on the motion?

21 All those in favor? (Background ayes)

22 Any opposed?

23 Okay, motion carries.

24 Let's go ahead and have a discussion of meeting
25 dates and locations for fiscal year 2011. And I will ask

1 or designate a Federal Officer to maybe lead that
2 discussion a little bit since she is the one that is most
3 oriented to the logistics associated with the meetings.
4 So Debra.

5 (Inaudible response)

6 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I was going to
7 say, I'm going to ask you to maybe lead this discussion
8 in terms of the meeting dates and locations for fiscal
9 year 2011.

10 (Inaudible response)

11 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And so do you want me to
12 scan for dates that do not work for the first quarter of
13 fiscal year 2011?

14 Okay. Our next meeting is going to be at the
15 end of August, beginning of September to kind of orient
16 everybody to our last Quarterly Meeting for fiscal year
17 2010. So as we're looking in to the remaining months:
18 October, November, December, just maybe a consensus on
19 the month that would work the best.

20 Let's start with maybe November, early
21 November, first couple of weeks in November? Are there
22 any major conflicts?

23 Allan?

24 MEMBER HUNT: Not the first week for me, but
25 the second week works.

1 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: November.

2 MEMBER KARMAN: I was wondering, Mary, didn't
3 we have a conference?

4 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I am in New Orleans. I
5 am in New Orleans the first week. So I guess the second
6 week.

7 MEMBER KARMAN: But otherwise, I'm fine.

8 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. November, second
9 week in November, for the first Quarterly Meeting for
10 2011.

11 MEMEBER HUNT: Works for me.

12 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. That seems like it
13 will work for everybody. Okay, thank you.

14 And then as we move to looking at the agenda
15 items to be considered for the last Quarterly Meeting,
16 the September meeting -- August, September meeting --
17 what are some of the areas that Panel members would like
18 to see on the agenda or consider?

19 Tom.

20 MEMBER HARDY: As we've discussed, I feel that
21 one of the main things this body does is deliberate. And
22 I often feel we don't get enough time for deliberation.
23 So I would like to ask for some serious blocks of times
24 for discussions. And possible topics might be taking a
25 look at skills and transferability. Because I again know

1 that's in the future, but I feel that it infuses a lot
2 of our work and should underpin some -- in some way what
3 we're doing. So I'd like to have that raised as a topic
4 again.

5 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And when you're bringing
6 that up as a general topic?

7 MEMBER HARDY: I think we can start general.
8 We'll probably get specific quickly.

9 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. What would be a
10 question that you would like to see addressed?

11 MEMBER HARDY: I think a good starting point is
12 what is your definition of it. Because we've found as
13 we've moved along that different disciplines have
14 different definitions of things. For example, job
15 analysis, we found out that we were talking about job
16 analysis but coming at it from different points of view.

17 I'd like to sit down and really make sure I
18 understand when an IO psychologist talks about
19 transferability of skills we're talking about the same
20 thing. And I think that would get us right off the bat
21 starting to talk about a couple other ancillary things
22 and might lead us to some fruitful discussion.

23 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Other areas? Bob.

24 MEMBER FRASER: I was just wondering hopefully
25 if we could get like an update on the data on the case

1 review process. Even if we don't have the whole three
2 thousand plus done, if we could just -- that would help
3 frame our whole discussion about skills and --

4 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are you talking about in
5 the sense of like when we were getting the updates from
6 User Needs analyses? That kind of?

7 MEMBER FRASER: No, my understanding is that
8 we're doing occupational review and functional capacities
9 and vocational characteristics of SSDI claims.

10 MEMBER SCHRETLEN: It be nice to get a -- some
11 data from both the IR study and the Op Med Voc in terms
12 of kind of cumulative frequency distributions of
13 occupational titles.

14 MEMBER HARDY: Right. Yeah, just to begin to
15 get our head around issues.

16 MEMBER KARMAN: We'll see what we can do about
17 that.

18 MEMBER HARDY: I mean even if they're
19 preliminary, I think it would be very interesting --

20 MEMBER KARMAN: Absolutely.

21 MEMBER HARDY: -- to see what they're looking
22 like so far.

23 MEMBER KARMAN: Yeah, I don't think -- I don't
24 know that that's going to inform the skills discussion,
25 though. But certainly you would have a list of the top

1 most frequent jobs people have coming in or what we're
2 citing.

3 MEMBER WILSON: And I'd be in favor of that too
4 as long as it doesn't disrupt the study. I mean we don't
5 want to do any -- in other words, we don't want to pull
6 them off to create some analysis for us that would slow
7 the completion of the study. So if that's the issue, I'd
8 rather not talk about it unless it's something that can
9 be done relatively quickly.

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think that's why I
11 have the question. If it was like when the User Needs
12 analyses were going on, and we were getting kind of an
13 interim report before the final was done. That was kind
14 of a -- you know, what we're finding in general. I think
15 that's -- is that what you meant, Bob? Okay.

16 Allan.

17 MEMBER HUNT: I think everyone probably knows
18 that we're planning some sort of activity to talk about
19 labor market information: sampling, design, the top down
20 versus the bottom up. So I'm not sure yet exactly what
21 form that will take, but a half a day at least, maybe
22 more depending on how far we get. And I hope we will be
23 at a point where we can actually start to see towards
24 some decisions. I don't think we'll make them at that
25 next meeting but certainly derive some of the

1 implications and the problems that we will encounter as
2 we go forward.

3 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan.

4 MEMBER GIBSON: I'd like to hope that the User
5 Needs and Relations Committee can provide the Panel
6 members with copies or a synopsis of the feedback we've
7 received from public comment in August.

8 MEMBER HARDY: I'm just making an assumption,
9 but I wanted to make sure I'm making the right one. In
10 looking at the Roadmap, we've got some like review final
11 prototype. A person cited instrument is due some time
12 around August. Things like that as they come in and
13 they're completed, they're just going to be on the
14 agenda, correct?

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I'm assuming if they're
16 being -- yes. Sylvia, I'm assuming.

17 MEMBER KARMAN: I think it -- I guess it
18 depends on where the Panel is with these things. So you
19 know, we have something that we want to be discussing in
20 the public meeting, yeah.

21 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Other areas? Is
22 there anything else?

23 Shanan, you mentioned the public comment in
24 terms of the User Needs, which I think is huge because
25 that's closing at the end of June and then being

1 processed through the summer.

2 So, anything else in terms of User Needs in
3 terms of research, ad hoc, in terms of the different
4 groups or subcommittees? Okay.

5 Did we cover it?

6 I think we find ourselves at the end of the
7 agenda. Is there anything else?

8 Tom?

9 MEMBER HARDY: (Inaudible response)

10 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: We already approved the
11 minutes, yes. You missed that.

12 Barring no other business, I would entertain a
13 motion to adjourn the meeting.

14 MEMBER HUNT: I so move.

15 CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Allan moved and it looks
16 like Deb seconded.

17 All those in favor? (Background ayes)

18 We are adjourned. Thank you. Travel safe
19 everyone.

20 (Whereupon, this Quarterly Meeting was
21 concluded at 10:02 a.m.)

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2 This is to certify that the attached transcript in
3 the matter of:

4 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

5 OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT

6 ADVISORY PANEL QUARTERLY MEETING

7 MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

8 JUNE 10, 2010

9 were held as herein appears, and that this is the
10 original transcription thereof for the file of the Office
11 of Complaint Investigations.

12
13
14 _____
15 STEPHEN P. ANDERSON, Reporter
16 FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25