

1 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
2 OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

3 Quarterly Meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel
4

5
6 Thursday, March 22, 2012

7 Pier 5 Hotel
8 Baltimore, Maryland
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Panel Members:

- 2 Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., Chair
- Leola S. Brooks, Designated Federal Officer
- 3 John W. Creswell, Ph.D.
- David J. Schretlen, Ph.D.
- 4 Abigail T. Panter, Ph.D.
- Shanan Gwaltney Gibson, Ph.D., Subcommittee Chair
- 5 Juan I. Sanchez, Ph.D.
- Andrew E. Wakshul, J.D.
- 6 Janine S. Holloman, MA, CRC, LPC, CBIS, Subcommittee Chair
- Robert T. Fraser, Ph.D.
- 7 Pamela L. Frugoli
- Thomas A. Hardy, J.D.
- 8 H. Allan Hunt, Ph.D., Subcommittee Chair

9
10 Attendees:

- David A. Rust, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Retirement and Disability Policy
- 11 David A. Weaver, Acting Associate Commissioner, Office of Retirement and
Disability Policy
- 12 Sylvia E. Karman, Office Director
- Tom Sutton
- 13 Jeff Truthan
- Lynn Tracy
- 14 Cynthia Grimley
- Leola Brooks, Designated Federal Official

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX

1		
2	Call to Order	
3	Leola S. Brooks	page 4
4	Overview of Agenda/Chair's Report	
5	Mary Barros-Bailey	page 6
6	Office Director's Report	
7	Sylvia E. Karman	page 7
8	Welcome Remarks	
9	David A. Rust	page 20
10	Taxonomy/Instrumentation Subcommittee Report	
11	Shanan Gwaltney Gibson, Ph.D.	page 49
12	User Needs and Relations Subcommittee Report	
13	Janine Holloman	page 46
14	Sampling Subcommittee report	
15	H. Allan Hunt, Ph.D.	page 59
16	Deliberations	page 69
17	Public Comments	
18	Jeff Truthan	page 79
19	Lynn Tracy	page 84
20	Andy Wakshul	page 90
21	Cynthia Grimley	page 91
22	Shanan Gibson	page 94
23	Operating Procedures	
24	Janine Holloman	page 97
25	Future Meetings	
26	Mary Barros-Bailey	page 98
27	Adjournment	page 102

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 MS. BROOKS: -- of the Occupational Information Development
3 Advisory Panel. This meeting is now called to order, and the meeting is now turned over
4 to the Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey.

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Leola. Good morning everybody
6 on this foggy Baltimore morning.

7 I would like to first of all indicate to the Panel that we have been asked by
8 our Court Reporter for you to turn on your mics when you speak. These mics are a little
9 bit different than what we've seen in the past; you couldn't have two on at a time. But if
10 you would say your name because he's kind of hidden behind the pillar, and he has to
11 take down everything we say.

12 Welcome everybody. If you are on telephonically or here live in
13 Baltimore for your attendance to the second quarterly meeting of the Occupational
14 Information Development Advisory Panel for fiscal year 2012.

15 If you are listening to us telephonically and you would like to follow along
16 with our agenda for today, you can access it at our website, www.ssa.gov/oidap. You
17 would go to the meeting's page and then for the Federal Register and the agenda for
18 today's meeting.

19 There you could also access our charter. If you are here live, I think you
20 have a copy of our charter in your packets.

21 At our website, you can also access technical and working papers, past
22 presentations, reports and public letters. There you will also find a link to the website for
23 the OVRD, the office within SSA that's actually developing the Occupational
24 Information System, and within their website, any other public documents that are posted
25 there.

1 As we indicate at the beginning of each meeting, the charter of the
2 Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel, or OIDAP, is to provide Social
3 Security with independent advice and recommendations on the development of a new
4 Occupational Information System to replace the -- of occupational titles in SSA's
5 disability adjudication.

6 Our task is not to develop the OIS itself. I know that at the beginning,
7 we've been doing this for three years, but at the beginning, people thought the Panel was
8 actually developing the OIS. We are not. We are providing advice and
9 recommendations.

10 There are three main purposes for the OIDAP. Number one as our name
11 implies, we are advisory. Number two, we are independent. Number three, our process
12 is transparent and open. That is, when we deliberate as an entire Panel such as we are
13 doing today, our meetings are open to the public. Two of our Panel members Dr. Tim
14 Key and Deborah Lechner, will not be available for today's meeting.

15 Sometimes as special government employees, we have access to pre-
16 decisional documents that are confidential and not open to the public such as something
17 that informs the development of a component within the scope of the Occupational
18 Information System Research and Development Plan and maybe somewhere along that
19 development.

20 So as special government employees, we cannot discuss these matters with
21 the public and may refer you to sources within SSA or to known publications in the
22 public domain that have the scope of information that's available to the public.

23 At this time, let's go ahead and review the agenda for today. We find that
24 when we went from four face-to-face meetings to two face-to-face meetings, that we are
25 needing more time for subcommittees to be able to do their work when we get together in

1 face-to-face meetings as was the case with this meeting. So the agenda for today is very
2 much an administrative agenda and a business agenda.

3 We will start this morning with presentations by the executives, remarks
4 by Deputy Commissioner David Rust and Acting Associate Commissioner David
5 Weaver. This will be followed by a short report from the chair, myself, and then a report
6 from Office Director Sylvia Karman.

7 After the break then we will go into subcommittee reports from User
8 Needs from Field Job Analysts and then from there, we will have the Taxonomy and
9 Instrumentation Subcommittee report.

10 After lunch, we will have a report from the Sampling Subcommittee. A
11 lot of activity has happened at this meeting with sampling as those who have been
12 following our meetings for the last year or so, we've had a lot of presentations from
13 outside entities around that topic. We had an hour on the agenda for that subcommittee
14 to present to us. I believe that it will be shorter than anticipated presentation.

15 We will go from there to the deliberation and then on to public comment;
16 we have one public comment person scheduled so far. And then from there, we'll go into
17 our administrative meeting. We are anticipating adjourning at 3:30 or before that.

18 At this time, I would like to invite comments from Social Security
19 Administration executives. Is Deputy Commissioner David Rust here?

20 (Pause)

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We'll have a little change in order in of the
22 -- I know that traffic is pretty bad this morning.

23 We'll go ahead and I'll start with a very brief report in terms of the
24 Chair's report and then we'll go into Sylvia Karman, the office director's report.

25 In terms of some of the workings of the Panel within the last six months,

1 I'm not going to get into the individual subcommittees in terms of what they will be
2 reporting but look more at a global level.

3 Starting about two years ago, we were asked by the commissioner to issue
4 an annual report; that annual report is nearer completion. We anticipate it'll probably be
5 completed and out to the commissioner and to the public within the next two to three
6 weeks. It will summarize the calendar year; we're more on a calendar year rather than
7 maybe a fiscal year as the government usually is. So you may anticipate that we will
8 disseminate it out to the public.

9 One of the things when we restructured the Panel about a year ago into
10 subcommittees that were more in line with the development of the OIS that we had talked
11 about was generally the issue that we would have to deal with at some point in the future
12 about looking at all data collection for this project. And so we had decided in terms of
13 the Executive Subcommittee that at some point we will address that specifically.

14 At the point when we originally put together the subcommittees, we had
15 looked at the Field Job Analyst as a specific area of data collection that we needed to
16 have more hyper focus at that time. So I have asked Dr. Abigail Panter to head that
17 effort. Abigail serves on two of the subcommittees, Taxonomy and also Sampling, where
18 there are discussions on both of those subcommittees in terms of issues that are specific
19 to data collection so she will be heading up that efforts. So you'll be hearing more about
20 data collection in general as we move forward.

21 The other thing I wanted to announce, there's been a change in our next
22 teleconference for those that are listening and keep track of that. It will be
23 June 4th, a Monday, and it will be at 10:00 a.m. Eastern Time. So for those who had the,
24 I think it was two days later that we had on the 6th. It's been moved to the 4th.

25 At this time, I'd like to welcome Sylvia Karman, the project director, to

1 deliver her report.

2 MS. KARMAN: Morning, everyone. Is the thing on? No, I mean is the
3 slides overhead on? If we don't need them, that's cool, I'll just work from paper, paper's
4 fine.

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I know we all have copies of your slide.

6 MS. KARMAN: All right. So we've been busy since we last met in
7 December. I know that we had introduced our new senior research psychologist to the
8 Panel at that time. I've got some other individuals that I'd like to also introduce that have
9 joined our team in the intermittent time. I just wanted to mention though that I do have
10 some background on some of the individuals.

11 Jone Papinchock is our senior research psychologist, and she joined us in
12 November of 2011. Prior to coming to SSA, she was with the Office of Personnel
13 Management, Classification and Assessment Policy Group, and she was their project
14 manager for the development of the government-wide online selection and promotion
15 assessment batteries. Her project involved web-based international job analysis, data
16 collection across federal agencies.

17 Jone has worked as an Industrial Organizational psychologist for 25 years
18 in public sector, that is, city, state and federal; private sector; and consulting roles
19 specializing in the supervision of job analysis and assessment validation studies. Jone
20 spent more than 11 years providing expert services in employment discrimination cases
21 serving as the managing director of the SHL Litigation Support Group.

22 She earned a masters and doctorate degrees in Industrial Organizational
23 psychology from the University of South Florida.

24 We've also included to our team recently, other members of our staff are
25 all from within SSA. Tom Hale who comes to us from another office in the Office of

1 Program Development and Research. He was the contracting officer's representative
2 for the Mental Health Treatment Study. This was a successful six-year long and over
3 \$51,000,000 study to test the effectiveness of employment supports treatment package on
4 a sample of Title II beneficiaries with schizophrenia and affective disorders.

5 While at SSA, he has also been the contracting officer's representative for
6 the evaluation component of the Homeless Outreach Projects & Evaluation.

7 Prior to coming to SSA, Dr. Hale worked at the Bureau of Labor Statistics
8 in the office that publishes the official unemployment rate. While there, he developed
9 and implemented a research methodology to identify people with disabilities in the
10 current population survey. Dr. Hale also has over 20 years teaching experience mostly at
11 the University of Maryland.

12 And also we have Rob Desmarias (phonetic sp.) who joined SSA in 1994
13 as an IT specialist in the Department of Economic Research. Rob has collaborated on
14 several research projects, developed databases to store micro data and created
15 applications to analyze survey data. Prior to joining SSA, he served as a research
16 associate and software systems developer.

17 Rob has a BS degree in computer science from the University Maryland,
18 University College; BS in psychology from Middlebury College; and an MS in
19 psychology from Eastern Michigan University.

20 Also with us just this week, in fact, is Juliana Gonzalez who is a
21 presidential management fellow on detail from our sister component, the Office of
22 Disability Programs. She has been with the Agency for almost two years and has
23 completed four rotational assignments within the Agency. Her rotational assignments
24 have included the social, insurance specialists within the Office of Disability Programs
25 eCAT team, field office associate in Washington, D.C., management analyst on the

1 Human Capital Planning Staff team, and budget analyst in the Office of Budget.

2 Juliana received a bachelor's degree in business administration from
3 Trinity University and an MPA from University of North Texas. She also has major
4 coursework towards an MA in applied anthropology.

5 And then we also have with us Bill Davis who has joined on a consultative
6 basis from Social Security's Office of Research, Evaluation, and Statistics. He has joined
7 SSA's OREAS, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Statistics, as a chief mathematical
8 statistician in December 2008. Bill assists the OREAS associate commissioner on
9 statistical issues within OREAS and throughout the Agency.

10 In particular, Dr. Davis has assisted in the developmental of SSA Title
11 XIII, Disclosure Review Board, and in the validation of the new Social Security number
12 assignment method.

13 Previously, Bill has worked for 35 years as a statistician in academics,
14 industry and government. His areas of interest include survey design and analysis, small
15 area estimation and statistical modeling.

16 Dr. Davis received a Ph.D. in statistics from the University of Wisconsin,
17 Madison, in mathematics, and a BS in mathematics from Case Western University.

18 Also, we have received approval to hire two Industrial Organizational
19 psychologists, and we anticipate the postings for those positions to USAJOBS later this
20 Spring, we're thinking May.

21 The next topic that I had was I know folks have been interested in where
22 we are with the memorandum of understanding between Social Security Administration
23 and the Department of Labor's Employment Training Administration. The revisions are
24 now reviewed by the legal counsels in, are under review by both legal counsels in both
25 agencies. And we anticipate that the document will be ready for signature in May of

1 2012.

2 The legal standards, another area that we have been working toward. We
3 do have a final paper, a Phase IV paper that is under review and final review by our
4 Office of General Counsel, and it should be ready for clearance through our management
5 later this month so that would be next week.

6 Usability. We have also on the area of standards and activities regarding
7 usability. We have created a standards draft document, Phases I and II have been delayed
8 for other activity that we've been attending to, but that has been revised and so we're
9 getting back to that.

10 For the work taxonomy development over the last five months, we have
11 created a flow chart on how SSA adjudicators currently use occupational information
12 resources, and that chart is being additional information, additional details being added to
13 that. And it's being prepared for review by our Occupational Information System
14 Development Workgroup so that they can review it for how adjudicators are currently
15 using occupational information resources.

16 Also, we are preparing a workshop on the usability factors that we must
17 currently consider. The objective of this workshop will be to give a usability framework
18 for non-SSA program experienced professionals who are joining the project or will be
19 working on the project.

20 We are going to be piloting our workshop within our own staff first among
21 those who are new and/or who have more technical background and not necessarily the
22 disability background. We will also be piloting it with our OIS Development
23 Workgroup.

24 Some of the things that were important to us in developing this workshop,
25 I think will also be very helpful in the development of the taxonomy certainly for not

1 only our own senior research psychologists but any other staff that comes on board
2 that have IO background or any others that we work with externally.

3 I think that part of that would be, you know, being able to understand the
4 details about the inferential thought processes, the myriad of micro decisions that happen
5 within Step 4 and Step 5. We think that that will very much inform the content features
6 for the OIS tool.

7 Another area that we've been working on, and we have completed the
8 work on, we're now getting toward reviewing the results is the Disability Evaluation
9 Constructs activity. It might be helpful if I just restated a little bit about the background
10 on the Disability Evaluation Constructs activity.

11 Originally, the purpose of the DEC as we call it is to identify and
12 document SSA's program needs, and we will be using it to inform the work taxonomy
13 development. We had developed the DEC initially, it was basically a list, it's an
14 inventory, by identifying the vocational and functional constructs or concepts, if you
15 would, that SSA applies in the assessment of claimants as well as constructs or concepts
16 that have been recommended to Social Security.

17 And we based the inventory on four essential sources, Social Security's
18 Disability Program Policy directly from our regulations, the Panel's 2009
19 recommendations, public comment or recommendations regarding the Panel's 2009
20 recommendations, and preliminary work that was conducted by Social Security with an
21 inter-agency agreement with the National Institutes of Health. That work was based on
22 the international classification of function and so there were certainly functional
23 constructs that we wanted to include to facilitate using the inventory.

24 Again, restating that the purpose of the inventory is really in the long run
25 to be able to, for us to be able to hand something to the Industrial Organizational

1 psychologists who will be working with us to be able to reflect the universe of
2 elements that Social Security finds important in evaluating claimant function and
3 vocational profiles.

4 So to facilitate using it, our team developed a methodology for classifying
5 and filtering the information in it so that it would be easier to work with, and also so that
6 it would represent, you know, the final version of what Social Security would want to put
7 forward to the IOs.

8 We had asked our OIS Development Workgroup to work with us on that
9 activity, both the classification and the filtering. In classifying it, basically what we were
10 doing was arranging the concepts into groups based on similarity. Those concepts rather
11 the organization of that came from our own policy structures. So it was familiar to
12 people, that way it was something that we could all recognize.

13 Also, the filtering is basically removing constructs that are based, that are
14 not necessarily based on SSA's program needs. We had a series of criteria that were
15 applied to that, and we documented as well the OIS Development Workgroup's decisions
16 on those things.

17 So essentially what we will have at the very end of this when we produce
18 a report is you start out with the inventory in the beginning which is everything everyone
19 recommended, everything that was in our policy that had to do with function and
20 vocational constructs. And then as it goes into classification and then the final filtered
21 version, one could see the disposition of each and every element that was captured on the
22 original inventory.

23 We will -- some of the background also on how we had done some of this
24 work. We asked the OIS Development Workgroup members to serve as raters and so we
25 had a protocol that went with their rating for how they wanted to classify the elements

1 and how they wanted to be filtering them based on the definitions that the sources in
2 each of these cases may have provided.

3 Our staff did not participate in those ratings. They were done, the idea
4 there was for the ratings to occur with the Agency's recognized program experts. Those
5 who are overseeing, in offices that oversee either the Disability Determination Services,
6 or the Office of Disability Adjudication and Review, or the Office of Disability Programs
7 that is working on the policy as well as the Office of Quality Performance.

8 We are completing the final paper, Phase IV, for that, and that will
9 hopefully be accomplished this Spring.

10 Another topic that I know is near and dear to everyone's heart is the
11 Occupational-Medical-Vocational Study. We have quality reviews of the study that we
12 are completing in the next two weeks, and those are for the study results related to the
13 hearing level cases.

14 We are also involved in the final analysis, begun our final analysis of the
15 initial level results, and we also have been conducting a number of briefings. We briefed
16 offices within Social Security that would be stakeholders for the kind of information that
17 Occ-Med-Voc Study would entail. We've also recently briefed the Department of
18 Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics on the initial level results.

19 Other topics include collaboration with other federal agencies, and we
20 have also been under that heading collaborating pretty much with the Department of
21 Labor as well as the Office of Personnel Management regarding Department of Labor.

22 As I mentioned, we have briefed the Bureau of Labor Statistics on our
23 Occupational-Medical-Vocational Study. BLS officials in turn briefed our Office of
24 Retirement Disability Programs deputy commissioner and our ORDP components on its
25 national compensation survey to assess its potential usefulness in OIS development.

1 And then in addition to collaboration with DOL, we are also working
2 with the Office of Personnel Management on an inter-agency agreement to bring
3 additional IO expertise on to work directly with our senior research psychologists and
4 staff. This inter-agency agreement is under review with our general counsel, and we look
5 forward to working with OPM staff later this Spring.

6 Then another topic is work taxonomy development that's certainly our
7 first major step in beyond our baseline activities of which I was reporting out some of
8 those this morning is work taxonomy development. And also, I'll back up to November
9 even though I know that we had met in December, it might be helpful for the audience.

10 The Industrial Organizational consultants that we've been working with as
11 of November 2011 produced independent analytic reports that were recommending
12 various methodological options for producing structure and content of SSA's OIS work
13 taxonomy.

14 Then in December 2011 after our senior research psychologist had been
15 with us for a month, our consultants and two of our IO panel members attended an SSA
16 organized summit to discuss design and development issues regarding SSA's OIS work
17 taxonomy.

18 Then January 2012 through March, the consultants have produced a set of
19 reports addressing the methodical issues that were highlighted at the December summit
20 and also provided consultation on the development of a request for information which
21 many of you may know is out on FedBizOps. I believe the comments for that are due
22 today.

23 The next topic is interestingly the RFI since I just mentioned it. March
24 2012, on March 1st, SSA posted the RFI to the website of the Federal Business
25 Opportunities and to identify potential availability and capability of vendors who may be

1 interested in the design and testing of job analysis, data collection and the
2 development of SSA's occupational information. Again, as I mentioned before, the
3 responses to the RFI are due today.

4 Another area that we've been working on is with ICF International under
5 the blanket purchase agreement, a task order or call that we refer to as Call 003. ICF has
6 been conducting interviews with a number of federal agencies on various protocols for
7 data collection. Some of those federal agencies, for example, include Department of
8 Labor's Employment and Training Administration; Department of Labor's Bureau of
9 Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Census, Office of Personnel Management and others.

10 Interviews were intended to capture information regarding topics such as
11 obtaining, you know, what experience do they have; obtaining OMB clearance for data
12 collection instruments; identifying, contacting and arranging visits with the entities that
13 they are working with; providing assignments to the job analysts, how is that actually
14 happening; and also identifying and reviewing jobs and positions within the
15 establishments to ensure the sampling accuracy; how does the federal Agency, you know,
16 do they have options for transmitting, different methods in which the transmit the data;
17 and also review of the analyst's performance, the job analyst's performance; and then, of
18 course, what kinds of protocols do they have in place for close-out procedures with each
19 of the establishments that they're involved with.

20 That is all that I have this morning. Do you all have any questions?

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Questions for Sylvia? Okay. I have some
22 questions.

23 DR. SCHRETLEN: I guess I do have --

24 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, go ahead.

25 DR. SCHRETLEN: I know that Social Security does an enormous

1 amount of work in classifying and filtering these Disability Evaluation Constructs, but
2 it still remains a little unclear to me how they will be regarded. Are they sort of
3 advisory? I mean, there's an enormous unevenness in them I thought. Some of them are
4 really sensible constructs and things that one could define relatively easily, and others
5 seemed a lot more obscure and some of them were sort of, well, they were rejected in part
6 because they were almost nonsensical or just so broad that, like weather.

7 But also conspicuously missing were any kinds of constructs about
8 measurement which makes sense because we're not at that point yet.

9 I just sort of wonder, you refer to these as a sort of universe of constructs
10 that will be used in some part, in some ways to inform a taxonomy, but how exactly will
11 that happen?

12 MS. KARMAN: Thank you, David. Yeah, that's a good question. They
13 are in some sense, when I say that they are representative of the universe of things that
14 SSA would be turning over to IO consultants, it's largely the -- since it also includes the
15 constructs that are currently in use, it certainly embodies the things that SSA is currently
16 doing. And it also, it captures related elements that we received, you know, information
17 from a number of different sources.

18 For example, I know the Panel and a number of people in the public
19 recommended things about overhead reaching, for example, side-to-side reaching. So in
20 a sense, it's advisory to the, when I say advisory, it's not as if certainly, you know, the
21 Industrial Organizational staff or others that we would be working with wouldn't be
22 replacing them in the sense of SSA should try to use other constructs in it's disability
23 evaluation process but rather given that SSA is interested in these kinds of concepts, what
24 is it in the world of work that would be relevant, that would be possible to capture so that
25 the content for the OIS reflects SSA's needs.

1 And we're not sure yet since we have not completed working through
2 the issues of the methodology for taxonomic development. We're not exactly sure how
3 that might get used.

4 I mean, one way I can imagine is that there may be an initial meeting
5 where at one juncture Industrial Organizational psychologists may sit down with our staff
6 and look at are there any analogs, ready analogs on the work side to the elements that are
7 considered in disability evaluation. Some that we can readily think of, for example,
8 sitting, standing, walking, lifting, those kinds of things.

9 And that we, you know, sure to have that discussion then amongst
10 themselves and then coming back to our staff about the measures, possible measures and
11 scales that would be suitable to capture in the world of work. Then that would also give
12 us an opportunity in turn to take that discussion back to our OIS Development
13 Workgroup to be sure that the types of measures and scales that are being considered
14 would in truth be something that adjudicators could recognize or associate with medical
15 evidence.

16 So, you know, I'm just using that as an example of how folks might be
17 using the resulting inventory that we'll be having to give them.

18 DR. SCHRETLEN: I know that some of the, like on the mental-cognitive
19 constructs were things that the Mental-Cognitive Committee thought about really
20 carefully and, you know, debated and discussed. And then other things were sort of like
21 things that came up from user need groups or almost like wishes oh, wish we could do
22 this, wish we do that. And I just wonder, I hope that doesn't get lost that some of these
23 things were I think more, I don't want to say whimsical, but they were sort of whatever
24 occurred to someone as gee, that might be helpful.

25 MS. KARMAN: I think I believe I understand what you're alluding to.

1 Certainly when we are providing that information, first of all, our whole team knows
2 about what the sources are. But the inventory itself or resulting list, and I guess we need
3 to come up with a name for the final version of it, the final inventory, I don't know, it
4 would have, it would include the information with regard to the source.

5 So I think that that would be a big, you know, a key component for
6 consideration so that if there's something on the list that seems curious but you see that
7 the source was one in which, you know, Social Security Program Policy, something that
8 was recommended by a body that had set aside literature and other things that had been
9 discussed in order to come up with that recommendation that would be evident by the
10 fact that the source is recognized.

11 So I think that that's one way in which that could happen and certainly
12 since we will be very much involved in how those elements are considered, we certainly
13 would be in a position to make that more salient, make that understood.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, Shanan has a question, and I think
15 the senior SSA executives are here so maybe what we can do is I know they're on a
16 timeline. I have several questions for Sylvia as well so maybe what we can do is go
17 ahead and take the comments from the SSA executives. And Sylvia, if you could come
18 back, I think we have several questions. Sorry.

19 At this time, I would go ahead and like to welcome to address the Panel
20 the Deputy Commissioner David Rust, and the Acting Associate Commissioner, David
21 Weaver. Welcome, good morning.

22 And I'd also like to acknowledge in the audience that we have the acting
23 associate deputy commissioner, Susan Wilsky, who is with us this morning as well.

24 MR. RUST: Good morning.

25 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Morning.

1 MR. RUST: You just stole part of my thunder. I was just simply going
2 to mention to the Panel that Richard Balkus is now retired. Bob Weathers who was his
3 deputy, was the deputy assistant associate commissioner, he stepped up as the acting for a
4 while. He has entered our SES training program, and he's off doing an assignment in
5 systems right now. So we've asked David Weaver to come over from Retirement Policy
6 where he was the deputy AC, the deputy associate commissioner, there to be the acting
7 associate commissioner here. And we've asked, you know, Susan to continue as the
8 acting deputy.

9 So we're really happy with the team now, and we're sorry to see Richard
10 retire but it's, he said it was time and so we're happy for him. So that's the sort of team
11 line up change that's occurred since the last time we met.

12 Just a couple of things very quickly. This effort became a minor topic in
13 the sense that it was a Q and A at the Ways and Means Committee hearing on Tuesday
14 with the commissioner. He was asked a question basically about O*NET and about the
15 Department of Labor. And he explained the limitations of O*NET. He also explained
16 the Department of Labor does not have some of the resources that it would take to carry
17 out this role. So he responded to that question and said that this was an important, an
18 important ongoing effort and explained the relationship that we do have with Labor and
19 move the project forward. So I thought it would be interesting.

20 He also did get a question about the cost of the project from the chairman
21 of the subcommittee so they're looking at everything even relatively small cost items at
22 this time. But it was discussed at Tuesday's hearing in the Ways and Means Committee.

23 A couple of other things I guess I would probably sort of mention. We
24 continue under a tight budget situation, we continue under a staff freeze. My component
25 is down about 100 people, almost 100 people since the freeze went into effect in July of a

1 year and a half ago. We were, however, able to request two additional hiring
2 exceptions for the OIS Panel for staffing. The commissioners granted those and so we'll
3 be in the process soon of soliciting those staff.

4 As I think I told the chairman a few days ago and a couple of committee
5 members a few days ago, you know, we only got three slots for my whole component and
6 you got two of them so I want you to know that the commissioner, I think that's a good
7 reflection of the commissioner's commitment to this project to keep it moving forward.

8 We continue to look for additional resources in terms of work we may be
9 able to tie into other departments and other agencies. We had a very productive meeting
10 about a week ago with the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. We have
11 talked to other departments and will continue to do that for their surveys or some other
12 instruments that we might be able to tie into.

13 We've had a very successful relationship with the Census Bureau not that
14 it would necessarily affect this project, but often the Census Bureau has been willing to
15 add questions to a survey or do something of that nature, generally for a certain amount
16 of money, but we've been able to sometimes expand our ability to do research and
17 surveys by tying into other things. So we're open to all possibilities that might help us to
18 expand the work and support the work of this Panel. I wanted you to know that.

19 We continue to view this as a very important project, the commissioner
20 does too, and we want to urge you all to keep the project moving forward. That's pretty
21 much wanted to say this morning. David?

22 MR. WEAVER: Sure. Thank you, David. So I'm a little bit new to this
23 so let me introduce myself. I want to give a little perspective on or my perspective on the
24 project. I was trying to think of a few things this morning that would inspire the group. I
25 don't think I'll reach that level, but I'll say a few things about why I think it's important.

1 As David mentioned, I come from sort of the retirement side of the
2 house of Social Security. And the retirement programs are in terms of number of
3 beneficiaries by far our largest programs. And I think they're wonderful programs and
4 they do a very good job of serving the broad American middle class.

5 The disability programs are special though in their own way and part of
6 that is because they really do serve some of the most vulnerable segments of American
7 society.

8 When we look at our data and just try to characterize the economic
9 wellbeing of our different beneficiary groups, you know, almost no matter how you look
10 at it or even those who make it up to the roles, our disability beneficiaries are far more
11 likely to be in poverty than a retirement beneficiary.

12 Social Security disability beneficiaries are far more likely to qualify for
13 means-tested programs including SSI than our retirement beneficiaries.

14 So one reason I think this work is important is that the population that
15 really is being looked at here has really serious challenges, and they do need sort of the
16 proper attention from the federal government in the sense they often have difficult work
17 records, obviously severe impairments and even in the event of qualifying for benefits,
18 they're often still low to moderate income beneficiaries. So I think that gives this work
19 some real importance.

20 The other thing I want to mention is just so we don't lose track of it. The
21 size of the population is substantial and that just reflects how large the Social Security
22 programs and the SSI programs are in the
23 U.S.

24 We have over 8 million disabled worker beneficiaries under Social
25 Security. And the Social Security benefits structure is a, really is a family benefit

1 structure so going along with those 8 million disabled worker beneficiaries are nearly
2 2 million children who qualify for benefits on the basis of a parent's record.

3 We have, the SSI program is also quite large nearly 7 million recipients on
4 the SSI roles. Our programs are so ingrained in sort of American society even smaller
5 groups are large when you look at them.

6 For example, there are nearly a million disabled adult children on our
7 roles, and these are folks who are adults but the disability occurred before they could
8 really establish a working career. We have even relatively small groups, there are
9 disabled widows on our role.

10 One of the things I think maybe not to inspire you but I do think those
11 kinds of things give you a sense of how important this population is. It's often a
12 vulnerable population and it's a sizeable population. So it is in some fundamental way
13 important for us to get the process for determining disability to let it be fair, correct and
14 well thought of just in the interest of looking out for our beneficiaries.

15 Partly I just want to get, just remind everybody sort of the importance of
16 the work you're doing here. I will say a few things.

17 I'm new to this, but one of the things I want to compliment the Panel on is
18 that number one, you're very open about things so it's very easy to follow what you do.
19 One thing I really do love is you have lots of written documentation so for somebody
20 who's just starting out, you can get up to speed because the work has been so thorough
21 and well documented. I want to congratulate you on that, and I'm looking forward to
22 working with everybody as we go forward.

23 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, David. And David, I'll open up
24 questions to the Panel. Tom.

25 MR. HARDY: Good morning, good to see you. I recognize that we're in

1 very difficult financial times right now in the government, and it's wonderful that we
2 were able to get the two new hires for this project.

3 In broad terms, I'm curious what you see how the financial aspects of
4 budget and whether or not funding is full or partial, how that would affect the charge and
5 scope of our work in this group?

6 MR. RUST: You know, opening up to questions always causes problems.
7 Don't we have to leave, David? I think I have a 9:20 appointment.

8 We're in a very unpredictable time right now. Obviously, it's an election
9 year, there's going to be to some degree a little less attention probably because the
10 members of Congress, the members of the Administration will be focused on the election.

11 I remind you the commissioner's term ends in mid-January; his six-year
12 term expires the middle of January. The deputy commissioner's term expires the middle
13 of January. So if we were sitting here this time next year, we would, I mean, there would
14 be major leadership changes at Social Security. In addition to that, we don't know what
15 the Title XIII budget's going to look like.

16 Many of the activities for this Panel are funded from a research budget
17 that Congress is scrutinizing that more closely now. You notice the chairman actually
18 asked a question about the cost of this project.

19 So I just think Congress is looking even at smaller expenditures more
20 carefully than they have in the past. Our research dollars had been sort of know your
21 money, and I argued to the staff of the Appropriations Committees that that was, that that
22 encouraged us to be good stewards of it and we didn't feel the need to rush to get a
23 project out before the money lapsed, that what money we were carrying over was actually
24 and, I mean, I already said this, but I sincerely believe it was an example of good
25 stewardship. They've now asked us to kind of put a two limit, two-year rollover on that

1 money. So I think we're going to feel more pressure maybe to fund things or keep
2 things on schedule.

3 I just think there are lots of changes that, some we can anticipate, some we
4 can't. Obviously, we don't know what the XIII budget's going to be. We don't know if
5 we will have a continued resolution to start the year. I think that one could pretty well
6 expect one, and we do know that we have the \$1.2 Trillion cut over ten years hanging out
7 there, half domestic, half national security, and we have no idea how that will play out. I
8 think there's just, I think we'd have to say there's a lot of uncertainty now in terms of
9 what 2013, fiscal year 2013's going to look like.

10 And remember, it starts off, the sequestration at \$1.2 Billion, \$1.2 Trillion
11 cut over ten years takes effect on January 2nd of next year so whatever we would have a
12 spending quarter, the first quarter of the fiscal year will be without that sort of additional
13 cuts and then what would happen then depends on how Congress responds to it and how
14 the Administration responds to it. And that could be done during a lame duck session
15 and, of course, those are always, as a former Hill staffer, lame duck sessions are always
16 extremely interesting and unpredictable so there's just a lot of uncertainty.

17 If you ask me where I thought this project would be this time next year, I
18 think I'd have to say there's a lot of uncertainty. Not that the project wouldn't continue,
19 but the level of funding, the level of support and so forth depends on what happens in our
20 broader budget.

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Allan.

22 DR. HUNT: Did you get the impression from the interaction on Tuesday
23 that the Ways and Means leadership appreciates the payoff to this project as well as its
24 cost?

25 MR. RUST: I wasn't there in person so I don't have the ability to sort of

1 put it into context. I think it was probably just, there are certain, I mean, they just sort
2 of watch your ongoing things and ask you questions about them when you have -- this
3 was a broad enough based hearing. Sometimes the hearings focus on a particular
4 problem or crisis or something like that. This was sort of a more general hearing on the
5 disability program.

6 For instance, one of the other questions was on the QDDs that are Quick
7 Disability Determinations, and the question had to do with, you know, had we found any
8 evidence that people are beginning to try to gain that process by alleging one of those
9 conditions.

10 Now, obviously, from that point of view, the problem would be not that
11 the person would get benefits because we still look at the medical evidence and so forth,
12 but it could put people in the fast track when they shouldn't be. And then, of course, that
13 could slow the fast track down and so forth.

14 So the point is, they were asking a wide array of questions all across the
15 program. There really wasn't any follow up on this one so it was sort of one question.

16 I would just put it in a category that they were doing general oversight and
17 that they were just asking a broad brush of questions across the program. I wouldn't read
18 any greater significance into it than that.

19 Any other questions?

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions? I have one maybe
21 to follow up on what Tom was asking more specifically to maybe a timeline. The Panel
22 was originally chartered for two years, that was renewed for a year, and you had
23 mentioned that this time next year, the project would probably be going on but the
24 specifics and parameters within that because of all of the uncertainty may not be fully
25 known.

1 Our charter comes up, it was renewed for six months in July so that's
2 short of that 2013. Do you have any ideas in terms of beyond July 6th for the Panel, what
3 we would be looking at?

4 MR. RUST: I should have anticipated this question, and I should have
5 touched base with the commissioner to see what his most current thinking is, but I must
6 plead that I didn't, but I will be shortly because I, it's amazing how quickly July comes
7 around. I'll get on that.

8 My own instinct is that you all bring a special expertise, an array of
9 special expertise to this project that we have, we don't have on in staff and there's no way
10 we can get it on staff. Even if we weren't under the hiring freeze, it would be difficult to
11 get the numbers we need. But, I mean, with the hiring freeze, it's pretty impossible. I
12 think we're going to have to have some mechanism where we can continue to draw upon
13 the talent around the room either through a panel or through some other mechanism. So I
14 would think many of you would stay involved with the project, but I'll find out an answer
15 for that and give it to you soon.

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. One of the things I had asked you
17 last time was what you might anticipate in terms of changes to staff. There was kind of
18 an appeal, I think, from the Panel, and I just wanted to compliment SSA.

19 I think what Sylvia was telling us, there's been a lot of staff brought into
20 the project, the hiring, and I think it's going in a great direction. I just want to thank you
21 for all your efforts along those lines. It's been really nice to see all the support coming
22 into the project. And I know that you're dealing with really tough times.

23 MR. RUST: This is a very important issue. I mean, the DOT has not been
24 substantively or substantially updated, I think, since Jimmy Carter was president.
25 Sometimes, 1979 sounds like a long time ago when you start talking about how many

1 administrations back it was. It makes it even a more dramatic thing as to just how
2 dated the DOT is now and how badly we need to have the tool updated.

3 This is an important project, and if I can -- one of the things, for instance, I
4 noticed that Sylvia mentioned that her math statistician is now working closely with the
5 project. Those are internal resources I have within ORDP that we can, you know, share
6 and bring to bear here. So we're doing those things that we can do internally to help
7 support the project.

8 I would urge all of you, I mean, I think it's important to keep the project
9 moving, give the project some momentum. You've been doing that, but I think you want
10 to step that up a little bit because during a period of transition, I think you ought to be
11 able to show progress and momentum and so forth. That would be my best advice. Keep
12 doing what you're doing and do it a little faster with a little less money.

13 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for all your efforts. I think that it
14 has been really helpful to the project, and I appreciate you coming all the times you have
15 come in the past and today to address us. We really appreciate it. Thank you.

16 MR. RUST: We appreciate the work of all the people around the -- any
17 other questions before I run for the door?

18 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, David and David. Sylvia. And we
19 are being reminded by the Court Reporter to speak into the mic and to announce our
20 names. I think maybe the audience is having a hard time hearing us so if you could speak
21 into the mic that would be great. Sylvia. Actually, Shanan, I think was about to ask a
22 question so let me go ahead and have Shanan ask her question, and we'll go on with other
23 questions.

24 DR. GIBSON: Shanan Gibson who can't reach her mic. Actually, David
25 gave me a wonderful segway because the question I was coming to plays nicely off his.

1 First, I want to say that I personally was very impressed with the nature
2 of how the DEC study was performed not just in terms of the outcomes but in terms of
3 the documentation which you made note of which will certainly facilitate what I'm about
4 to point out.

5 My only concern looking at the current status of the DEC, and I obviously
6 know it is not complete, is that when they were engaging in the filtering process, one of
7 the criteria for filtering items off the list was does not apply to disability adjudication and
8 I think the, or does not apply basically. My concern is that does not apply now does not
9 necessarily mean does not apply in the future so I just want to make certain that the entire
10 list is maintained so that when it goes forward to your consultants, they can think of in
11 terms of it may not be applicable now, but it might still be worth reconsidering which I
12 think kind of dovetails with what David was saying as well.

13 Because some things were certainly removed from the list because they're
14 like the weather and nebulous and can't be identified. But other things might have been
15 removed simply because they do not apply or aren't applicable, and I would just caution
16 that not applicable now based on current disability evaluation doesn't mean they may
17 never be applicable or not relevant to work. But because it's all documented in the
18 criterion which were used to filter are there, it's really easy to go back. That was just one
19 of my please be aware comments.

20 But since I have the mic, I'm going to follow it up with the second
21 question.

22 MS. KARMAN: Can I --

23 DR. GIBSON: Sure.

24 MS. KARMAN: Before you go to the second thing, the first, to respond
25 to your admonition.

1 I think the criterion that you're referring to maybe is not relevant. So
2 first of all, they're not, we speak of the filtering process, you know, the results of that
3 being things that were removed so it's just a figure of speech. I mean, they're indicated
4 as the program and operational experts in our Agency have reviewed them and
5 determined through these criteria which would be evident certainly in other, you know,
6 the three criteria that were used would be there in the background material. So they
7 would be identified as not put forward.

8 That doesn't mean that one could not look at the full classified list or even
9 forget the classification and just go back to the inventory, the first starting point and look
10 at that. So that's available. It's not as if they disappear which I think, you know, is a big
11 feature in what we, that was one of the elements, guiding principles if you would, of the
12 DEC methodology in the first place was that you would have from start to finish a sort of
13 a running history of what had happened, what is the disposition which I think will also be
14 very important for us when we get into taxonomy development because then we will have
15 something, I think, similar on the taxonomic side where you would be able to see what
16 had been tested.

17 For example, what was originally started with, what ended up in an
18 instrument, which kind of instrument and what measures and scales were tested with it,
19 what were the results, what was the decision. If the decision was that this particular
20 measure and scale wasn't a good way to go, try something different.

21 So in other words, from the very beginning of the Panel's work with the
22 Agency from the starting point of SSA's current regulatory policy all the way through to
23 the, you know, whatever version of the OIS, you're going to have that running history.
24 Anyway, there we are.

25 DR. GIBSON: No, I wasn't disputing that it exists, and I was actually,

1 that was my point. I like that it exists and I just see that as being something to carry
2 forward.

3 I actually look at it as one of the really nice manifestations of the
4 development of your business process and adherence to it is that you have created this
5 documentation, and it's all there and captured. So I very much like that. As David
6 Weaver noted, it generates a lot of paper, we know, so that's good.

7 But, second question, or actually I'm just going to ask if you would
8 reconsider, or would you consider answering the question that Tom posed to
9 David Rust regarding your views as the office director on how things going forward may
10 impact the scope and the strategy of your efforts?

11 MS. KARMAN: Well, I certainly would, you know, I think that given the
12 uncertainty that the entire federal government, the entire executive branch is dealing with
13 in terms of it's funding and then having to make decisions about priorities, I think that
14 what may end up being things where we could possibly see an effect so what might be
15 the symptom. If you were watching the project, what might be a symptom.

16 One symptom may be that a particular activity may not be moving forward
17 as quickly because we need to be focusing on directing a lot of our resources either in
18 terms of funding or in terms of staffing or other resources that we may be bringing in
19 externally, for example, our work with OPM, you know, when we get the inter-Agency
20 agreement up.

21 Depending on what actually is going to be the outcome of the next budget
22 cycle, that might require David Rust to ask his associate commissioners to make some
23 changes in what they're planning on doing, what they're planning on spending and so
24 that might mean we will have to move one thing forward whereas another thing may have
25 to set to the side.

1 And in the case of our development of the OIS, since so much of what
2 we're needing to do is interrelated so, you know, I know we've had discussion about
3 taxonomy development, and we've looked at some sampling questions, sampling issues,
4 these things do run somewhat not exactly concurrently, but they do run together. So
5 where things need to be together, that might slow something down overall because you
6 just simply can't bring all that you need to, to bear on the activity.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: John has a question.

8 DR. CRESWELL: John Creswell. First of all, thanks for your report,
9 Sylvia.

10 I'm curious about the last item on your report, Call 003, where you're
11 interviewing different federal agencies, and you're learning about what instruments they
12 use and how they transmit data and what protocols.

13 It seems to me that that falls into the area of data collection, and I'm
14 curious about how that will intersect with what Abigail has now been asked to do to head
15 up a data collection subgroup from this Panel.

16 Will there be some coordination that will go over, go on during the next
17 couple of months between what you're learning from these federal agencies and what
18 Abigail's been asked to do?

19 MS. KARMAN: Yes. In fact, it is an integral starting point for us, a
20 critical starting point,
21 Call 003, in the examination of a variety of protocols that others use in what we consider
22 to be substantial or extensive survey processes or data collection efforts so some of things
23 that we had asked ICF to investigate certainly involve not so much the instrument
24 development. So you're correct, John, that this does really focus on the process for how
25 does an agency go out and collect the information and bring it back and what are all the

1 different features that we would need to be examining.

2 For example, some federal agencies have whole infrastructures already in
3 place. Are those infrastructures something that we want to either piggyback on or
4 mimic? Certainly, those have gone forward and done this kind of work as ETA has done
5 with O*NET, as BLS does with the OES, Census with ACS, for example. All of that is
6 lessons learned for us because they do this, they do it well and they've been doing it for
7 many years so, you know, it certainly no point for us to reinvent the wheel.

8 Given our business process, certainly one thing that I can see happening as
9 a result of Call 003 would be that as we get certainly the draft report, for example, from
10 ICF International, we would be sharing that draft report with members of the Panel.
11 Typically, we make that, certainly, we go to the subcommittee that is most involved with
12 it or most, for whom it may be most relevant because we certainly recognize that all of
13 you do not do this full time as we do.

14 We try to minimize the footprint, so to speak, the impact that we might
15 have with our work on your day-to-day lives. But in your roles as a Panel, you may see
16 all of the documents so we can certainly make them all available to the entire Panel.

17 In this case, we may well make it available to the whole Panel because
18 there is so much crosswalk between or crossing between data collection, methodologies
19 and processes as well as their implications for some aspects of taxonomy in terms of
20 instrumentation, certainly sampling so almost everything that's going on in our work that
21 is mirrored in the subcommittees would be touching the Call 003 results.

22 And then as we're moving forward, we'll be looking at the implications of
23 the work that ICF has done, you know, what are the key features that we should be
24 paying attention to. I think that's where we may be having some business process
25 consultation with the group.

1 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom.

2 MR. HARDY: Good morning, Sylvia. A quick question or two about the
3 RFI that's out there. I know that's closing today so I don't want to tread into that area too
4 deeply. Will we as Panel members be getting copies of any responses to the RFI?

5 MS. KARMAN: I would have to check with our Office of Acquisition
6 and Grants so I don't know the answer to that.

7 MR. HARDY: I would just like to put it out there that I'm asking for
8 review if it's possible. In reading the RFI, there's a couple of things that came up for me,
9 but again, I'm trying to not tread into things too much.

10 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

11 MR. HARDY: Yes.

12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I think we've been given direction that we
13 cannot talk about the RFI by OAG on the public record.

14 MR. HARDY: Okay, so not even with a hypothetical question? I'm fine
15 with that if that's the answer.

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I think we need to have direction from our DFO
17 on this.

18 MR. HARDY: Okay, thank you.

19 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And we could come back to that, but I think we
20 need to get direction on that. Thank you. Is there another question? Okay, Juan.

21 DR. SANCHEZ: I probably should have asked the deputy commissioner,
22 but it just occurred to me. But to some extent, we had this conversation with him. It's
23 more of a comment.

24 I know that at this time, it's easier to add temporary resources such as
25 consultants or more Panel members than to add permanent staff. Sometimes I wonder

1 simply because it's easier. I think it gets done more often. And I wonder what's the
2 return on the investment. And I tend to think that the return on the investment for the
3 pace of the project is probably much higher when we add internal resources.

4 I guess it's just a, I'm thinking out loud simply because something is
5 easier perhaps it shouldn't be done more often than what perhaps at this time not consider
6 appropriate or is more difficult because of the hiring freeze.

7 But on the other hand, it has, I think, a much more profound impact on the
8 pace with which the project moves. And I know it's not truly something that you could
9 answer, but it's just a thought that I think it's probably a good idea that it goes on record.

10 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan.

11 DR. GIBSON: Since I've gotten another segway here, I'm going to play
12 off Juan's comments. And, again, this is just a statement to the internal working group.
13 It comes as no surprise, I think, that I do believe that given the current economic
14 situation, the continued need for additional human resources on the project and the
15 direction of the efforts as described by Deputy Commissioner Rust and Sylvia, I think it's
16 logical that the Agency may need to seek additional outside manpower to further this
17 project. As such, I think I just want to publicly state some things that which others might
18 feel are self-evident issues.

19 I believe it's vital that the Agency set and protect the strategic direction of
20 this project. It is imperative that all design decisions related to the OIS be made
21 internally to ensure that it's going to meet SSA's adjudicative needs and to protect the
22 integrity of your outcomes.

23 As it relates to the development of the work taxonomy, in particular,
24 which is foundational to this project, I continue to strongly suggest internal development
25 of the structure and higher order or content constructs.

1 In all endeavors, scrutiny and oversight by your lead scientists,
2 extensive collaboration with your existing IO consultants, adherence to the business
3 model protocol that's been established and been shown to be highly effective, and
4 continuous attention to those standards that ensure scientific integrity and legal
5 defensibility have to be the minimum precautions whether you're working with other
6 agencies, outside contract labor or any other group.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Shanan. I think that was important.
8 Are there other questions or comments for Sylvia? I have some.

9 As probably a lot of people in this audience know, I'm a big advocate of
10 the OIS R&D plan, and I refer to it often. I have it up here on my iPad, and I'm looking
11 at page 52 which is my little Gantt chart 'cause I'm very visual.

12 So I'm looking through the Gantt chart, and I'm also, I have before me the
13 GAO testimony on Tuesday on the modernization of SSA disability programs, the
14 preliminary observations on updates of medical and occupational criteria, the statement
15 by Daniel Bertoni.

16 And he mentions in here, and it's part of the plan, an investigation of
17 existing OISs. And what he mentions here on page 13 is that the investigation of existing
18 Occupational Information Systems now completed has resulted in useful information
19 about design issues other organizations have confronted and mitigated when completing
20 their own systems.

21 Then going to the project website, I see there are a variety of documents
22 up there. Is that a document that is going to be available to the public?

23 MS. KARMAN: Thank you, Mary. Yes, it is. In fact, it should be up
24 there, but we just recently completed it and I think we shared it with GAO a couple of
25 weeks ago so we put it up there.

1 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I'm kind of going through my checklist here,
2 and I see that Calls 001 and 002 from my CF are up on the website. I know that Call 003,
3 they haven't provided the report on that yet. Is that something eventually that will be on
4 the website as well?

5 MS. KARMAN: I can see where it would be, I mean, it would make sense
6 to have that there. In fact, I think once we get to a certain point, we may end up with a
7 room on the website that has latest reports organized in a certain fashion because it's
8 going to become unwieldy to just to look at this long list.

9 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: You mentioned the legal standards that were
10 going through final review. I know the scientific standards are up on the website. Will
11 the legal standards eventually make it up to the website as well?

12 MS. KARMAN: I think we will be working with our general counsel on
13 what information Social Security would want to put up on a public website with regard to
14 that. Certainly it's our intent to have some description of what the legal standards would
15 be, yes.

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Then Occ-Med-Voc, I know there are several
17 PowerPoints that we have on our website. And I know that there's, the staff's probably
18 tired of us asking about it, but there's a lot of interest on this Panel because it's such an
19 important study. I know that you said the quality reviews will be completed in the next
20 couple of weeks.

21 Again, will that eventually be a study that will be available to the public?

22 MS. KARMAN: So with regard to outcomes of our studies where there
23 are a quantifiable data, I certainly would, we would want to have the quality assurance
24 completed, I would want the data analysis to be completed. The presentations that we
25 have given on the initial level results is, and I know you all are aware of this, but for

1 those listening or in the audience who may not be aware, a lot of the presentations
2 we've been given on it have been on preliminary results from the analysis.

3 I think that it certainly would make sense for us to be able to share the
4 Phase IV paper, put that up on the website when that is completed.

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I think I'm done with the checklist as I'm
6 looking at my little Gantt chart, but then I want to pull back now to the whole OIS R&D
7 plan in and of itself. I think that for those of us who read it several times and since July,
8 since it was posted publicly, we recognize that it's a moving document, that it is
9 supposed to be updated on an annual basis.

10 As I look at the document and particularly page 53 on the Gantt chart and
11 the activities that have emerged within SSA over the last several months, how has
12 globally, I know you probably cannot identify specifically, the OIS R&D plan changed
13 and has the scope upon which that plan is developed changed?

14 MS. KARMAN: I'll go from larger to more specific.

15 So the scope has not changed in terms of what you're seeing in the plan. I
16 think that as we get through a number of the activities that we're working on now which
17 will, in fact, help us to be more specific about what actual changes may be in the
18 timeline, what sequencing of activities maybe, there may be some changes in terms of
19 how we would move forward with some of the work that we're doing.

20 For example, because it's a paper plan, when we describe design decisions
21 which I think is in Section 4(h). Yeah, it's sad, isn't it, that if I know what that is.

22 We talk about it in one section as if it happens linearly that point and then
23 other things occur after that and were, in fact, there are design decisions that need to be
24 made throughout the life of the research and development, and I think it was Shanan who
25 alluded to the need for us to have that, those decisions being made in house.

1 Point being, when we get to more specifics about taxonomic
2 development, instrument development, what next steps we would need to be taking in
3 terms of sampling, is there any work that we need to be doing right off the bat at the same
4 time with data collection. So there's, so it's kind of like a starting line for, you know,
5 with all the cars lined up and you get them going down the roadway.

6 And I can see where, for example, I used design decisions as an example
7 of where there may be points at which certain activities need to stand still for a moment
8 while you're dealing through that before you can go to the next level.

9 What that means then in terms of its impact on the timeline, I'm not sure
10 at this moment so I can't really address that other than to say some things may be moving
11 along at the same point and pace that's reflected in the Gantt chart. Some things may be
12 set aside until others have been done. But I think pretty much we're still heading in the
13 same direction and doing, you know, adhering to the same timeline. At least we're
14 looking at those dates that way.

15 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Other questions? David.

16 DR. SCHRETLEN: Sylvia, Shanan's carefully parsed words of
17 encouragement sparked a question in my mind, and I just don't know how much is
18 involved in this.

19 But my question is do you think given existing resources or with some
20 configuration of existing internal resources and consultants that Social Security could
21 develop the taxonomy in house? Do you think it's feasible?

22 MS. KARMAN: I think these things are feasible. I think that at this point,
23 I'm not sure that it would be efficient or wise to do that because we have a number of
24 things that are irons in the fire, so to speak, that we're waiting on. For example, the inter-
25 agency agreement with the Office of Personnel Management.

1 When Dr. Papinshock joined our staff, after a couple of months, you
2 know, and our discussions became evident that it would be valuable for us in moving the
3 work forward in taxonomy, for example, if we were to be able to bring on at least on a
4 temporary basis individuals with extensive experience in Industrial Organizational
5 psychology. And hence, the outreach to OPM as a starting point for that. Certainly we
6 have two IO consultants as well.

7 So in order to sort of set up the critical team that might be working with
8 her and our staff on these structures, so to speak, for the taxonomy, we were even at that
9 point looking at bringing folks on board to help us with that. Obviously, OPM is where
10 that is at this stage.

11 I guess it kind of comes down to for me define in house because even if
12 we bring others on board to work with us, we have to be in the driver's seat. A senior
13 research psychologist needs to be the technical lead for that work and because we do
14 have a business process, our agency stakeholder components will have input as it's
15 relevant moving through as would others that we work with in some cases.

16 I think also, just a note on the business process, I work hard to not have
17 the business process turn into something that's bureaucratic. I know you guys would be
18 very appreciative of that given the fact that you do have a lot of other work that you need
19 to be doing.

20 As we develop each Phase document or as we're developing in the case of
21 taxonomy the initial methodology for structure, for example, we would want to be going
22 to selected sources possibly where we think it's going to be vital to ask for consultation
23 or to perhaps review a document or a section of the document or something that we
24 haven't, or just to have a discussion with us.

25 So I think that no matter how it's configured, we are very much, we're

1 going to continue to work the way we work which is to have that interdependency or
2 intercollaboration with other federal agencies and with other entities that we work with
3 including yourselves.

4 I guess that's a long answer to -- I think in house is how we need it to be.
5 So in other words, what resources can we bring to bear to help us with this work and
6 regardless of whether, you know, all the resources are actually literally reporting to me or
7 whether they're reporting elsewhere, but they are working with us, it's still, the seed of it
8 has to be in house.

9 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom.

10 MR. HARDY: I truly forgot, I can't remember, and you probably already
11 answered this. The Disability Evaluation Constructs, when are you looking to be finished
12 with that? I honestly don't remember.

13 MS. KARMAN: And I may not have said. I think we are, I have a review
14 that I need to conduct so I'm maybe somewhat of a bottle neck at this point. But I do
15 know that the staff is preparing the Phase IV document or at least outlining pretty much
16 some of the salient features that came forth from the DEC in outlining the methodology
17 for Phase IV final paper.

18 So I think we're looking at probably like May before we'll have
19 something drafted.

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And I know that's a stimulus document from
21 what I understand for the development, for the IOs. Is that in any way going to be
22 publicized because I know it's right now
23 pre-decisional?

24 MS. KARMAN: So I guess it depends on when we get to a point where
25 we're ready to begin working with the, working with it in context. Some of the reasons

1 where we have not released it to date certainly one of the main reasons is it wasn't
2 finished. Well, yeah, it's a minor detail.

3 But the other thing is that I think it's going to be really important for us to
4 hold the DEC in context with other work that goes in the OIS development. I think at the
5 point at which it would be useful for us to be able to share that document and then
6 understandable and useful for others who might have an interest in it is if they were able
7 to see it in context with its use in taxonomy development as a stimulus.

8 At some point, we'll be putting it out there, I think, but it would be at the
9 stage where we have something to show or to describe at a minimum with regard to our
10 method for taxonomy so that you could really see where it comes into play because it
11 isn't, in effect, a stand-alone document. I mean, it is for us in our work, but in terms of, if
12 somebody were to visit the website and they see this without having the background of
13 what this serves as a stimulus and how that might work, I don't know that that would be
14 helpful to people.

15 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Any other questions? I think at
16 this point, I will during the break follow up on Tom's question to look at where we can
17 go with that, what the question was and what we can say under OAG or not say so we
18 may come back after the break. But let's go ahead and take a 15-minute break and come
19 back at 10 --

20 (OFF THE RECORD)

21 (ON THE RECORD)

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I'm going to ask the Panel -- I think during the
23 break, the staff was able to move some of the mics closer, and we've been asked to
24 directly speak into the mic.

25 A couple of other notes associated with that. This is a meeting where like

1 all our public meetings, a transcript is being developed. We have four past meetings
2 uploaded, I think most of the transcripts are up there now and so there will be a transcript
3 of this meeting if you wanted to refer to that in the future.

4 So during the break, we also explored the issue of the RFI. I understand
5 that there were just some things there that developed general questions for Tom, and he
6 wasn't speaking specifically about the RFI or provisions of that RFI. And so I would ask
7 Sylvia to maybe come back up and address the questions that Tom had.

8 MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mary. Can you people hear now? Can you
9 hear me now? I feel like I'm on a commercial.

10 A question that's been kind of floating around in my mind as we keep
11 moving along in the process here is one is regarding data collection. Can you speak to
12 data collection in a broad or more specific way regarding your thoughts regarding data
13 collection either in person or utilizing incumbent surveys over the net or things like that,
14 and what you see is utility and what you see as a reason for choosing one over the other?

15 MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia Karman. We are interested in pursuing a
16 number of things with data collection and certainly I think some of this will come forth
17 from our interactions with other federal agencies who've done this kind of work, this
18 work being surveying, doing large national surveys and data collection efforts.

19 As there are a number of different modes of data collection that are
20 selected for a variety of reasons, some of them have to do with efficiency, some of them
21 have to do with the practical reasons of how you may be able to gain access to an
22 establishment or not. But certainly we would first of all want to test any of the data
23 collection methods that we think might be useful in our process.

24 And we also recognize that there may be instances in which we would
25 need to use a certain data collection method or want to not have another data collection

1 method just by virtue of the fact that there are types of occupations that may not lend
2 themselves to having incumbents complete a survey either because the occupation may
3 be one in which the incumbents are not in a position to complete a survey so you may be
4 wanting to speak with a supervisor perhaps, or you may have a circumstance where, you
5 know, we have certain kinds of data that might be observable. Other kinds of
6 information that isn't observable I think pretty much you could follow me around all day
7 and not really be able to do much with that information other than I talk a lot and I sit in
8 meetings.

9 In any case, where I'm going with this is that I think that we need to be
10 prepared to test each of the types of data collection modes that would be useful for our
11 project and then also be in a position to say, you know, what is the data quality that
12 comes from that, what are the practical considerations that emerge that we may not have
13 realized would be what they are even with the background that we're getting on data
14 collection methodologies from other federal agencies and entities.

15 I don't know if that answers your question.

16 MR. HARDY: It does, thank you. And I have one more and then I
17 promise to cede the floor. And this is kind of an ill-formed question, and I'm not sure,
18 I'll do my best.

19 As we work forward in trying to do the evaluation criteria and we're
20 looking at what we're going to try and measure that's going to populate the OIS, can you
21 speak to not necessarily the physical because I think physical remains one of our easier
22 topics to work on, but for those non-physical pieces that we're going to have to look at
23 some point and in some way.

24 What are your thoughts on that? And I'm leaving it very broadly based
25 for you.

1 MS. KARMAN: I think this is exactly one of the many, myriad of
2 reasons that we have needed to go to Industrial Organizational psychologists to assist us.

3 We know that we're going to want to have information related to
4 occupations regarding the amount of sitting, standing, walking. And some of the things
5 may have to do with positional types of things so the extent to which somebody needs to
6 bend down or stoop. But I think as we get into other areas of information, it would be
7 helpful for Social Security's Disability Evaluation, that's, you know, we need to have the
8 IOs really be in a position to advise us with regard to the best ways for us to reflect the
9 demands of work that would be non-exertional including the mental-cognitive aspects of
10 work.

11 For example, are there tasks that are required by the job that are, you
12 know, can be associated with certain kinds of elements such as attention, social
13 interactions, these kinds of things.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions? Thank you, Sylvia, we
15 appreciate your entertaining our questions in your report.

16 MS. KARMAN: Thank you.

17 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: At this point, we'll start a series of reports by
18 the subcommittees, and I would like to introduce Janine Holloman who will provide the
19 report on the User Needs and Relations Subcommittee.

20 MS. HOLLOMAN: Thank you, Mary. This is Janine Holloman.

21 We have had one meeting since the last report and that was March 21st of
22 2012. Our summary of activity since the last report, two of our Panel members are
23 Chair Mary Barros-Bailey and I have given presentations to stakeholder organizations
24 this period.

25 Ms. Barros-Bailey and OVRD Director, Sylvia Karman, presented at the

1 International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals Forensic Conference in
2 November. I gave a presentation at the Michigan Rehabilitation Conference as well as
3 giving a presentation to students in the Rehabilitation Counseling Masters Program at
4 Michigan State University. Both of these presentations were in October 2011.

5 Regarding future activities, presentations are scheduled in April for the
6 National Association of Disability Representatives and for the Michigan Association of
7 Rehabilitation Professionals in May.

8 At the March 21st meeting, we discussed with the SSA project staff
9 upcoming projects and activities that include the SSA staff assisting presenters with
10 information and materials that are accurate and vetted for future presentations,
11 conducting follow-up meetings with the subcommittee and SSA staff post-presentations,
12 assisting in the development of future training workshops, and development of readily
13 available information on the project website in either written or video form to ensure
14 consistency of information.

15 Any questions?

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I have a question. I always have questions.

17 And the last bit of what you reported on in terms of the project staff relates
18 to what Sylvia had in her report in terms of usability-related activities. And I know that
19 the subcommittee has representatives from a variety of user groups so you have an ALJ,
20 you have a retired ALJ, you have a claimant rep, a non-attorney and attorney, and you
21 have a VE or former VE there.

22 Do you have any thoughts in terms of ways that the subcommittee could
23 contribute to that particular aspect of the project based on yesterday's conversation?

24 MS. HOLLOMAN: Well, yeah, and based on what these workshops
25 might be discussing or trying to identify. The fact that all of us are either current or

1 former people working in the field, I think we can give a significant amount of insight
2 as they develop the workshop components. We are current users or former users of the
3 current system and the system after it's developed.

4 So, yes, I can see the expertise being valuable to the workgroups as they
5 develop these workshops because we know what's there that works well, we know what's
6 there that doesn't work well, and what we would like to see in the future as this moves
7 forward.

8 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Janine. Any other input from any
9 other subcommittee member? Questions? Okay. Thank you. Deb Lechner is as I
10 announced at the beginning of the meeting not here today, and she did submit comments
11 from her review of Call 001 and Call 002 to the staff. In terms of a formal report, that
12 subcommittee has not met during this period except for yesterday for a very short amount
13 of time to discuss the status of Call 003.

14 One of the things that Sylvia had mentioned during her presentation earlier
15 was that some times there are activities that are moving forward faster than others
16 depending on the dynamic process of this. Field job analyst is a type of data collection.
17 It needed a lot of hyper focus during some past periods. And at this point until there's an
18 instrument and better information that can be articulated and decided, it has been
19 inactive, fairly inactive over the last few months, but it will become active again. There
20 is, that is the extent of that report.

21 Are there any questions? I know there are several members of that
22 subcommittee around the table. Are there any questions from the Panel to the
23 subcommittee in general? Okay.

24 Next on the list, it was going to be after lunch, but it's being moved
25 forward is, actually, it wasn't going to be after lunch, it was on the record. Go ahead,

1 Shanana, for Taxonomy and Instrumentation Subcommittee report.

2 DR. GIBSON: Yes, just the next page not after lunch.

3 As SSA has continued its internal efforts to draft its strategic direction and
4 design of the OIS taxonomy, very few activities have occurred that have actually
5 included all members of the committee prior to our meeting on March 20th.

6 However, individual members have been contributing on as needed basis
7 to the efforts of the OVRD staff and, specifically, we provided feedback regarding the
8 numerous works in progress that you've heard about today as part of Sylvia's director's
9 report.

10 At our meeting on March 20th, the subcommittee was briefed by OVRD's
11 lead scientist and staff regarding those ongoing efforts as they relate to the development
12 of the OIS taxonomy and work analysis instrument.

13 Going forward between now and the next quarterly Taxonomy
14 Instrumentation Subcommittee meeting, we look forward to several activities or so we
15 hope. We hope to provide feedback on any taxonomy-related projects crafted within
16 OVRD. We look forward to continued review and consultation regarding products
17 resulting from the efforts of the two Industrial and Organizational psychologists who are
18 working as consultants as part of OVRD.

19 We look forward to provide input toward the development of any future
20 Calls to contractors that might occur, and we look forward to continued work with the
21 newly hired lead research psychologist and the entire OVR team in any manner that
22 hopefully facilitates their efforts.

23 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any questions in terms of the activities of
24 taxonomy? I know this is a pretty important aspect, hugely important aspect of the
25 development of the OIS. Abigail.

1 DR. PANTER: This is Abigail Panter. I was just wondering if the
2 committee had any views about how the DEC was coming along with respect to the
3 taxonomy enterprise.

4 DR. GIBSON: I don't know that I'm in a position to speak for the entire
5 subcommittee on this because we didn't discuss it in that specific vein.

6 I think I have been pretty clear and that I'm very pleased with the progress
7 on the DEC and the methodology that they've utilized for documenting their movement
8 toward it.

9 I think what you may be asking me to comment on though is perhaps to go
10 into what Tom asked about in terms of the use of the DEC as it will inform the taxonomy.
11 And I can only speculate there, but I do think it's an integral part of that process,
12 whoever, internal, external, combination thereof, in house that's developing the
13 overarching structure of the taxonomy needs a foundational understanding of those
14 construct areas which are essential to Disability Evaluation.

15 You have to have, if you will, a benchmark against which to build. I have
16 also consistently cautioned though that I believe that whatever work taxonomy is
17 developed must be comprehensive in nature. Although I see the DEC as integral to it and
18 benchmarking, I see it as a minimum standard is would be my hope for the actual
19 overarching taxonomy. And other members may agree or disagree with that thought
20 process.

21 DR. PANTER: Thank you.

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom.

23 MR. HARDY: As part of the work of the Taxonomy Subcommittee, are
24 you guys in any way thinking about or addressing the non-physical demands from your
25 chair?

1 DR. GIBSON: At this time, we have not been tasked with looking into
2 that beyond the fact the Taxonomy Subcommittee sits in waves and hopes to help
3 develop the entire taxonomy or to work, no, let me rephrase that. We do not want to
4 develop the taxonomy. Please do not misunderstand. I'm very sorry.

5 We absolutely want to facilitate their efforts as they do this in house and
6 provide whatever expertise we can in that domain.

7 MR. WAKSHUL: This is Andy Wakshul. I want to echo what you said.
8 Your summary is very good, but certainly non-physical demands are as important as
9 physical demands in Disability Evaluation. And to leave that, that's one of the major
10 flaws in the DOT that we have to address. That certainly is important even if we haven't
11 focused on it in our meetings.

12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: The elephant in the room, right? Any other
13 questions or comments? John.

14 DR. CRESWELL: John Creswell. So as you look at the current DEC, do
15 you see that the mental activities are being included within the broader framework of the
16 types of functional activities that are included on that list right now?

17 DR. GIBSON: Short of opening my notebook and refreshing my memory
18 on what's yellow and what's not yellow on the highlighting at this time, I do know that
19 the DEC is derived from a comprehensive listing which included physical and cognitive
20 because the input came from the Panel subcommittees, the outside input providers and
21 groups. So they were there, therefore, they are there in some format or another. Whether
22 or not they are the right ones or adequate ones, I can't speak to, but they were certainly
23 part of the original DEC based on how it was created.

24 DR. SCHRETLEN: I'd like to add that I know that all of the constructs
25 that came out of the Mental-Cognitive Subcommittee's deliberations were included in the

1 DEC list of constructs including things we recommended that Social Security consider
2 as well as things we didn't. So they're all there. It's a very inclusive list.

3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions for Taxonomy and
4 Instrumentation? Go ahead, David.

5 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes, I have a question, and it's just to, because this is
6 so far outside the scope of my background and expertise, I'm just curious. How much
7 work is involved in designing a taxonomy? Is this something that a couple of IO
8 psychologists could sequester themselves in a windowless room and do in six months, or
9 is it going to take a year or three months, I just don't know, is it going to take an army?

10 DR. GIBSON: I think the answer to that is that it is always context
11 dependent. If this, if we had a private organization which was headed by two
12 IO psychologists who wanted to craft their own occupational evaluation, a job analysis
13 instrument, and had to create a taxonomy obviously to base that job analysis on. They
14 could sit in their room, they could decide what constructs they thought were appropriate
15 for inclusive, and yes, they could probably hammer it out in six months.

16 The problem we have is that I see the context here is terribly different.
17 That SSA in developing their taxonomy has a whole series of constraints and situational
18 variables that no private group would have to encounter or deal with.

19 So I don't know that I can put a timeline on what's appropriate given their
20 staffing resources, the multitude of activities their staff is focused on besides just being
21 locked in a room to create the taxonomy, the levels of expertise within that group which
22 they're seeking to increase from various sources.

23 I'm afraid that I think it is going to be a highly time consuming aspect of it
24 because it will never be the one and only activity they are consumed with. It can't be. It
25 is foundational. But these other activities have to also be going on at the same time to

1 move the project forward.

2 So I don't think it can be quick in their case. Hypothetically in a different
3 situation, sure.

4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Juan.

5 DR. SANCHEZ: This is Juan Sanchez. I'm not on the Instrumentation
6 Subcommittee, but I guess I have an opinion on this.

7 My experience is that taxonomies, right, and we know this, taxonomies are
8 everywhere. We do have pre-existing taxonomies on human abilities that are used in
9 different instruments like O*NET and many others. And I think developing the
10 taxonomy honestly is not the issue.

11 I think what the issue is, is developing a measurement of those constructs
12 of those human abilities because what we know from experience is that when you ask
13 somebody estimate, for example, how much -- ability people go flexibility of closure,
14 believe it or not. There's another one called speed of closure. Now, you ask somebody
15 will you please estimate how much flexibility of closure does this job have and when
16 they do that, you tell them now estimate the speed of closure. Well, not surprisingly,
17 their estimates are very -- to the point that somebody may say well, they are probably
18 judging the same thing because the definition of the construct is so fine grained that
19 people have difficulties coming up with independent judgments.

20 So I think the challenge is to come up with reliable valued measurement of
21 those taxons, I think is the term. But the theory, it's out there. How to come up with a
22 good measure is going to be a challenge, and how to do it effectively and with limited
23 resources, it's even more difficult.

24 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Allan.

25 DR. HUNT: Let me just ask. Given, we know this process is not yet

1 complete and we've seen some work in process, but are you are satisfied with the
2 classification and filtering that's gone on so far based upon the limited exposure that you
3 have?

4 DR. GIBSON: First, I want to, first, I'll speak to the classification.

5 I think there are many arguments that could be made about what the
6 ultimate classifying higher-level order factor should have been. The factors they chose
7 were derived from their policy as they currently exist, and I think that is as defensible of a
8 classification scheme as they probably could elicit. So from that, I have no problem.

9 In terms of the methodology that they utilized for the classification, it was
10 well delineated. They worked towards a structured means of innovator (phonetic)
11 agreement. The actual process was developed in consultation with one of their IO
12 consultants. I have no problems whatsoever with the classification scheme and how it
13 was carried out.

14 I think the filtering that is being done and in process is being well
15 documented. My only concerns, once again, come to how we handle ultimately the
16 things that are classified as not relevant because of the implications that it could have.
17 But I see no reason to fear that it's not going to be handled well.

18 So, yes, in sum, I am happy with where they are currently going and how
19 they're doing it.

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: John.

21 DR. CRESWELL: John Creswell. So what's been done at this point is to
22 come up with a classification, a rather inclusive list of constructs. But I'm not sure that I
23 understand how we move from constructs to taxonomy.

24 Just in terms of your expertise and advice, does a taxonomy consist of
25 broad constructs, definitions, scales? What would go into a good taxonomy?

1 DR. GIBSON: There are so many different ways to answer this, and I
2 should just defer to one and let him take it.

3 But I think what I'm going to say is that a taxonomy is composed of
4 taxons. Taxons represent those attributes of work you wish to know more about.
5 Attributes of work can be written at various levels of specificity, some more macro which
6 would be certainly at the construct level, some much more specific which we would
7 probably at a certain point actually refer to as items which will be used for collecting data
8 points.

9 In terms of what I think goes, and those items are measured with scales
10 and measures which you mentioned. As far as what goes in the taxonomy, the taxonomy
11 is those taxons at which ever level they are currently defined from macro to micro and at
12 some point, they move from being taxons to being written up as items. I would draw the
13 line there. I would say the items are not part of the taxonomy. The items are written to
14 measure those constructs that are taxons. But I think it is purely a hypothetical line that
15 others may or may not agree with.

16 But it should be to me the taxonomy is all attributes of work you are
17 interesting and learning more about in some way, shape or form, measuring. He's going
18 to disagree.

19 DR. SANCHEZ: No, I'm supposed to say something.

20 Going back to the issue of abilities. In your analysis has been always a
21 dilemma when we judge human attributes that are needed for performance, right, what
22 we call in psychology constructs as you know.

23 Do we ask our subject-matter experts, for example, our job incumbents to
24 get those human attributes directly, or do we ask them to tell us about work activities that
25 they perform? And then somebody else, right, makes the judgment, makes that

1 inferential leap because that inferential leap of going from work activities to deciding
2 what human attributes are needed sometimes is not that easy to make. Sometimes job
3 incumbents are not really well equipped to make that leap.

4 So when you ask people tell me how much tolerance for stress does your
5 job need on a scale from one to seven, maybe people say well, this is the only job I ever
6 had, it seems very important to me so I think it deserves a seven. And some people tell
7 you well, I thought you were the psychologist and you were being paid for this.

8 What I'm saying is that's another question that the subcommittee needs to
9 resolve, and I think the entire Panel needs to perhaps advise on what would be best.

10 Some of the consultants that SSA has hired think that we should collect
11 data only on work activities and then have a system to develop the human attribute
12 requirements ourselves through other means, through mechanical means, through
13 statistical means. And there are other folks who will think we could actually ask people
14 to estimate abilities directly like, for example, O*NET does that. Not job incumbents,
15 but they use experts.

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom and then Bob.

17 MR. HARDY: Tom Hardy. I appreciate everything you do and the
18 Taxonomy Committee 'cause I'm learning so much, and I understand now 'cause we've
19 talked about this for a long time task versus generalized work activity and how those two
20 stack and match.

21 This maybe a deliberation question, but I'm just trying to get some
22 information. How does the common metric or generalized work activity differ from
23 across occupational work descriptor? Are they all the same thing? It's really technical,
24 and I don't understand that. Can you explain it?

25 DR. GIBSON: They don't differ. If something utilizes a common metric,

1 it is, therefore, going to be cross-job relative. If you utilize a metric which is not
2 cross-job relative but which is specific to only a specific job, it won't be cross-job
3 relevant. So the terminology, it's just a different phrase for the same thing.

4 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Bob.

5 DR. FRASER: Bob Fraser. So the final taxonomy will drive the job
6 analysis approach or a combination of approaches. Is that right?

7 DR. GIBSON: I would think it would have to and along with other
8 considerations such as price and feasibility, but certainly a taxonomy drives items and
9 how you then collect data for those items in the most efficacious efficient manner drives
10 these other things. But it is a strategic aspect of that decision making and design process.

11 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: One more, Tom, go ahead.

12 MR. HARDY: -- don't get together that often. The Taxonomy
13 Subcommittee when looking at how, and again, we've talked about it in the past since it's
14 going to come up again in the future.

15 In looking at how you want to organize the information and we've talked a
16 bit about of top up, top down or bottom up, can you speak to that in generalities as to
17 your views on those data collection ordering systems, and how that might fit into future
18 work?

19 DR. GIBSON: I can honestly say I haven't had adequate time to
20 deliberate on the presentation that was given by the Sampling Subcommittee regarding
21 the two diverse methodologies. David might actually be able to speak to it better since
22 he's on the Taxonomy Subcommittee and did the top down, bottom up.

23 But I will say that based on my preferences for how to do job analysis and
24 the way I perceive, and again, I can't speak for the committee, the needs of SSA, I
25 believe the data collection will need to be top down.

1 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And I know we're getting into sampling
2 topics at this point which is our next subcommittee report after lunch so we might want to
3 hold off on that discussion until we get to that report. Go ahead, David.

4 DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes, so I have a question that's not on that, and it is
5 for those of you in the IO world and job analysis world, do we know sort of *a priori*
6 which constructs are going to be more difficult, are more susceptible to biases of
7 reporting whether it's reported by the employee or the supervisor? In other words, this is
8 sort of getting to the issue of job analysis and how items assess abilities that are or
9 demands of work that are in the taxonomy taxons.

10 When someone is asked how much do you have to lift in this job, one way
11 you could evaluate that is to actually see how much people who do that job can lift. But
12 you may not need to do that because people, this reporting may be accurate enough that
13 there's no need for that.

14 And I just wonder, is there an empirical literature out there that says well,
15 when it comes to lifting or pushing or pulling, people are very good at reporting; when it
16 comes to this, concentration, focus or something else, they're not good?

17 DR. GIBSON: I'm going to answer part of that and then I'm going to ask
18 Juan if he actually wants to talk about it 'cause he has a paper that he's doing that
19 actually kind of goes to this soon.

20 I was going to say that what we know from psychological literature in
21 general is that people make worse assessments under high levels of cognitive load. And
22 so that things that are easier to us as typically are more accurate and things that are more
23 nebulous and require a greater cognitive load when making these decisions tend to not be
24 as good. That part's pretty straight forward.

25 When you say they give good enough answers, that assumes that there is a

1 hard right and wrong. In some cases, it is easier, how much do you lift, there can be a
2 hard right and wrong because they're easily defined. Right or wrong, we can't always
3 assess in terms of job analysis, but there is some empirical literature out there that looks
4 at differences in what the ratings are.

5 In other words, that when it comes to the ratings on knowledge, skills and
6 ability, the ratings we get between incumbents and experts tend to be more different than
7 the ratings we get when it comes to assessing physical attributes.

8 So if difference is a concern, and it is, there's some literature out there on
9 that. If Juan wants to that, great, and if not, but I mean, that's what's there.

10 DR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, you know, I think we had a chapter in the Annual
11 Review of Psychologists, the first chapter in job analysis that was just published in
12 January so I'll be happy to send you a copy. You'll be the first one to -- the only one to -
13 -

14 In general, I agree with Shanan, and it has to do with what we said before.
15 People have, people without psychological training, right, not surprisingly have an easier
16 time judging things that are concrete such as the activities, the behaviors that they do. If
17 you ask them how much weight do you lift a day and how often do you lift it, you get
18 more inter-incumbent agreement which usually we take as a sign that they are telling us
19 the truth, right.

20 If you ask them tell me how much tolerance for stress does your job
21 require, and they say well, will you explain to me what you mean by that, it becomes --
22 because that's a construct. A construct, you know, the British was the word construct as
23 that's a lie, right, it's something that we construct because it's an explanation.

24 So we do have quite a bit of literature suggesting that it's more difficult to
25 get reliable ratings on human requirements on human attributes such as physical abilities,

1 mental abilities than it is to get attributes on activities. Activities you could call them
2 job behaviors, responsibilities, tasks.

3 And also the ratings that have to do with those such as frequency, duration
4 even importance which is slightly subjective, they tend to be more reliable than the
5 ratings that we get on human attributes not surprisingly which, you know, has a practical,
6 it's a practical issue because it has to do with what it is that we ask job incumbents and
7 what it is that, what decisions do we reserve for the job analysts or for this, you know,
8 there are ways to make those decisions in using, for example, a statistical means.

9 You could compute, you could regress attribute ratings on activity ratings
10 and get a multiple regression equation. And you could make mechanical estimations of
11 attributes based simply on the activity ratings. Some might say that that's more
12 objective, less subject to individual biases. So that's another question that the Panel and,
13 I guess, the SSA is facing.

14 The source, right, who gave us what information and are there certain
15 decisions that we reserve for job analysts and others are, you know, given to the
16 incumbents to make, the ones that are more objective and more concrete.

17 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions for Taxonomy and
18 Instrumentation? Okay.

19 We're running a little bit early about 15 minutes to the lunch, and I think
20 that Sampling's going to take longer than the 15 minutes with discussion and questions so
21 I'd like to keep it for after lunch.

22 I'm going to go ahead and keep the lunch scheduled to 12:30, and so if we
23 could take a break 'til 12:30 and resume here, and we will continue with the Sampling
24 Subcommittee then we'll have some time for deliberation.

25 We do have three organizations signed up for providing public comments.

1 We have a half hour for public comment. Each organization gets 10 minutes so that
2 will be a pretty full amount of time.

3 (OFF THE RECORD)

4 (ON THE RECORD)

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We have a quorum of members so I'm going to
6 go ahead and bring the meeting back to order.

7 I would like to introduce Allan Hunt who is the chair for the Sampling
8 Subcommittee and turn the meeting over to him for his report.

9 DR. HUNT: Thank you, Mary. The Sampling Subcommittee was formed
10 last fall with the reorganization and inherited some members from the Research
11 Subcommittee that had preceded it. Just so they can't deny responsibility, members are
12 Abigail, David, John, Juan and Pam. It's a good representation of different sectors and
13 different skill sets. I think it would be fair to say that we've had some very spirited
14 interactions including over the last couple of days which other Panel members have been
15 aware of.

16 I want to start with just a few words not a lot but to talk a little bit about
17 the two national databases that have been the focus of a lot of our thinking partly because
18 they represent such different strategies, and partly because they both represent essentially
19 linkages that SSA can make to databases that represent the jobs in the national economy
20 when you come to that point at
21 Step 4 or Step 5, and also because they constitute possible sampling frames that could be
22 used.

23 And also as you've heard if you were listening carefully to the bits and
24 pieces because SSA is actually talking to both of the producers of these surveys in terms
25 of what can we learn from your experience. I would like to think that at least some of that

1 was because of the spotlights that we shone on these.

2 So the Occupational Employment Statistics, or the OES in shorthand, is a
3 semi-annual survey of wage and salary workers so excluding the self employed. But it's
4 what we call the top down, an establishment survey that gathers information on the
5 occupations and in that case, the earnings of workers at those establishments.

6 So about 400,000 establishments are sampled each year in two waves, one
7 in the Spring and one in the Fall. And the estimates of employment are developed from
8 those responses for about 800 SOC occupations. It's a lot of detail, but it's nothing like
9 12,000 which the DOT standard set.

10 Those statistics are available basically at the five-digit level, both industry
11 and occupation, and constitute a potential benchmark against which SSA could measure
12 its results.

13 That survey also serves as a model because it's a joint undertaking of the
14 Bureau of Labor Statistics in the U.S. Department of Labor and state workforce agencies
15 out in the country who actually collect the data from the employers. So we've got both a
16 sampling frame and a sampling strategy here that constitute one potential model.

17 On the other hand, we also spent some time looking at the American
18 Community Survey which is fielded by the Bureau of the Census. Big contrast. That's a
19 survey of housing units and the people who live in those housing units including group
20 homes, by the way, which is an interesting wrinkle.

21 This is a major effort. There are approximately 3 million housing units
22 per year sampled, but it is if you're familiar with census work, it does consist of, in the
23 first instance, a survey mailed to those housing units. There are second and third waves
24 constituted by telephone or even face-to-face contact to get the relatively complete
25 response rates.

1 But the data that we were initially interested in come from the fact that
2 if you think about this as a paper and pencil survey mailed to your home or to someone's
3 home, and they ask about the occupation and the industry and the employer, it turns out
4 that occupation is a free form response. So respondent can write anything they want in
5 that space, probably a job title. Those items are coded by the Bureau of the Census into
6 SOC codes about 500 and some that they actually publish. But we had the interesting
7 provocative idea of well, what about all those raw responses, what could be done with
8 those, is this a valuable resource that SSA could use.

9 In fact, at one point, being something of a dreamer, I thought well, maybe
10 this is the ticket, maybe this is the data source that could really be essentially mimicked
11 or piggybacked even to give us the information we need.

12 It is interesting because it constitutes the opposite approach, it's a bottom
13 up approach so it starts with well, they're sampling houses but still, it's the people in the
14 houses that they're looking for. So they're talking to a, essentially a random sample of
15 all the population and they're asking them what do you do at work. So very interesting.

16 I do have to say though that a somewhat casual review, there were a
17 couple of visits made including one that I was not involved in to look at those micro data,
18 those individual responses. And I would just say that the quality of the data were
19 somewhat disappointing. And while they keep all that information, they don't edit it or
20 massage it in any way so it's basically those same raw responses.

21 I was also a little bit troubled, and this is only implicating me, to find that
22 there were some discrepancies when you compared the two, the OES with ACS, the top
23 down versus the bottom up. You got some very interesting discrepancies in the
24 employment totals which look to me like it represented something akin to grade inflation.
25 If I'm reporting my occupation, I'm reporting something that sounds more prestigious

1 than what my employer might call it. That seemed to me to be another problem.

2 The Sampling Subcommittee has been meeting monthly by telephone
3 since our December meeting, reviewing both these sources plus some others, the CPS and
4 others, worrying about the distributions, the methodologies and the fielding strategies for
5 these surveys.

6 We also were very excited to know about the Occupational-Medical-
7 Vocational Survey which was briefly mentioned this morning because that constitutes the
8 first look at the actual occupational distribution of Social Security disability applicants,
9 both DI and SSI adult applicants. And as you probably know if you've been following
10 carefully, there was a lot of energy put into this study, and it's been a couple of years in
11 the making. Preliminary results are finally available, and we've been very excited to look
12 at those.

13 In my mind and I think in the minds of the committee members if they
14 care to chime in, any one of these could constitute kind of a first-cut model for sampling
15 frame, if you will, for SSA for our purposes of disability adjudication.

16 And the fact that at least the two national potential benchmarking
17 databases also would serve that purpose of making sure that we knew what the threshold
18 was for jobs available in the national economy because we can not only analyze
19 employment by occupation but by geographic region, by whatever you want because
20 these are really representative databases.

21 I think that the most interesting thing that we've started working on lately
22 that will probably end up being something you'll see longer term is the conceptual
23 overview of the sampling issues.

24 Since you realize that SSA is not sitting back waiting for the Sampling
25 Subcommittee to tell them exactly what to do, they're proceeding on a parallel front.

1 And what I think are comparative advantages probably in providing some guidance,
2 some standards, some comments about methodology that might be helpful to SSA as they
3 look at these alternatives from their perspectives.

4 So John Creswell and David Schretlen were kind enough to volunteer to
5 develop what is a draft paper addressing the questions that need to be answered to move
6 toward a specific sampling plan for an OIS. I'm not going to go into that in great detail.
7 In fact, one Panel member asked me please don't do all that again because we did it, we
8 spent three hours on it yesterday or on parts of it.

9 So it includes the sampling frame of occupations; the unit of analysis
10 which is basically this top down or bottom up approach; contact information; questions
11 about how do you find out who it is actually you try to contact when you're ready to
12 survey them; stratification issues that, of course, also reach to the question of
13 representative populations; the sample size issue which is comparatively trivial after
14 these other questions are answered, you can get that pretty much from a formula; and the
15 type and form of data collected. We expect to go forward on this, what this constitutes an
16 agenda really, that we can then pass on to SSA.

17 In addition at the Panel meeting, we had a presentation on the Occ-Med-
18 Voc Study and thanks to
19 Mark Trapani and Debbie Harkin for giving us that. Again, as we had it before and
20 maybe I didn't, some of us didn't appreciate the significance of that from a sampling
21 perspective so that was also very helpful.

22 I just want to say a couple words about this, it was mentioned earlier by
23 Sylvia, I think. But a random sample of 5,000 disability claims, both acceptances and
24 denials, is really a valuable resource and this is going to have a life beyond this project, I
25 believe. It's going to be a resource for researchers and policymakers well into the future.

1 Representing the population of 2009 applicants at the front end of the
2 recession so not, almost before the big swelling of the applicants partially caused by the
3 recession, it seems to me that the electronic file review that's been done by expert
4 adjudicators and experts from within SSA constitutes not only a tool for administrative
5 review and sort of assessment of the quality of decision making, but invaluable tool to
6 guide our thinking about sampling because now we know where the clients are coming
7 from. And you'll probably see more of that again later.

8 Of most interest to the Sampling Subcommittee are the occupational
9 details cited as past relevant work. An OVRD has now developed the information on the
10 jobs that these claimants held without regard to, you know, the outcome, although you
11 could do that, but whether it was accepted or denied, or whether it went to stage four or
12 stage five or whatever. So it's truly a population estimate of the content of occupational
13 detail for the Social Security work, the wood pile if you will.

14 And we believe it will also offer significant insights for sampling design.
15 And basically we are setting out to answer a slightly different question, I think, than what
16 we started with. And, again, I invite other subcommittee members to address this if
17 they're so motivated.

18 SSA has asked us to look at specifically what are the available sampling
19 frames and the sampling strategies that are realistic and practical in the world that we
20 face, and what criteria should be used to choose among those. We expect to have an
21 answer to those questions before too long. I'm not going to make any promises. But I
22 think it's fairly safe to say by at least by the August Panel meeting. And we may have
23 something to say sooner than that depending on a multitude of events.

24 That's all I'm going to say. It's been an interesting ride, and I think we've
25 got a little bit farther to go. I like to see those heads nodding over there among the staff.

1 I'm going to close there and invite any other committee members to chime in if you
2 are so motivated.

3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I know there were some questions before lunch
4 that were starting to move in the direction of sampling. I just wanted to make sure that
5 there weren't any questions along those lines. Allan and then Pam, go ahead.

6 DR. HUNT: I was just going to say after yesterday, I'm pretty sure
7 everyone on the Panel has asked every question they could think of.

8 MS. FRUGOLI: This is Pam Frugoli. I just wanted to make sure we were
9 all clear 'cause we talk about taxonomy and so forth is that, you know, that there's an
10 occupational classification which could also be called a taxonomy and then there's the
11 job analysis taxonomy, and we have to make sure we don't confuse those.

12 Like for in O*NET, we call our descriptive variables the content model
13 and then we call O*NET the taxonomy which is based on the standard occupational
14 classification. So I just want to make sure we, 'cause sometimes when we're talking, we
15 use the terms and then I'm not sure which one we're talking about.

16 And that, you know, I think, I just wanted to observe from the OES and
17 the ACS that the establishment-based survey produces slightly more occupational detail
18 than the household-based surveys partly because of that issue you said about what people
19 write in on their form. If you actually talk to them or had follow-up questions like if you
20 did caddy (phonetic) interviews with households, you can actually get more occupational
21 detail.

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any of the other committee members want to
23 say anything? Are there any questions for the other committee members? Okay.

24 And I knew Allan was going to run shorter. We had mentioned that at the
25 beginning of the meeting this morning that we would probably not need that full hour.

1 What we're going to be doing -- when Sylvia was on the Panel, it was
2 easy for her to provide clarifications or for us to ask things of her in terms of Social
3 Security, but she hasn't been on the Panel now for quite some time. So before we go into
4 deliberation, we usually bring her back to see if there are any questions of her before we
5 go into the deliberation period.

6 We have set aside, like I mentioned earlier, a half hour for public
7 comment. That public comment if it's an individual, it's five minutes; if it's an
8 organization, it's ten minutes. We have three organizations so it's very full, but we have
9 a lot of people in the audience. And so if somebody did not have the opportunity to get
10 on the public comment and would like to provide public comment, we will have a little
11 bit of time, and I will allow it. Just let Leola know if you are interested in that.

12 But at this point, Sylvia, if you could come back, that'd be great. Thanks,
13 Sylvia.

14 I'll go ahead and maybe just open it up to you first, Sylvia, if there was
15 anything in terms of the discussions that we're having that you wanted to offer
16 clarification and then I'll open it to the Panel for questions.

17 MS. KARMAN: Sure. This is Sylvia Karman. Some of the questions
18 that I was hearing after I had left my presentation centered on the DEC and the filtered
19 results and also was getting some questions by some folks in the audience. I thought
20 maybe it would be valuable if I tried to clarify that the DEC-filtered results, they were
21 filtered for Disability Evaluation purposes. So in other words, the results have to do with
22 and the whole DEC actually has to do with the SSA program needs, and they're not
23 filtered for their relevance for work.

24 So, therefore, the distinction for us then being the IO psychologist who
25 would be involved with our senior research psychologist and our staff in developing the

1 taxonomy would have available to them the entire DEC.

2 The reason that it was important for SSA to be filtering them or to be able
3 to point to the ones that are most important or, you know, representative of what SSA's
4 program needs are, this really was the main rationale for why we needed to have that.

5 It was quite a long list. A lot of them were possibly repetitive. Those
6 things weren't taken off because they were repetitive, they were just grouped together,
7 again, one of the purposes of classifying it. So it just helps give the IOs a sense of what
8 SSA's program needs are, but it does not dictate on the taxonomic side and the work
9 taxonomy side, you know, what needs to be in a work taxonomy to establish an
10 occupation or to identify an occupation.

11 I don't know if there are any other questions about that.

12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: If there are no other questions about the DEC,
13 are there any general questions for Sylvia? Okay. Sylvia, thank you.

14 And so now we have some time. I know that this morning and the kind of
15 the question and discussion section of the subcommittee meetings or subcommittee
16 reports, we had quite a bit of time to talk. But we always allow time for deliberation of
17 the Panel if there are any major issues that anybody would like to bring to the table.

18 We used to have shorter amount of time and then we were asked to
19 include a considerable amount of time on the agenda so we did so. I just want to open it
20 up for the Panel in general, and if you don't have something, I do. Go ahead, I'll open it
21 up to the Panel for general deliberation. Everybody's talked out after three days. Go
22 ahead, John.

23 DR. CRESWELL: This is just a general comment. Yesterday before I
24 talked about the sampling conceptual overview, I started with some general comments.
25 And one of them was the challenge before this Panel of speaking between the academic

1 scientists and those that are in SSA that are living in more of a practical world, as well
2 as others on the Panel that are involved in it and how we develop a common language.

3 And I'd just like to say that Jone has done a great job in bridging this
4 transition for us because through all of our discussions the last couple of days, you've
5 been taking the more scientific as well as the more practical adjudicator perspective and
6 kind of blending the two, taking us back and forth. I just wanted to say good work.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, John. I think we appreciate that,
8 those of us who were involved in discussions where you were present. I think we really
9 appreciate that perspective.

10 Any other comments or areas for deliberation? Okay.

11 The one I do want to bring to the Panel, and we don't have to go into
12 deliberation about it now, but I do want to keep it kind of in the back of our minds as we
13 move forward and when we understand that this is kind of a moving and dynamic project
14 moving forward.

15 Our charter specifically indicates advice and recommendations on the
16 development of an OIS. We've seen maybe the need for more direct care or laser focus
17 on data collection. As we move forward, I want to have the Panel maybe advise me
18 about areas that you think that we need to be considering as well.

19 We had the first seven recommendations that we issued in 2009. We went
20 to the eighth recommendation which was for an OIS R&D plan. That specifically was
21 mentioned earlier this week in some of the comments, I think. It's provided a lot of the
22 foundation that for the first couple of years, we kept on saying that the Agency had a very
23 difficult task before it. It was being asked to deliver something and create the foundation
24 for it at the same time. And it really helped to create that foundation in many ways.

25 So if there are other things that are specific to that charter as we move

1 forward, I would appreciate the Panel's input into other areas for consideration that are
2 very specific to our charter. So just kind of a general comment out there as we're moving
3 forward.

4 If anybody has any thoughts on that, I'd appreciate it. If you just want to
5 take it as just a general thought, I'd welcome that as well. Allan.

6 DR. HUNT: I've just a reaction. It seems clear to me, I've been with you
7 for two years now, but as SSA's capability and reach has increased, the need for specific
8 recommendations from the Panel seems to me has decreased. So we've kind of got a
9 balancing going on.

10 And at the first, you know, there was a dearth of, I don't know, conceptual
11 activity and now there's great plenty. And it seems to me our role has evolved toward,
12 less towards leading and much more towards following.

13 So I would say that what you're saying, what you're asking for is certainly
14 what we're here for, but on the other hand, if Social Security has the ball and is running
15 with it, that's fine.

16 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I'm okay with that as well. I just want to make
17 sure that we are very focused on what our charge was and that we're not missing the ball.
18 And that I as chair am not missing the ball in terms of trying to anticipate things and
19 needs under our charter.

20 Any other thoughts, anything else anybody wants to bring to the Panel?
21 Tom.

22 MR. HARDY: I don't know if this fits in with what you were saying, but
23 we're chartered up until July of this year, correct?

24 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: July 6th, correct.

25 MR. HARDY: And with the current budget situation, like everything in

1 government, we're not sure what happens on August 1st.

2 Tied into what you're talking about, is there a need for us to in some way
3 sit down and review the work that's been done to this point and then project a bit into the
4 future with some thoughts should we not be a Panel coming next year? Would that help
5 organize something of what you're talking about?

6 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I'm not even -- we've had periods where our
7 charter was coming up, and we just are working business as usual moving forward. I
8 mean, we just established data collection so I don't think unless there is something I'm
9 missing that we should do anything but move forward under our charter.

10 I think when the question was posed to David Rust earlier today, and he
11 said he hadn't had a chance to talk to the commissioner, but he will imminently do that
12 and get back to us so we should hear.

13 We have a meeting established for the week of August 13th and let's keep
14 it on our calendars. Juan.

15 DR. SANCHEZ: I have a comment along the same lines that Allan made
16 his. I think I agree with, I don't know if this needs to go in the record, but this is my
17 graphic representation of this. This line here is execution and this line is advice and
18 execution. The need for execution keeps going up. And I think the need for advice, I
19 agree with you, that it keeps going down.

20 So I think one risk that we face now, not us but sort of like Sylvia's team,
21 is that the perception might be -- and we see the deputy commissioner, every panel who
22 comes here and tells us try to do it a little bit faster, right. And the truth is, we don't do
23 anything. We advise, right. We are actually prohibited from doing anything other than
24 advising and consultation.

25 I think one draw back that Sylvia's team faces is the perception of their,

1 that she may have all these resources, all these scientists, psychologists, kind of it's,
2 and disability specialists working for her. And the truth is, she doesn't.

3 Even though we might talk a lot and we may have a lot of opinions, we
4 execute relatively little. And I think the pace of the project is proportional to how fast
5 and how many resources that she gets. And we have seen in the last few months there
6 were things, they've got John and other folks that things are speeding up.

7 So I think it's something to think about that when we're told do it faster, I
8 think it gets to the point where the return on the investment on advice keeps going down,
9 too many opinions. Like we were saying, too many chiefs, too few Indians kind of thing.

10 It's just a thought, and I don't know how to, what the formula might be to
11 deal with that perception, but I think the perception is out there.

12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Pam.

13 MS. FRUGOLI: I'm Pam Frugoli. I do think, though, that we just
14 recently got the information about the filtering of the DEC, and we just recently got the
15 Occ-Med-Voc Study. I think, I personally am not real good in the abstract and to have
16 something real to get my hands on and then figure out what it looks like and then go ah,
17 that sort of implies this.

18 I think we have a lot more to work with right now that we just recently got
19 too, and I think that will help inform what the subcommittees do further.

20 So I think there's still plenty to be done in sort of focusing it down
21 because I find, you know, like I said, it's going to be less abstract now and more getting
22 toward the applied which I think helps with advising on execution. So I'm very grateful
23 that we have those resources now.

24 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And I think there'll be periods in the project
25 such as when data starts coming in from the pilots and the implications of those and

1 users, the impact and usability studies and that type of thing that will be important to
2 review. Thank you for that.

3 And I just want to add something to what Juan was saying. I think that
4 sometimes there's also the perception that you get 20 more people, and you could really
5 put your foot on the acceleration. I think that in government one of the things that I've
6 learned in the last three years is you might be able to double or triple the staff, but it still
7 takes staff time to be able to get up to speed. With government, there are lead times on
8 so many things that there's only a certain level of speed you could get to, to make things
9 happen at a certain clip. So just because they might triple, quadruple their staff tomorrow
10 doesn't mean that OIS will be out in 2013.

11 Any other, anything else for deliberation or comment? Okay. I think
12 maybe at this time, I know I checked with Leola and we have three organizations who
13 have signed up for public comment. So I would like -- and I asked her to check with
14 them to see if they would be ready to go a little earlier in case we ran short or long on
15 time. At this point, she's nodding her head back there that everybody's ready to go.

16 The three organizations that are going to have representatives provide
17 public comment are NOSSCR with Tom Sutton, SkillTRAN with Jeff Truthan and IARC
18 with Lynn Tracy. I would like to welcome Tom Sutton from NOSSCR to provide public
19 comment.

20 And all three of the public commenters have presented to us before at
21 various times and so we have ten minutes per organization and then after the ten minutes,
22 we have an opportunity to ask questions. So, Tom, welcome.

23 MR. SUTTON: Thank you, Mary. I don't believe I'll need ten minutes.
24 If there are other people who would like speak, that would be great with me.

25 At the beginning of the meeting, you talked about transparency, and

1 transparency, I think, is very, very important. I have to say that to me as someone
2 who has been following the activities of this Panel for three years, things today have
3 been, at best, translucent verging on opaque.

4 This unfortunately starts with the Federal Register notice of today's
5 meeting which provided a teleconference number, 1-888-445-2238, which turned out to
6 be wrong. We know this only because someone who was trying to call in basically kept
7 getting put into the ether. It's a digital mistake, unfortunately, and it was also in the e-
8 mail that was sent out on Monday of this week. The actual number was 455-2238. So
9 we're never going to know how many people in the public would have liked to have been
10 here by teleconference but couldn't get in.

11 You had also mentioned it was very difficult this morning. Thank
12 goodness after the break, the acoustics were adjusted and the mics were adjusted so that
13 we could hear. But much of what transpired this morning before the break was inaudible
14 to any of us in the back where all the public is.

15 You had mentioned that a transcript is being made, and I would love to be
16 able to read that particularly Commissioner Rust's comments which were very, very
17 difficult to hear.

18 But most importantly, we in the public, and I speak as a former president
19 of the Organization of Claimants' Representatives across the country, are very concerned
20 about what exactly is happening with the Panel's work and with the execution to use the
21 term that's just been used. Specifically, GAO testified two days ago before Congress
22 about very specific things and these are quotes.

23 One, "According to an SSA official, its investigation of existing
24 Occupational Information Systems now complete has resulted in useful information about
25 design issues other organizations have confronted and mitigated when creating their own

1 systems.” I haven’t seen this report, if it’s complete. I don’t know why.

2 Two, “Additionally, SSA’s preliminary analysis of its own administrative
3 data identified the most frequently cited occupations and functional and vocational
4 characteristics of disability applicants.” That is, I believe, a reference to what has been
5 called here today the Occupational-Medical-Vocational Study which I understand the
6 Panel has just received. We also haven’t seen that.

7 And then three, “Also in 2011, SSA completed a comprehensive
8 framework for assessing an individual’s capacity to work key to informing the OIS
9 content according to SSA officials which was based on recommendations of outside
10 experts as well as SSA’s policy and program requirements.” This is what
11 Ms. Karman referred to, I believe, as the Disability Evaluation Constructs. Once again,
12 we haven’t seen it.

13 We haven’t seen much. In fact, if you go to the website for this Panel and
14 you look for documents, there is no substantive document that has been posted to this
15 website since 2009, none.

16 These documents should be a matter of public record. Everybody in the
17 public, particularly the millions of people who depend on disability benefits for basic
18 subsistence in life, have a right to know what has been completed and what this Panel is
19 working with particularly when we hear that the advice curve is going down and the
20 execution curve is going up, and we’re speeding up. What are we executing? We still
21 don’t know.

22 Ms. Karman made a reference at your last meeting from reading the draft
23 minutes, I don’t know if those have been approved yet, to the legal standards document
24 that she expected to be finalized in January of this year. We haven’t seen that document
25 either.

1 We are very concerned because this program is of paramount
2 importance to our clients, and how disability is determined is integrally related for
3 anyone who does not meet or equal a listing of impairments on pure medical grounds
4 with what this committee advises and what this Agency implements over the next number
5 of years. The public needs to know what is happening in real time not after the fact, not
6 when you get around to it, but now. And those are my comments.

7 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Tom. And I think that in terms of
8 your comments, probably one of the functions of your comments was the fact that the
9 mics weren't working very well this morning. So I want to go ahead and address each of
10 these for you.

11 We will have a transcript and as I mentioned this morning, if you go to our
12 website and you go to where we have the meetings, we have transcripts from past
13 meetings. That will be uploaded there. Within a month of the meeting, they're usually
14 available.

15 And then when Sylvia was here, I went through, actually, I was going
16 through the Gantt chart, page 53 on the OIS R&D plan and went through every one of
17 your, every single one of your questions in terms of the documents and where they were.
18 So let me go ahead and address those because it sounds like the audience didn't hear the
19 responses.

20 The OIS study that's mentioned in the GAO report, and I actually quoted
21 directly from the same area that you're looking at. From what I heard, that was
22 completed and it should be up on the website. Now, let me explain 'cause that might not
23 have been clear when I spoke earlier.

24 There are two websites, there's the Occupational Information
25 Development Advisory Panel. We are an advisory panel. We're not developing the OIS.

1 And then if you go to our website, there is a link to the project OVRD that is actually
2 developing the OIS. So those documents, the reason that you're not finding those kind of
3 documents on our website is 'cause we're not developing the OIS. So those kind of
4 documents will be on SSA's OVRD website or the project website. What I was told was
5 that the OIS study is completed and that should be up there imminently.

6 The Occ-Med-Voc Study, we've had several presentations, at least two
7 that I could think of, in the public domain at our meetings that if you go to our meetings
8 and you go to the meetings page and you click on any meeting that we've had, the agenda
9 comes up and there is a link directly to any PowerPoint including the PowerPoints the
10 SSA has already delivered to us on preliminary findings of that study.

11 They are doing the final review over the next couple of weeks in terms of
12 the quality review, and the final report is not out on that. That was one of the questions
13 that I had asked Sylvia whether that information would be out, and she indicated yes. So
14 that's not completed in final form to be out, but what has been put out in the public, you
15 could go to our website and just go to the agendas and see that preliminary information
16 there so that's available.

17 The DEC, I had asked Sylvia about that earlier at what point we would be
18 able to have that in the public domain. And her answer was that it has to be in context. It
19 is a stimulus list for the IOs in terms of their development of the OIS. So that's pre-
20 decisional, that is not up on the website because it is not at the point that it can be up.

21 You asked about the legal standards. I asked about the legal standards
22 because if you go the project website, they have the scientific standards up there, and
23 they are going through a final review, legal review. Once those are done, they will be up
24 there as well. So some of these are completed, the OIS study, is my understanding it will
25 be up there. The Occ-Med-Voc Study, the information that has been presented is up

1 there. The DEC will be up there once it is in context; it's pre-decisional at this point.

2 And then the legal standards will be up there as well, the scientific standards are already
3 up there.

4 And we're talking about two different websites so if you go to our website
5 and you've linked the actual project because the Panel is not developing the OIS, you'll
6 find that.

7 MR. SUTTON: Mary, I'm aware there's another website.

8 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

9 MR. SUTTON: As you've just said, if we go to that website today, those
10 documents aren't there.

11 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: So you were talking about the project website?
12 You were talking about our website?

13 MR. SUTTON: I'm talking about public information and specifically
14 with respect to the Disability Evaluation Constructs matter. That, you were calling it pre-
15 decisional. It sounds as if it is, if not complete, very close to completion with the filtering
16 the DEC as we've been talking about here today.

17 This is absolutely crucial information. If the question is can it be
18 understood out of context then provide the context, show us what you're doing with
19 taxonomy at the same time if that's what you need to do so that we understand what's at
20 issue here.

21 But going back to the very beginning, you know, first purposes from your
22 charter, again, quoting the GAO's testimony, "SSA further decided to develop its own
23 Occupational Information System which would contain detailed information as in the
24 DOT but would also include additional information such as the mental demands of
25 work."

1 We are still waiting for three years to find out what it is that the Panel
2 is advising and/or the Agency is executing regarding the mental demands of work, how
3 those are going to be assessed, what specific demands you're looking at and how they're
4 going to be measured. And the public is waiting to find out. It's taking a very long time.

5 I think that the Disability Evaluation Constructs as it's been described
6 today should not be considered pre-decisional. When it is in final form, it should be
7 released to the public. I believe we have a right to know.

8 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for that, and SSA is here. They're
9 aware of that. In terms of what the Panel recommended, that was in 2009 report in terms
10 of what our recommendation was that went into that consideration. And I think that as
11 soon as it is in a decisional form, what I heard from Sylvia is that it will be out. Thank
12 you. I appreciate your comments.

13 Let me ask the Panel if there are any questions for Tom. Thank you, Tom.

14 At this point, I'd like to welcome Jeff Truthan to address the Panel in
15 public comment, and Jeff, you'll have ten minutes.

16 MR. TRUTHAN: And I know you watch your clock so I'm going to
17 watch mine too.

18 Okay. First of all, I'm excited to hear that we are getting close to seeing a
19 final document with the Disability Evaluation Constructs. My understanding from what I
20 heard was that that will be May is I thought what I heard this morning, but I'm not sure.

21 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I'm not sure if we got a time on that. I know
22 it's a stimulus for other activities so I'm not sure there's, I heard a time, but I might have
23 been wrong.

24 MR. TRUTHAN: Okay. Well, I know there's a lot of things that are
25 going to start to come. That is such an important document, I think, so that people do

1 have a more concrete view like Pam was saying about having something really to look
2 at and put some edges on what this thing is all about and why there's been such a careful
3 consideration of the different factors that impact the whole process of what do we need in
4 an Occupational Information System.

5 As you look at these constructs and as you go through the process of
6 figuring out which ones do you need, please, once again, do not overlook the needs of the
7 rehabilitation community.

8 In 1980, one out of 30 people who received disability benefits went back
9 to work. That number is now a half a percent, one in 200 people go back to work.
10 What's wrong? You still, Social Security is still in the rehabilitation business too. You
11 operate the Ticket to Work Programs, you operate a PASS program, the BOND program.
12 These are all efforts to get people off, and that requires looking at additional constructs
13 beyond just the adjudication process.

14 Social Security has set in effect what is a national standard that's been
15 widely adopted beginning in 1965 when the Agency first was born. And that is what
16 triggered the growth of all the factors that were in the DOT in 1977, the fourth edition
17 and its subsequent revisions and expansion to additional constructs in the '91 version that
18 we've been looking at for too long.

19 The understanding of what the Agency needs to make its decisions has
20 improved, the population being served has shifted, you're seeing a huge number of psych
21 claims. So it's very important to look at the
22 mental-cognitive issues.

23 And in that whole process, you know, think about the other factors that
24 what could somebody do if they had some training and not just limit the scope to the
25 transferability of what they know how to do right now. People do need to go back to

1 work and be restored to a dignified life when that's possible. So I just want to put in
2 my pitch for that too.

3 Shanan made a great comment this morning about taxonomy, and I think
4 it's important that there be an independent group of people that probably developed that
5 with oversight and certainly final say by Social Security. I think it's important to avoid
6 arguments that the taxonomy is something skewed to the benefit of Social Security
7 decision-making process, that it be a good well-constructed independent taxonomy.

8 When measures are constructed as many things as can be identified
9 through very concrete measurable criteria, go out there with push/pull meters to measure
10 forces and weights. People do not report weights well. Self report is all over the boards
11 in terms of what people lift.

12 Comments that you made, Allan, about how people aggrandize about
13 some of their stuff is just as true with the physical demands of a, I lift 300 pounds on a
14 job. No, that doesn't happen.

15 So be precise, use scientific measures, objectives measures that can be
16 replicated. Rulers, if you're going to measure walking, how far are they walking, what
17 kind of terrain are they on. All of those impact what's required for a particular
18 occupation.

19 When you're looking at what kinds of occupations to do, obviously, where
20 you're going to be looking is going to be at the occupations you hear about most often in
21 work history. Those are high frequency.

22 There are other occupations that happen. I'm not sure how stratified the sampling was of
23 cases, whether it was out of several regions or whether it was a full national sample, but
24 people do work all over this country doing many different kinds of occupations that may
25 occur in area of the country and not in another.

1 That has an impact, they take that work history with them wherever
2 they go so well, they may go to Omaha, they may have worked on the coast shucking
3 oysters. You don't have too many jobs like that in Omaha, but they did it when they
4 lived on the West Coast.

5 You really do need to study a lot of occupations. You don't need to study
6 the occupations that have gone away, occupations that have gone away because they've
7 been combined, at least in the DOT, that just occur very, very infrequently; jobs that have
8 been combined; jobs that have gone away because of obsolesce or automation or
9 outsourcing. Some jobs have gone away because of the work of people in rehab that says
10 don't make people do these same things over and over again because you're causing this
11 carpal tunnel issue. Mix it up, have them do other positions in the occupations and other
12 work stations.

13 Well, that changes the context and they're no longer doing one of these
14 sedentary unskilled jobs that are getting fewer and fewer.

15 Most folks, our studies of using the technology that we have to look at
16 where do these kinds of people work is showing a continuing decreasing number of
17 people nationally, and they can tend to cluster in about five or six occupations with any
18 frequency, and the other 130 DOT occupations, the numbers are pitiful, and it's just the
19 industry's are gone. Where we used to have industries in 1990, they're gone. They've
20 been greatly reduced.

21 There are ways that you can look at the frequency of occupations much
22 more precisely than has been done before. There is, we created a methodology that our
23 customer base is widely endorsed, and it can be repurposed for looking at those
24 occupations that do, are likely to exist in industries that have some significant numbers of
25 employment. It's going to be a pretty straight forward process to find and identify the

1 low frequency. Social Security would have to set what is that lowest frequency.

2 I don't know that there's a national number for that, but at some point,
3 there will be. How small is too small a group to bother studying? And that's going to be
4 an interesting decision point.

5 With labor market information, our experience in comparing wage and
6 employment information has been that the census data well helpful, and the only source
7 for an important consideration in Social Security which is number of hours worked that is
8 not collected in the Occupational Employment Survey data so that at least you can have a
9 division between what's full time and what's part time. That's a valuable piece of
10 information in the whole process because I believe Social Security's interest is in the
11 number of full-time positions. So we use that information to adjust numbers in our
12 estimation process.

13 But we find that the occupational employment statistics that are reported
14 by employers are far more useful in coming up with a solid understanding of not only
15 how many people there may be in a given OES group or a SOC group, but also, the
16 industries in which they work. You're observation is right on in terms of the lack of
17 standardization of some of that information. So it's difficult to extract that from the
18 micro data which is massive amounts of data but still needs some structure around it to do
19 useful things with it. We're looking forward to the Occupational-Medical Study
20 information to be released as well to look at the occupations.

21 I would, again, encourage Social Security to modify its processes to
22 capture information about work history at the DOT level, capture it with the employer of
23 record for that particular occupation and use that information for subsequent sampling
24 efforts.

25 You've got a built-in source for where do these jobs exist. Use that, mine

1 it, do your sampling, use the information you already collect from people. It will
2 come in handy for subsequent surveys.

3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Jeff. I will open it up to the Panel
4 for comments or questions. Allan.

5 DR. HUNT: I'm not sure I understood you, Jeff. Did I hear you say
6 something like do not let the taxonomy be skewed to SSA adjudication, or did I, that
7 didn't exculpate (phonetic sp.) for me so could you --

8 MR. TRUTHAN: I think the concern, yes, the concern is that a taxonomy
9 could somehow be crafted that would bias towards unfavorable findings towards
10 claimants. That's an argument just to be aware of, that could be a legal argument tossed
11 up there that you certainly don't want to have to fight that one, and having an
12 independent body to provide that structure helps to insulate the Agency from that kind of
13 an argument.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions? Comments? Thank you,
15 Jeff, I appreciate it.

16 Now I'd like to welcome Lynn Tracy from the International Association
17 of Rehabilitation Professionals to address the Panel. Welcome, Lynn.

18 MS. TRACY: Good afternoon, everybody. I'm glad to be here once
19 again. I may be repeating myself, but some of these things need to be repeated again. As
20 you know, I'm the chair of the IARP Liaison Committee for IODAP. I'm also a member
21 at large to the board of IARP as well.

22 I'm going to start off by just echoing something that Jeff just said that
23 seems to be important and wanted to make a point about.

24 First of all, we owe you, David in particular, the results of our survey that
25 we did on the incidents of past relevant work and it's coming soon; it's being written up.

1 We all have our full-time jobs, our board responsibilities and everything else so it is
2 being written as we speak and hope to have that for you soon.

3 With that comes something that came to my mind as Jeff was speaking
4 and that is that when we start looking at these jobs that we found as well as SSA found in
5 their studies that are the, of higher incidents, what I haven't heard us completely address
6 nor anyone else is well, why are those the jobs of higher incidents?

7 If we start thinking that those are going to be the jobs that will be surveyed
8 and the data will be collected on those and that's a starting place, okay, but as a stopping
9 place, I think we then have to say why are those the jobs that came up.

10 We can speculate with probably some reasonable good result of why some
11 of those jobs such as cashiers it's because there's so many cashiers in the national
12 economy. But we don't know why all of those jobs came up high.

13 And so with that said, I don't think we, that Social Security should then
14 leap to only doing those jobs. There is a very good valid reason to gather data on a lot of
15 other jobs as well. So I just kind of wanted to make that point.

16 In reading the RFI, even though it's, I don't know what time it is, if it's
17 closed yet, it gives some tone, shall we say, of kind of how SSA is looking at things. I
18 just wanted to kind of take from that and comment a little bit.

19 As SSA moves forward with the data collection as it appears it's clear
20 from the RFI, we don't, we want to, again, encourage drawing from the expertise of
21 professionals who work with injured workers and the disabled and employers namely, the
22 vocational rehabilitation professionals and practitioners.

23 Practitioners is an important thing to remember. The people with the boots on the
24 ground that are going in there day in and day out and seeing what happens with
25 individuals, what happens at the employer level to help do these job analyses. These are

1 people that are already trained in doing job analysis work although we find that
2 sometimes the terms of -- a little bit different. Fundamentally, vocational rehabilitation
3 professionals have a good strong baseline to start from as you move forward.

4 And especially since the work on the OIS is for disability adjudication, it
5 is only logical and practical to utilize the expertise of vocational rehabilitation
6 professionals that work with the disabled.

7 We remain concerned with the idea of training job analysts who have no
8 real understanding of workers and the disabilities that they deal with such as has been
9 mentioned to draw from teachers as an example. And I know that these are only
10 examples that have been given out, it doesn't mean SSA's planning to move that way.
11 But none the less, it should be mentioned and a concern.

12 Drawing from large different diverse professional groups that may have no
13 real understanding as a baseline to start working from, that doesn't seem logical when
14 you have hundreds if not thousands of vocational rehabilitation people out available to do
15 this kind of work.

16 We also encourage that the job analysts have baseline qualifications,
17 baseline requirements and qualifications. There are national qualifications out there that
18 would, at least, direct that you know that people have some education, training and
19 experience as a place to start. And then once the idea of how the job analysts would be
20 trained and what the methodology is and the procedures and such, you can build from
21 there.

22 We, again, encourage on-site job analysis as the preferred method, can't
23 say it too many times. You know, I noticed in the RFI, and again, I know you're giving
24 examples and that's going to be the response back to me from my comments but none the
25 less, they are in here. But things like that with white collar occupations, you know, it

1 may be more appropriate to do something other than an on site, maybe a written
2 survey or an electronic survey. But having done at least hundreds if not thousands of job
3 analyses and working with employers, white collar, blue collar professionals, they are not
4 necessarily always the best source of information.

5 Whenever possible, we know that there are budgetary constraints, there's
6 no question about that, but at all costs whenever possible on-site job analysis is going to
7 be the preferred way that we would like to see things done.

8 Also with new technology that's out there with the Cloud, so much can be
9 now done and uploaded. I know that, gosh, I don't know if it was 2009 or 2010 when I
10 suggested that, you know, all of our members who go out and do job analyses for
11 employees be it through long-term disability carriers, be it workers' compensation
12 carriers, if we had a standardized format of conducting job analysis, that is something that
13 SSA uses, that then employers start using and Vocational Experts start using, and we're
14 all on the same playing field. Then every time a vocational counselor goes out and does a
15 job analysis, if they followed that format and it was uploaded to the Cloud, even if they
16 didn't do it on an SSA case for SSA, nonetheless, that data would be available and could
17 be a good way of propagating information.

18 That is not to say our professionals wouldn't like to be compensated for
19 doing the work, but I think that there are lots of creative ways now with technology that
20 we can start helping with gathering all of that data.

21 My final comment goes to the contractors just as a cautionary comment. I
22 happen to be one of three Social Security Vocational Experts that was on a focus group
23 with ICF International, three. And I was surprised by the limited understanding of what
24 we do, the limited scope of the questioning. I just, I have very serious concerns
25 sometimes when things get out to contractors that don't really understand the process that

1 we work within and the people we work with.

2 And so as you go forward, as Social Security goes forward 'cause you're
3 not making the decisions, but as Social Security goes forward, I just would hope that
4 they'd be very careful about the contractors, that there's some subject matter expertise
5 there that is drawn upon so that they can really gather the best information and make the
6 best recommendations to Social Security.

7 And with that, I thank you all.

8 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Lynn. Any questions or comments
9 for Lynn? David.

10 DR. SCHRETLEN: Lynn, I agree that it would be very interesting to sort
11 of try and make sense of the Occ-Med-Voc data not just know what that study shows.
12 And I'll be very interested to see how the findings compare to the IARP analysis as well.

13 You've got lots of experience. What do you speculate, what is your
14 speculation about why the most, why certain jobs are coming up again and again? Is it,
15 do you think it's simply that they're the most represented in the economy, or do you think
16 there's more to it than that?

17 MS. TRACY: Our list, by the way, very much parallels at least when
18 Deborah presented how ever long ago that was, we very much parallel. There are very
19 similar results. There won't be much change there.

20 I think that the top factors I would say come to mind right away based on
21 the people I see as one, the incidents of the jobs, but I also think it is also you're going to
22 see lower educational levels, you're going to see more the type, the heaviness of the work
23 on a repetitive nature.

24 I think it's your CNAs who are, you know, lifting and moving patients and
25 doing it for years and years and years at a time. It's your cashiers with the repetitive

1 motion kinds of things, your janitors, truck drivers. So I think those are some of the
2 factors you're going to see.

3 What also comes to my mind is how is it that this large group gets all the
4 way through the adjudication process as opposed to some other claimants that are
5 applying for benefits. And I think there's just some interesting questions to be asked.

6 But it's definitely having done thousands and thousands and thousands of
7 hearings, I could tell you what's at the top of the list, but it's surely not all that's on that
8 list. There are many, many other professions that we see come before us that have to be
9 characterized.

10 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other comments or questions? I have one.

11 One of the things that we were discussing yesterday was the instances
12 where VEs are given hypotheticals of where they can vary outside of the DOT in terms of
13 their testimony. I was wondering if you had seen any data or if you were aware of any
14 data of how frequently that occurs, and what kinds of sources VEs are going to when they
15 are going outside of the DOT. Are you aware of any of that?

16 MS. TRACY: Great survey, we haven't done that one yet, that's a good
17 one to do. I can only speak from my own experience and talking to colleagues and such.

18 It's frequent that we have to go outside of the DOT, but I can't give you a
19 number exactly. But I would say part of what causes that to occur is, of course, the
20 collapsing of jobs.

21 X-ray techs now also do all of the input, and they have for a long time
22 now, but they do the input of, they type up everything as well as doing the
23 x-rays, right. Well, that used to be two jobs at one point in time. It's not two jobs
24 anymore.

25 I think some of that, it's been, we're giving maybe two DOT codes to

1 describe a claimant's work history because it's, or three, because there is some shifting
2 of combinations. That occurs quite a bit.

3 Jobs have changed and so it also occurs that once was considered a light
4 job is now medium, a medium job is now light. That's another instance that comes up
5 quite a bit where we go outside the DOT because it's just the job is different or however
6 it was classified isn't just how we as professionals generally view that job. So those are
7 the, probably the best instances of where I'm testifying that I'm outside the DOT.

8 The sources we go to are our own expertise in doing job analyses. That's
9 really where we go to. So I am frequently questioned by counsel about why am I coming
10 up with that analysis and where I go to is, I did a job analysis, and I have them in my
11 computer, I pull them up and I read them, and I've gone out and I've weighed stuff.
12 That's where I draw from is what I see and my expertise in working with people and
13 placing them.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Are there any other questions or
15 comments? Go ahead, Andy.

16 MR. WAKSHUL: I appreciate the input from all three of the
17 organizations not just yours, but certainly, including yours.

18 I do notice that a lot of the things that all three of you have said were
19 really not directed to the Panel which, but to SSA and to the component who's actually
20 doing the OIS. There really is a hard line between us and them, and we sometimes blur it
21 as well others.

22 We're just there taking the bullet for the, jumping in front of the President
23 as a Secret Service Agent because you have no other avenue to maybe to address it to
24 them. But it's not really this Panel that can do anything about a lot of the things that all
25 three of you had to say. But they were all good comments from all three.

1 MS. TRACY: And well aware of that.

2 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Andy. And I think that what we
3 received from public comment is also helpful to keep in context of our advice and
4 recommendations to SSA.

5 And we actually do have one more organization that signed up for public
6 comment so I'd like to thank Lynn for her public comment, and I'd like to welcome
7 Cynthia Grimley. She's the President Elect of the American Board of Vocational
8 Experts.

9 Cynthia, you've never testified before the Panel before or offered public
10 comment, so just to let you know how we go. It's ten minutes that you will have and
11 then we'll have the opportunity as you saw with the other three to ask questions or offer
12 comments. Welcome, Cynthia.

13 MS. GRIMLEY: Thank you. I won't be that long. I'm
14 Cynthia Grimley, and I do work as a Vocational Expert in private rehabilitation practice.
15 And as Mary said, I am also the President Elect of the American Board of Vocational
16 Experts and Chairperson and now tasked to follow the OIDAP.

17 I want to say that this was a very eye opening experience for me to see this
18 process, and to thank the Panel for all of their hard work in their task to develop a new
19 OIS because this is not an easy task.

20 One of the concerns, I think, that I felt after listening to all of, everything
21 that had gone on today was with the public not permitted in the working subcommittee
22 meetings. It was very difficult for the public to know and understand the process and
23 how things are moving forward.

24 Then today, there was very little deliberation between the Panel members
25 to inform the public at this open hearing as to what actually happened in the

1 subcommittee meetings. So it did not seem very enlightening to me sitting here
2 listening as to what happened days prior.

3 This is just very concerning because as Vocational Experts in private
4 sector, we depend on and are in desperate need of having an updated OIS. And the
5 sampling and criteria is so very critical.

6 We are the rehabilitation professionals that are out there providing
7 evaluations on a day-to-day basis, assessing labor markets, surveys, conducting job
8 analyses. The DEC should be made public as a working document. This is very
9 important.

10 In the past, Social Security Administration has led our field in how we
11 perform our evaluations in private rehabilitation sector. And those are my comments.

12 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Just to, because I know you're
13 fairly new to the process in terms of the subcommittees that we have, each of our
14 subcommittees that worked in subcommittee under FACA, we cannot have a quorum on
15 the subcommittee. So they under FACA can have their discussions not in the public
16 forum. That's why each of the subcommittee chairs was providing kind of an overview,
17 a couple of the subcommittees.

18 And I think because this is a dynamic process, we're very active such as
19 Sampling, and we heard some of that discussion there. Some others are a little bit
20 inactive until there is more going on that will deal with their particular topic. They've
21 been active in the past. The field job analyst was very active for about a year and did a
22 lot of presentations and those are all on our website.

23 So I think maybe, you know, coming in to this process at one meeting, you
24 might have seen kind of a disparity between the subcommittees. It's just their need, and
25 it does reflect that a couple of them have been rather inactive because they've been active

1 before and they'll be active again. It's just where they are within that process.

2 If you, each of the subcommittees, basically, reported what happened
3 within that process.

4 MS. GRIMLEY: Oh, I understand that. I guess I expected maybe to hear
5 a little bit more deliberation between the subcommittees at the public hearing, and there
6 was very, very little of that. I mean, that's really the only comment.

7 And other than the fact that I think that, and I understand that the DEC, the
8 testimony today was that the DEC has not been released because it's not final. But I
9 think that the public does deserve to see it as a working document.

10 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And I'll note that I think each of the public
11 commenters made that comment. That's something that SSA will, obviously, they're
12 here so I'm sure they're taking note of that.

13 MS. GRIMLEY: Thank you for letting me speak.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I do have a question for you, the same question
15 I asked Lynn in terms of ABVE has VEs that do SSA VE work.

16 MS. GRIMLEY: Yes, we do.

17 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Are you aware in terms of when VEs, SSA VEs
18 that are members of ABVE testify and go outside of the DOT in terms of their opinions
19 that they provide, how often that happens? Have you seen any data on that or and what
20 they go to?

21 MS. GRIMLEY: I don't have any data, a specific data, and I'm not aware
22 of any type of research. I can speak specifically to my practice and what I do. And
23 again, it's very often where I will have to conduct an interview with the claimant or the
24 injured worker that I'm evaluating to get a more detailed description of their job and/or
25 with the employer and actually doing a job analyses.

1 It does happen because the jobs have definitely changed, and some jobs
2 just do not exist. There are many out there have different job functions within one job
3 title so it's not uncommon that I will still rely on the DOT and maybe have five different
4 DOT titles that might relate to that one specific job title that that employer uses.

5 Job analyses as, like I said, in interviewing either the claimant or the
6 injured worker themselves in addition to doing the job analyses with the employer
7 directly; and also labor market surveys, calling employers and talking with them.

8 Actually, that also helps to verify then the Department of Labor, Bureau of
9 Labor Statistics, and all of the research as far as the comparative between the wages and
10 how they correlate to the local labor market.

11 I personally have referrals that I get for Vocational Expert testimony that
12 are in other areas of the country. I find the need to have to step out just to verify if I am
13 going to be required to testify in court in a different jurisdiction than where I live.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: So kind of like Lynn, you're going to your own
15 experience or you're developing that primary data yourself through labor market surveys.
16 Is that what I'm hearing?

17 MS. GRIMLEY: Yes, exactly. And the primary data would be almost
18 like on a per case, per case basis because you have to find out and determine if that DOT
19 is outdated and not accurate to that job description of the person. You have to actually go
20 out there and find other ways and resources and having the knowledge to know how to do
21 that.

22 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan.

23 DR. GIBSON: Two things. First, thank you for your comments there and
24 to Lynn because one of the things I feel that you've just reiterated which is good
25 information for us as we make recommendations and as SSA makes their plans is that it

1 will be very important that whatever OIS is developed not obscure heterogeneity
2 whether it emerges due to regional differences, labor union differences or the like, but a
3 system must account for this if it's going to be effective. I thank you for, once again,
4 pointing that out.

5 Two, I think it's important to mirror what Andrew just said. I'm
6 empathetic to the members of the audience today who might have felt today's meeting
7 was less transparent than some other meetings have been. Some of our meetings have
8 been very spirited, and you're probably lucky you haven't been part of them as other
9 members might be able to attest.

10 Please understand that as a group, the Panel tends to be very forthright
11 almost to the point of being obnoxious at times. It is our desire to be transparent, but we
12 do have as part of our job that access to internal government information sometimes
13 which simply isn't appropriate for discussing on the record now.

14 So for many of us, the briefings that have transpired in the past couple of
15 days really were bringing us up to date so that we can further help by making advice and
16 recommendations going forward.

17 So I feel like many people in the audience are aware of the direction that
18 the Agency is seeking information and help in and, hopefully, we will see more activity
19 from the Panel going forth.

20 I don't know that I believe that advice goes down as execution goes up. I
21 think it becomes more targeted advice instead of the generalized advice we gave early on.
22 That's what I'm expecting going forward, and I hope that'll better meet your needs and
23 expectations.

24 MS. GRIMLEY: Thank you for that clarification.

25 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions or comments of Cynthia?

1 Well, welcome, thank you.

2 MS. GRIMLEY: Thank you.

3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And I've been handed a note that BWI is
4 backed up so it's probably a good thing that we're running a little early. So I'm going to
5 plow through the agenda and go to the administrative business part of the agenda.

6 We have two sets of minutes in our binders. One of them is the minutes
7 from the last face-to-face meeting. We already reviewed those minutes at our
8 teleconference. According to our Operating Procedures, we have to ratify those at our
9 next face-to-face meeting 'cause that was an electronic meeting.

10 Do I hear any objection to accepting those minutes as previously, we don't
11 need to vote on it if I don't hear any objection? Okay. Hearing no objection, we have
12 ratified the minutes from the last face-to-face meeting in September.

13 Then we have the other set of minutes, and I'd like to actually step aside
14 here a little bit and just compliment the staff that's putting together our minutes. These
15 are looking really good. You've done a fantastic job, and I wanted to compliment the
16 staff working on these. So hearing no objections, those minutes are accepted as printed.

17 We have also been provided with a copy of our Operating Procedures, and
18 it looks like we get a chance to take a look at these almost at every meeting. But the
19 reason we had to look at them this time more basically for two areas.

20 One of them is our charter change so just the date change on the Operating
21 Procedures will bring it before us. The other area that was up for modification of the
22 Operating Procedures was based on a motion and a vote that we had at the last meeting
23 for inclusion.

24 So at this point, I'd like to open up discussion on the Operating
25 Procedures, if there any questions? Janine.

1 MS. HOLLOMAN: Thank you, Mary. Janine Holloman. Again, this
2 is an issue that seems to just keep coming up.

3 If you look at the September minutes and go to page 14 of the September
4 minutes, this is to remind the Panel that there was a vote at that meeting to incorporate
5 changes from the Boston meeting and make, and put those changes into the Operating
6 Procedure.

7 So this paragraph in the middle of page 14, a motion was made to
8 incorporate the previous approved edits to Appendix C of the User Needs and Relations
9 Subcommittee report, Section 5, Appendix C, with an amendment that was approved. It
10 was approved that the wording with the amendments would go into the Operating
11 Procedure.

12 On page 4 of the Operating Procedure is where that should have gone, at
13 the end of page, Section 5, subsection C, page 4 is where those changes should have
14 gone, and they are not there.

15 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And just to remind the Panel, this is something
16 that we integrated at the Boston meeting that any general recommendation that we make
17 will go out for public comments, and we will hear that public comment through the
18 Federal Register before we go to final vote on that. So that's a general recommendation
19 that was from the Boston meeting. We revisited it at the last meeting, and it was voted
20 and approved and so that is what is being referred to.

21 MS. HOLLOMAN: Right, and it did not get incorporated into the latest
22 version of the Operating Procedures.

23 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, Shanan. Did you have something?

24 DR. GIBSON: I was going say so is this is simply a matter of we must
25 move to have the previously voted upon amendment incorporated in the Operating

1 Procedures before we agree to approve them?

2 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: So I think at this point, we just need to take it
3 back to the DFO to ensure that that wording is included in that before we vote on these
4 Operating Procedures.

5 MS. HOLLOMAN: Correct, thank you.

6 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Is there anything else in terms of the Operating
7 Procedures? Okay. We are down to our last item.

8 We have right now two meetings scheduled. We have one before our
9 charter ends and one after our charter ends. The one before our charter ends is our
10 teleconference on June 4th at 10:00 a.m. Eastern Time. I would entertain areas of agenda
11 consideration that the Panel would like to ensure gets included on that agenda. Allan.

12 DR. HUNT: Sampling Subcommittee Interim Report, whatever you want
13 to call it.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: All the subcommittee chairs are on the hook for
15 that one and so is the project director. Any other areas that you want to make sure that
16 we are briefed on, we are discussing on that agenda? Shanan.

17 DR. GIBSON: I don't know that we'll need to discuss it at that time, but
18 if we have indeed received the final draft of ICF's Call 003, I would believe it would
19 come up at that time if it's been received and reviewed.

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for that. I think that Sylvia indicated
21 that in May, Call 003 was going to be delivered to them so that timing would be, so Call
22 003 of ICF. Tom.

23 MR. HARDY: Would you entertain the idea of perhaps sending an e-mail
24 reminder around in about a month or so and asking us again at that point what we would
25 like to have on the agenda?

1 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Absolutely.

2 MR. HARDY: I would like to ask you to do that.

3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I will do that.

4 MR. HARDY: Thank you.

5 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And then the other meeting that we have on the,
6 on our calendars is for the week of August 3rd, 13th, excuse me. It will likely be in
7 Baltimore. We've been meeting here consistently for quite a while now just because this
8 is a cheaper way to go, and we're dealing with budget issues.

9 I will get to the Panel as soon as I hear from the SSA executives in terms
10 of past July 6th, but at this point, it's business as usual I think. Janine.

11 MS. HOLLOMAN: In the event it's not business as usual, I love to take
12 worse case scenario and figure out what we're going to do. And if we are not chartered
13 beyond that June meeting, are we going to develop an exit strategy or exit comment? I
14 would like not to just get an e-mail saying thanks, but we don't need you anymore.

15 I would like to, because this group has such a collective expertise, it would
16 be nice to develop something that SSA can take forward what we would like to see
17 happen or some final document or some final meeting.

18 I'm hoping it doesn't go there, but maybe this is a good time to talk about
19 what if we do go there.

20 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Great question. Believe me, I'll be on it. If we
21 do hear that we will not be chartered beyond July 6th, we do have the meeting in June,
22 but we could have other public meetings before then or after that time until July 6th.

23 MS. HOLLOMAN: So that was my question. At that June meeting, we
24 could schedule another meeting as long as it happened before July 6th?

25 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Or we could have another public meeting

1 before June 4th.

2 MS. HOLLOMAN: Correct.

3 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I will be in close contact with the Panel. Any
4 other comments? Go ahead, Janine.

5 MS. HOLLOMAN: Just one more, and maybe this is a good way to
6 rephrase the way I'm feeling about this entire meeting.

7 I know I had e-mailed the Panel before this meeting that I had always been
8 extremely pleased to be working with such an excellent group, both from SSA and from
9 the Panel, and our need, our feeling that we were going to get this right, were we now
10 heading to, are we just going to get this done.

11 After the meetings and meeting Jone and spending more time with her and
12 other Panel members, I'm leaving this meeting feeling like we are on track to get this
13 right.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Janine. Is there anybody who did
15 not have a chance on the Panel to say something that you would like to say now? I think
16 everybody had a chance to speak at some point throughout the day, but I just want to
17 make sure. Okay.

18 I'd like to thank the Panel. I'd like to thank the staff at SSA. I'd like to
19 particularly thank the public for your participation in our meeting today.

20 Hearing no further business, I would like to turn the meeting over to our
21 designated federal officer who will adjourn the meeting.

22 MS. BROOKS: If there are no objections, we will adjourn.

23 Hearing no objections, we are adjourned until June 4th at our next
24 telephone meeting of this Panel.

25 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, all.

(Whereupon, the meeting closed at 2:04 p.m. on March 22, 2012.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of:

Quarterly Meeting of the Occupational Information

BEFORE: Development Advisory Panel

DATE: March 22, 2012

PLACE: Baltimore, Maryland

Represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported
and reduced to typewriting.

Christina Neilson, Transcriber
Free State Reporting, Inc.