UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT
ADVISORY PANEL (OIDAP)

+ + + + +

QUARTERLY MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

+ + + + +

The Panel met in the Calvert Ballroom, Radisson Plaza Lord Baltimore Hotel, 20 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland, at 9:00 a.m, Mary Barros-Bailey, PhD, Chair, presiding.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT
MARY BARROS-BAILEY, PhD, Chair
JOHN CRESWELL, PhD
ROBERT FRASER, PhD
PAMELA FRUGOLI
SHANAN GWALTNEY GIBSON, PhD
THOMAS HARDY, JD
JANINE HOLLOMAN
H. ALLAN HUNT, PhD
TIMOTHY KEY, MD
DEBORAH LECHNER, PT, MS
ABIGAIL PANTER, PhD
JUAN SANCHEZ, PhD
DAVID SCHRETLEN, PhD
ANDREW WAKSHUL, JD

ALSO PRESENT
DAVID A. RUST, Deputy Commissioner, ORDP
RICHARD BALKUS, Associate Commissioner, OPDR
MICHAEL DUNN, Staff
DEBBIE HARKIN, Staff
SYLVIA E. KARMAN, Director, OVRD
ELIZABETH KENNEDY, Staff
CLARE RITTERHOFF, Staff
NOLAN SMITH-KAPROSY, Staff
DEBRA TIDWELL-PETERS, Social Insurance Specialist, OVRD
MICHAEL TRAPANI, Staff
LEOLA S. BROOKS, Designated Federal Officer

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Call to Order
Leola S. Brooks. 4

Overview of Today's Agenda
Mary Barros-Bailey 4

Presentation and Introduction of New OIDAP Members

Welcome Remarks from SSA Executives
David A. Rust 8
Richard Balkus 15

OIDAP Chair's Report
Mary Barros-Bailey 20

Office Director's Report
Sylvia E. Karman 26

OIS Baseline Activity - Services for Development and Reporting on Strategy for Training, Certifying, and Recruiting Job Analysts
Debra Tidwell-Peters 59
Brian Cronin 60

Call Order 0002: Business Strategy for Training, Certifying, and Recruiting Job Analysts
Jennifer Harvey. 128

Job Analysis Scaling Issues
Deborah E. Lechner 198
Shanan Gwaltney Gibson 215
Juan I. Sanchez. 223

OIDAP Deliberation. 285

Adjournment 305

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

9:00 a.m.

MS. BROOKS: Good morning. My name is Leola Brooks. I am the designated federal officer for the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel.

Welcome to the fourth quarterly meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel. The meeting is now called to order.

I would like to turn the meeting over to the Panel Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Leola.

Good morning, everybody. Thank you for your attendance at the first day of the fourth quarterly meeting of the OIDAP for fiscal year 2011.

The agenda for this meeting can be found in your packets if you are here in the audience, or, if you are listening in, you could go to www.ssa.gov/oidap under the meeting information and find the agenda.

We are going to be having a series of PowerPoints over the next couple days and those are coming up onto the Web site. If those are not up there during the course of the meeting and you would like a copy and you're listening in on line, you can email Leola Brooks at leola.brooks@ssa.gov.

On the Web site you'll find information for past meetings, panel documents such as formal correspondence and reports. For those of us who have been on the panel from the inception, we know it's been two years since we put out our initial report this month.

And as we indicate at the start of each meeting, the charter of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel, or OIDAP, is to provide the Social Security Administration with independent advice and recommendations for the development of the

Occupational Information System to replace the Dictionary of Occupational Titles in its disability adjudication. Our task is not to develop the OIS itself. As our name implies, it is to provide advisory recommendations to SSA as it develops the OIS.

So if we can go through today's agenda, we will take a look at what we have in store. It's behind tab 2 in your folders. We will have a presentation of certificates to the most recent OIDAP members. We will have welcome remarks for SSA executives. Then we will have reports by myself and the project director going onto the information in terms of some baseline activities for job analysis, for the training certification and recruitment of job analysts. We will have some presentation, but a lot of discussion, kind of a working session on job analysis scaling issues. We will have some time for public comment and deliberation and close the day.

As according to the OIDAP charter

that was enacted or appointment in January of this year, our panel membership was to increase up to 14 or not to exceed 14 members. As of the July teleconference we have been a full panel. However, since this is our first face-to-face meeting, and for the benefit of the audience listening in, I'm going to ask all the panel members to go around and identify your name so as we talk through the session people can know who we are.

I'll go ahead and start with Tim Key.

MEMBER KEY: Tim Key.

MEMBER GIBSON: Shanan Gibson.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: David Schretlen.

MEMBER PANTER: Abigail Panter.

MEMBER HARDY: Thomas Hardy.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Pam Frugoli.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Juan Sanchez.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: Andrew Wakshul.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Janine Holloman.

MEMBER HUNT: Allan Hunt.

MEMBER CRESWELL: John Creswell.

MEMBER LECHNER: Deborah Lechner.

MEMBER FRASER: Robert Fraser.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. As we can see, the mics are set up so we can't have two mics on at the same time.

So at this time, I would like to welcome the Deputy Commissioner, David Rust from the Office of Retirement and Disability Policy, who will provide our new members with their certificates.

Welcome, David.

Pam Frugoli and Andy Wakshul.

David, if you'd like to come and present the certificates here. And Pam and Andy.

(Whereupon, the certificates were presented.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think we are -- David, I think they're okay. Thank you, David. Welcome. Welcome, David.

MR. RUST: Madam Chair, thank you.

Thanks for inviting me this morning. I'm pleased to be with you this morning and to greet the two new members of the panel.

As I do every time I meet with you; so I know this will be repetitious for the more senior members, I want to urge you to move this project forward with all deliberate speed. This is an important project for the Social Security Administration. The purpose of the project is to give SSA an occupational information system for the specific use of our disability programs. It is our expectation that OIS will provide us with an updated and fully applicable replacement for the current DOT, which as we always like to point out to people was never really designed for our program purposes. It was always sort of adopted or adapted to the needs of our disability program.

We look forward to working with you to produce this product and we hope it will enable us to adjudicate disability claims under our current regulations. It's also our expectation that the revised OIS will be a platform for us to look at policy changes and process changes in the future.

We recognize the need for additional in- house expertise to support OIS. First, I am pleased to tell you that we are in the final stages of hiring a senior research psychologist with the requisite specific expertise in this area. We anticipate that the individual will be selected for this position and will join SSA sometime in October or early November.

Second, while our projected and current fiscal situation precludes hiring of new staff; and as many of you know we've been under a hiring freeze for about 14 months now, we are looking for other tools to allow us to expand the staff expertise to support this effort. One of them is interagency personnel agreements and contracts with consultants.

I'm pleased to announce that we recently awarded contracts to Dr. Fred Mergeson and Dr. Robert Harvey to assist us in the OIS research and development needs for fiscal year 2012.

We will also continue to expand our effort to collaborate with other federal agencies. We are meeting with the Census Bureau and BLS and we have an MOU pending with the Department of Labor for approval, all of which will help supplement the resources that we can bring to bear on this project. We will continue to identify additional resources, including internal resources that will help us move this project forward.

In closing, to facilitate the work of this committee, I am recommending to the Commissioner that we extend for an additional year the OIDAP charter so that it will cover the period from January 2012 to January 2013.

Once again, I want to thank all of you for your hard word, for your willingness to serve on this panel. We look forward to having the new members dive right in and participate actively in the deliberations of the panel. I can say to the two new members you'll find this is a very active panel and we're pleased to provide whatever support and encouragement we can in any way we can. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, David.

Are there any questions from the panel?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I don't hear any questions.

I have a question in terms of the staffing. I know that's a challenge and I know that you've been working hard. And I know another challenge in terms of having the OIS plan out there is that there are some timelines associated with delivery of certain aspects of the plan. And would the staffing projections or inability to meet some of those staffing projections to be able to deliver the plan the way it is perceived affect the timeline into the future, because I know that you had started the session by talking about speed. And from the meetings we had yesterday, I know some of the subcommittees are raring to go, and so, I know that staffing may be an issue from what I just heard. So I was just wondering in terms of the staffing pattern into the future to support the timeline.

MR. RUST: Well, the two contracts that I just mentioned are already in place, so those people are going to be available to us this year. Like I say, we expect the senior scientists to be on board in a matter of weeks. Beyond that, what we've done internally is we've looked within SSA to see if there are any additional resources, or if we don't move the people or bring the people to bear if they can work in a collaborative way. And we're doing the same thing with other departments and agencies. We'll continue to do that. But we're going to be badly strapped.

No one knows what our FY 2012 budget's actually going to look like. The last time I checked, a Labor ATW bill had not passed either House or Senate. We assume we're going to be under a continued resolution for the next couple months, but beyond that we don't know. We do think it will be tight. So I just don't see a lot of additional hiring, but we will do everything we can internally and externally to see if we can identify resources and bring them to bear on this project. This is one of our very top priority projects.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. I understand the situation that SSA is under and I think we are all pretty committed. And from the way we see the project going, everything's in place to make it work if SSA is able to deal with issues sometimes outside of its control in terms of the staffing. So thank you. I appreciate your time again to come and present to the panel.

MR. RUST: As I said, you can be assured we'll do whatever we can to help move this project forward because this is really one of the things that I think can greatly improve the performance and accuracy and getting to the correct decision in these critical programs, these critical cases. So we'll be there with you.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. And I would also like to welcome Richard Balkus to address the panel. Richard is known to the panel. He's the Associate Commissioner of the Office of Program Development and Research.

Welcome, Richard.

MR. BALKUS: Thank you, Mary. I just have a few comments this morning, and my comments are in the form of thank yous and acknowledgements.

First, I would like to extend my welcome to both Pam and Andy to their panel. I know the expertise that you bring from your respective careers and long careers in federal service and I know that those careers and your experience will serve the panel and our office well.

Second, I would like to acknowledge Sylvia and staff for their efforts and for the contributions from the panel to produce the R&D plan that we put out there in July. This was a tremendous effort, took longer than we expected. We know that there was a lot of back and forth and reviews in terms of producing that plan, but I think it's important for us to have it out there and for our monitoring authorities and for the public to have a chance to see what this project is about, and particularly the complexity that this project has.

I'd also like to acknowledge the work of ICF International. I've reviewed the reports that Drs. Cronin and Harvey will present on later this morning, on that focuses on job analysis methodology and the other one on the business process for training, certifying and recruiting job analysts. I value the comprehensiveness of the material covered and I value their guidance and recommendations.

I'd also like to thank Debra Tidwell-Peters for her outstanding leadership and contributions working with ICF International on these two initial projects.

For fiscal year 2012 we have a lot of challenges ahead of us. I think both David and Mary's question alluded to the challenge of making sure that we staff this project in a way that's going to continue to move it forward. I can tell you that we are looking at different options in terms of outside help through IPAs and possibly down the road through additional consultants to help us and supplement the staff that we have on board in moving the project forward. We are also anxious to have the senior research psychologists joint the staff. And as David pointed out, we hope that that person will be on board during the month of October,early November at the latest.

But in addition, I wanted to point out that for fiscal year 2011, in putting the plan out there I wanted to make sure that we keep on target in terms of the deliverables that we had indicated in that plan. And Sylvia's going to report later this morning on a lot of the base line activities that have come to a close or about to come to a close and that are reflected in the plan for 2011. I think we're all anxious to move on to fiscal year 2012 to continue with moving from the disability evaluation constructs into the development of the work taxonomy and into instrument development. These are critical activities and there are a lot of dependencies here with other activities that are outlined in the plan to make sure that this effort goes forward in a timely way and meets the time frames that we've identified in the plan.

So again, I'd like to thank the panel for their support and for their recommendations and guidance on helping us put out the R&D plan and I look forward to 2012 as we begin this important work. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Richard.

Does anybody from the panel have any questions for Richard?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Richard, thank you for your words. I wanted to comment that this project over the last year has changed tremendously. It's in a great shape and I think SSA should be proud of the direction it's going in. And I know it took a lot of work, I know it took a lot of thought, and I know that OPDR, OVRD is working to deliver this according to the speed that

David reminds us about and that we're all very aware of, and I think the project's in great shape to do just that. So thank you for your words and I wanted to acknowledge SSA for the work that it's done over the last year. Thank you.

Okay. At this point we have my PowerPoint. Is the PowerPoint ready to go?

Okay. For those of us here in the room, we have a copy of my PowerPoint. I'm just going to go ahead and talk through it as it's getting loaded.

It is in front of the second red tab in our -- tab 2, and it looks like this. It's the very colorful one.

I just wanted to basically summarize the fiscal year by acknowledging, as I did before, that over the last year we have had 3 new panel members that bring us up -- excuse me, 5 new panel members that bring us up to the 14. If you look at the PowerPoint, the ones that are highlighted -- so John

Creswell, Pam Frugoli, Tim Key, Juan Sanchez and Andy Wakshul are the new panel members. We welcome your attendance, we welcome your expertise. I feel very excited to see the people we have around the table working on this project, and particularly all of the wonderful conversations as we are heading into a very full 2012.

We have four new subcommittees and the subcommittee chairs are going to be giving their reports during this meeting, so I will let them go ahead and announce who is on their subcommittees at that time. But we have the Job Analyst Subcommittee, and that's Deb Lechner, chair. We have Sampling with Allan Hunt as chair. We have Taxonomy and Instrumentation with Shanan Gibson as chair. And User Needs and Relations with Janine Holloman.

We also have an executive subcommittee; it's not a formal subcommittee in the sense that it is kind of ad hoc, and it is a subcommittee that advises me or helps me with issues that come up. They helped with the subcommittee structure and definitions and other things that have come up during the last six months. And so I want to acknowledge Bob Fraser, Shanan Gibson and Allan Hunt who have served in that capacity. This is an advisory group that helps me. It rotates, so every six months I have new people coming into that capacity. So thank you for your assistance over the last several months.

I just wanted to very briefly summarize some of the things that we have been doing with SSA over the last year. It has been working in terms of planning and consultations for the OIS R&D plan, and a very useful tool as part of that plan has been the business process. It's very useful not only to understand where things are in the process as they get developed, but also our language. So yesterday as we had subcommittee meetings it was very helpful to understand, okay, something is coming in at Phase 1. What does that mean in terms of development? So this has greatly assisted the process.

And depending on what the activity is in terms of our level of engagement, it might take one panel member based on the activity such as the legal standards and our one famous attorney on the panel, or it might be an activity that takes a whole subcommittee. So it's very specific. It's very directed. I think it's a very efficient way to move and I see that really helping the process move along quite quickly. And obviously we had some input in terms of the job description for the lead scientist. We're very excited. That is moving along very swiftly, and thank SSA for that.

So the other thing in terms of some activities or some communication with stakeholders, Sylvia Karman and I presented to the National Association of Disability Examiners that we believe are one of the main users of this and very engaged in their understanding. And also they're probably the number one people that want the speed in this, because they see on a daily basis very much. And so that was in August, at the end of August in LA. We have also been contacted, and I spoke with the General Accounting Office in terms of a study that they are currently doing.

As we heard from David Rust, our charter is going to be going or renewed through January of 2013. I know the Commissioner is supposed to leave in January 2013, so that month will be a very active month, and so that meaning doesn't fall from me.

In terms of future meetings, I did recommend somewhat of a change over the next year, how we go about our work. We have, at the very beginning of this panel, had four quarterly face-to-face meetings. As things have changed over time, and particularly as we project into the next year, I recommended to SSA that we have two face-to-face meetings, two teleconferences. That would give the opportunity if there are issues that need to be addressed at the subcommittee status for smaller groups to be able to work with the project. We understand that SSA is like a lot of federal agencies, under a lot of fiscal constraint as well. And for the next year I believe that it's a good way to move forward. And so we will be having kind of a different structure. Our next teleconference is December 7. We do have the teleconferences set. The face-to-face meetings, we're still finalizing those particular dates.

In terms of stakeholder input, obviously that's one of the three main reasons for our existence, or attendance under FACA is our transparency and our ability to receive comment and also make the public aware of our activities. So we always welcome, always welcome the public to be involved at our meetings, whether telephonically or here live. We have been invited to present at a variety of conferences. I know that we have three conference presentations coming up. And there are other ways that the public can contribute and we welcome your input into this process at any point.

So are there any questions from the panel at all in terms of general outlook or activities?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you all.

At this time I'd like to welcome the project director to deliver her report. And her PowerPoint was right behind mine in the three- ring binder.

MS. KARMAN: Good morning, everyone. We've covered a lot of ground since we last met with you in May. We've been looking forward to this meeting for a couple weeks now, particularly the presentations that we're going to hear later today and tomorrow. And also I'm happy to report on some of the progress that we've had over the last few months.

So I've divided my report or presentation into two segments; one to cover the status and reporting, the completion of a number of activities for fiscal year 2011. And the second half covers the activity plan for fiscal year 2012, some of which we have already begun, and we initiated some of that discussion yesterday with the panel in subcommittees. This segment also includes a few words about the presentations that we're going to be hearing today, presentations to the panel, because of the significance of these topics for us in fiscal year 2012.

So as you know, SSA has published the fiscal year 2011 OIS R&D plan this July. It is available on our most recently initiated project Web site. The Web site address; I think it's going to be on the last slide, but for those of you who are listening, the address is www.ssa.gov/disabilityresearch/occupational_ info_systems. We intend to publish an update of the plan every fiscal year and largely because the plan provides a window on to the R&D phase, research and development phase of the OIS project.

The first few sections of the plan basically cover -- they outline OIS objectives; the R&D objectives, that is, the organizations that are involved directly and indirectly with the project, and also the OIS business process. As Richard had mentioned, because the audience of this plan is largely the public, also our monitoring authorities, it is written at a higher level so that it doesn't provide, you know, an enormous amount of detail or else it would be quite long, but also just sort of gives the public a sense of where we're headed, what we're planning to do in a given year. And of course, in our effort to update that every single year, some of these things are going to change.

So one of the things that I think is going to be of great focus for us in the next year certainly is if people were to look at -- Section IV covers the research and design activities required before full national stage data collection can begin. And you will note that the plan and the timeline are really quite aggressive. So we have a lot of work to cover, a lot of ground to cover in 2012. And already with the discussions that we've been having with panel members, I think we're going to be well able to really get that underway.

Some other activities that you will find in Section IV of the R&D plan refers to the baseline activities. We are completing a final report. That would be in our vernacular a Phase 4 document for the OIS International and Domestic Investigation. And we are on schedule to have the Phase 4 draft to the panel and the OIS Development Work Group in a couple weeks for consultation and review. One of the outcomes of the OIS investigation I find most useful is the extent to which we have established contacts both internationally and domestically with officials, particularly those of the U.S. federal agencies. I think it's going to be very helpful to us in terms of finding out, you know, who has the historical background and understanding for the processes, the design features that are in effect for a number of the classifications that we reviewed. So I think that that is going to be very helpful for us moving forward.

We have also completed the reviews of the appellate cases for the Occupational Medical- Vocational Study. The R&D plan timeline shows that the -- what we call the Occ Med-Voc Study to be completed in early fiscal year 2012. Our staff is now conducting a quality assurance process with some assistance from two or three reviewers from other offices within the Office of Retirement and Disability Policy.

Also, as shown as baseline activities in the plan is contracted work that we have with ICF International. ICF has completed final reports for what we call Calls 1 and 2, one for benchmarking job analysis methods and the other benchmarking recruitment training and certification processes for job analysts. And of course as you know ICF will be presenting to you all later this morning and this afternoon.

Another set of activities that we undertook this fiscal year is to identify the OIS standards. We have three areas that we are interested in establishing those standards, or recognizing, identifying standards that have already been established.

For legal standards we have completed the final report. Again, in our business process we refer to that as a Phase 4 document. And that is currently under review with Social Security's Office of General Counsel. Their comments are due to us I think by early next week, if not the end of this week, so we hope to have their input shortly. And then at that point our management will also review the plan -- I mean, the final report and we'll be sharing that with the OIS Development Work Group, as well as the panel.

For our scientific standards, we again have completed a draft, a final document or a Phase 4 document. Our management is reviewing it, and that includes me, so I need to do that when we finish today. We also plan to have the finals of the legal and scientific Phase 4 documents completed within the next two weeks, so I think that will be something that we can then have already identified. And in those two cases we are really identifying standards that exist.

In the case of useability, we have

completed a Phase 1 and we've met with the OIS Development Work Group with the SSA's useability center to inform our work moving forward in that area. I also know that the subcommittee, User Needs and Relations Subcommittee met to talk with our team yesterday about our useability work. The R&D plan timeline shows this activity is being completed in FY 2012, rather than 2011.

Our next steps involve consultations with the EOIS Development Work Group and of course with User Needs and Relations Subcommittee and other members of the panel. We anticipate the need to map out all of the decision points that adjudicators may need to make throughout step 4 and step 5 of the sequential evaluation process. I think that will really enable us to get a better sense of the specifics that we will need in order to develop the taxonomy and, you know, move into instrument development so that we're sure that we're creating an instrument that will garner the kind of information, the kind of data our adjudicators really do need.

So the useability portion of the standards is requiring us to do a bit more work with other aspects of our project, so it was not possible for us to be completing that at this moment since other things need to also happen concurrently.

So I think both Deputy Commissioner Rust and Richard Balkus did speak to the issue of where we are in terms of bringing additional staff and expertise that does not currently exist within Social Security to the project. And regarding our need to build on SSA's expertise to conduct the OIS research and development, we have conducted the interviews for the senior research psychologist position and we plan to complete the selection process in the next two weeks. And we anticipate that the individual will be joining our project in October or early November, as both has indicated.

Also in July we awarded contracts to I/O, industrial/organizational, consultants, Dr. Fred Mergeson and Dr. Robert Harvey. Each are preparing his proposal regarding the next steps that we need to take to complete the work taxonomy, which each in turn will critique the other's proposal before they submit them to us. And from these proposals we will consult with the panel, specifically the Taxonomy and Instrumentation Subcommittee to develop our methodology or what we term in our business process to be a Phase 2 document to develop the work taxonomy. So we really need to be moving as quickly and deliberately as we can. We anticipate having both proposals from the consultants within the next three weeks.

As for the additional SSA staff for OVRD, we do have the ability to hire any other staff as the agency continues to be under a hiring moratorium, which I know you've heard this morning. So we are certainly looking forward to having the senior research psychologist on board with us. That will be of enormous assistance to us and I, you know, continue to note that the need for additional full time staff is, you know, well known dependency for the work that we're doing while we do pursue other options though looking for interagency personnel agreements if the funding is available.

Also, with regard to some of our external activities, the Government Accountability Office is conducting an audit of SSA's activity to modernize the disability programs and in that effort it has also identified the OIS project as a subject of this review. The GAO staff has met with us a couple times over the last few months; once in May and again September 1, to ask us some questions about the project. We understand the GAO intends to produce a report in spring of committee 2012.

And while we have not be traveling

as frequently as we did in fiscal year 2010, both because of budget concerns and also because at this point with our project well underway it just is simply necessary for us to be, you know, in the office doing that work. However, I did present with Mary at the National Association of Disability Examiners National Training Conference at the end of August. She also had mentioned that. And I am scheduled to present on the OIS project at a preconference for the Vocational Evaluation Work Adjustment Association and National Rehabilitation Association in mid-October. And finally, Mary and I are presenting on a panel and project activity to the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals in early November.

I mention these organizations and our ability, when funding and our schedules allow and when we've been invited, to speak with these organizations because it's been very enlightening for us in terms of how our project is moving forward, how others see it, where in fact our work can be of most value. Certainly when we presented to the National Association of Disability Examiners it is very evident that the work that we are undertaking is of enormous importance to the adjudicators who are, you know, at the head of the line, first in line to get the initial claims for disability. So it's a good reminder for us about what the purpose is, so I very much appreciate the invitations to these organizations.

So let's talk a little bit about where we're going in fiscal year 2012. We have already launched a number of activities. And as our baseline in standards work winds down and completes in the next couple weeks, we have begun to move forward with several other key initiatives. We are developing a matrix of the key OIS design elements. We have design decisions that we need to address throughout the research and development phase of the project. That is also reflected in the table of contents in the plan. Particularly, we have begun consulting with the Taxonomy and Instrumentation Subcommittee regarding the design decisions that are must urgent and that these questions are the ones that we must address in order to complete the work taxonomy and the instrument. The industrial/organizational consultants will also provide their input to these questions.

Following the award of the two industrial/organizational consultants, the staff drew up a series of questions that comprised the consultants' first tasks. And I mentioned this a few slides ago about developing proposals on how to complete the work taxonomy the panel recommended in 2009, and that would be based on the agency's disability evaluation needs.

The I/O consultants proposals will help us take the next steps to complete the prototype work taxonomy and that, in combination with other work that we will be doing under our business purchase agreement with ICF, will need to be coming together at the end of February. So we have a lot of work to do in a short amount of time.

Also, staff is completing a final draft of a paper documenting our literature survey regarding work analysis. And again, this is for our use for our staff to be able to have sort of an overview, an sense of what the research and the work has been in the area of work analysis. And all of this lays the groundwork for our instrument development which we are scheduled to take up toward the end of 2012. We also plan to begin developing the requirements for a data management plan to house the OIS data as well as the protocol for analyzing it. So I think that that will be an important part of the instrument development certainly.

Some other things that we're looking forward to in 2012: We have drafted a

Phase 1, which in our business process is really a conceptual outline for developing a prototype sampling plan. We met yesterday with the Sampling Subcommittee and we held that initial consultation, recognizing that we already know we very much have a need to hear from a number of other experts in this area to I think help us not only, you know, look at the questions that we've already developed, but help us formulate an approach to addressing those and perhaps even identifying other options and creative ways of getting at this. Very unique problem, because Social Security is looking at gathering labor market information, but not quite in the same way that other statistical agencies have done so up until now. So, you know, we have as usual something that's not quite the same as what others have. So we really do need to take a creative look at what can be done there.

We are also preparing to begin another task under the business purchase agreement; I just mentioned that a little while ago, that Social Security has with ICF International involving data collection processes and protocols. And so that subject may come up toward the end of the presentations that they have.

Finally, we will need to initiate the title taxonomy so that we have a classification structure in mind to begin with when we conduct the prototype pilot as scheduled for 2013. Also, there are some questions that are related with regard to the development of the taxonomy and instrument in that regard.

So another piece of what we're looking forward to in 2012 involves the presentations that we're going to hear from today and tomorrow. First I just want to mention that a couple of the panel members are going to be discussing scales and measures, which I think is going to be really helpful to us as we are heading into this fall into taxonomy development and then preparing the requirements for the instrument.

So to support that work that we're going to undertake in 2012, we did work with the panel to schedule these presentations for the September 2011 meeting. So as I mentioned earlier, I think Deb Lechner and Juan Sanchez will discuss the relevant scales and measures for physical work demands and I think that information of course will be really critical to our taxonomic development. To assist the panel its deliberations and SSA in its development of data collection and job analyst business process, we are also pleased to have presenters from ICF International, you know, discussing the results of their final reports on both calls 1 and 2.

And also Pam Frugoli, our new panel member, and team leader in the Department of Labor employment Training Administration is presenting on the points of contact within the O*NET Center process for collecting data for

O*NET. And Michael Weiler from Census Bureau will be presenting on the data collection process that Census has in place for a number of federal surveys that it conducts to produce information that the public has come to rely on and probably does not even realize where it comes from.

So I do thank all of the presenters. We have a great deal to learn from you and we will continue to meet with experts and officials from other federal agencies who can provide us with their insight and valuable lessons such as we well know the sampling approaches that we heard from both Department of Labor and Census Bureau in May of 2011, and now the data collection processes.

So my final screen there does show the Web site and contact information. I guess this would be a good time for me to find out if there are any questions.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Thank you,

Sylvia. I guess I also want to second what Mary said, that it seemed after this panel promulgated our report that there was a kind of lull of activity as Social Security got reorganized to really get started, and it's very exciting to see how much progress has been made over this past year toward that end.

You talked about the consultants, Drs. Mergeson and Harvey, and they're consulting to SSA. This panel of course consults to SSA. And I'm just wondering can you talk a little bit about how we might wind up interacting with those consultants? Do you anticipate them attending any of these meetings? Will we have direct contact? I know we're going to be reviewing some of their -- you know, what they write, but will there be just dialogue between this panel and those consultants?

MS. KARMAN: Good question, David. We have established, as we do with our contractors, that the contracting office or technical representative and the manager overseeing the project are really the two individuals that will have ongoing continued contact with the contractors. There are a number of reasons for that. One is so that because, you know, they are the most familiar with the tenets of the contract and also with where we would want to be spending their time, since in this case time literally is money. And we only have so many hours that we can allot in a consultant contract to the contract, so we want to try to keep tabs on where the time is spent.

So we had a lot of discussion in setting up the contracts before they were awarded, about where might we be wanting to have consultants spending time? You know, would we want them attending meetings and that kind of thing? So there may be opportunity where it would make sense for us to, for example, have a round table with several members of the panel and then the industrial/organizational psychologists attending that as well, you know, to address a specific issue with, you know, a 4-square document and, you know, the questions laid out. Or, perhaps there may come a point where it may be valuable to have them come in and do a presentation as we have asked ICF to do so today.

And so the interaction that we anticipate the panel having with the consultants will be largely through our staff. But when we think that it would be valuable either on the part of the -- you know, one of the subcommittees or in terms of some of the activities that we're initiating, you know, it may make sense to bring one or both of the consultants in to, you know, participate in a formal meeting. So that's pretty much how we have it set up, because I think that way we can better manager the work load that we give them, since again it's the way the contract is set up. We pay by an hourly basis and we have a limit under the contract how many hours we can put forward to that.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And then the same question about the senior scientist.

MS. KARMAN: Okay. So the way in which we've set up the senior scientist position is, first of all, that individual is going to be in the front office for the Office of Vocational Resources Development. Person would report to me and they would serve as a senior advisor not only to me but to my managers and to my staff, as well as my management. So what we did was that position is not -- we did not encumber that position with management responsibilities because we felt that that would really distract that individual from some of the very, you know, much needed focus that we're going to need.

So I say that to start the conversation in the line of, well, you know, this person will be there to roll their sleeves up and actually work one-on-one with me, with our managers and staff, frequently having to mentor staff that are more new to this work. And since most of us are new to this work, I think a number of us will be mentored in that regard.

But also I think the way that that individual will interact with the panel will be through our business process, just as we're doing currently with, you know, our current staff and our current setup, you know, when there are particular activities that we're focusing on that we need to bring to, you know, one or more panel members, and sometimes it's to an entire subcommittee for consultation either at Phase 1 or Phase 2, and then again at Phase 4 when we've completed the work. During phrase 3 we'll undoubtedly be meeting with not only, you know, one of our managers and staff, but also with the senior research psychologist. So you're going to have that one-on-one time with that individual just as you would under our business process with one of us.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

MEMBER HARDY: I just had a quick procedural question. The reports coming in from the consulting contractors that are going to taxonomy, will they also go to the rest of the panel, or can I request that so I could take a look at the, too?

MS. KARMAN: Yes, I think we absolutely will be sending that to the rest of the panel. What we may want to do in the case of these two proposals is our staff will be preparing a Phase 2 document for taxonomy development, which is really like in a way our reaction to what we will be reading from the two proposals. And I'm sharing that with the taxonomy staff to -- I mean, Taxonomy Subcommittee to get their input and consultation. So but I think that absolutely, given the significance of what this entails in terms of, you know, how seminal and what a foundation the taxonomy is for all of the OIS, I do think that we would want the panel to take a look at it, as we will also want to invite the OIS Development Work Group to have an opportunity to review it.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for the question. I just want a reminder that when we get documents like that, as SGE is the pre-decisional, and so they have to stay within the panel and not go any further than the panel until SSA is at a point of releasing those.

So are there any other questions from the panel?

MEMBER HUNT: Maybe this is unfair to ask in front of your bosses, but you have an extended plan which has been promulgated now. I presume that it was drawn up in anticipation a constant level of staffing. I know this sounds like blue sky by and by, but is there any chance that if staffing were to be increased in any of the ways that you've describe some of those deadlines could be moved up, or do you think this is mostly a conceptual-level problem which is just going to take a certain amount of time to solve?

MS. KARMAN: Thank you, Allan. I think it's a little of both. And one of the things I think we're going to find as we map out our Microsoft project timelines, which we've already begun, and we're, you know, entering in information about our dependencies, I think as we uncover and get into more detail some things may, you know, require a greater amount of investigation; I'm thinking of sampling right now, than we might have thought originally; maybe not, but I mean, because we did give that, you know, a fair amount of time, so would if we were bringing on more staff, would that enable us to do more more quickly?

There is a limit in terms of how long it takes a federal agency to get through the contracting. There's a contracting cycle. We will need to get in line over at the

Office of Management and Budget to get approval for our sampling and data collection plans, and there's a certain amount of time that goes with that. And those things were thought of. I mean, they were built into the plan. So even though some of our work could be moved forward and some things could possibly happen more quickly with additional staff, some things just simply wouldn't because they take what they take and they're out of our hands.

But that said, I do think that, you know, we've been trying to do more with less for quite some time and I think it's time to do more with more. But, you know, we will, you know, avail ourselves to the best of our ability to look into, you know, other options in terms of IPAs and consultant contracts, although I must say that, you know, bringing in IPAs and consultant contracts, that really means that you need staff to monitor it. I mean, somebody has to physically do it and that's not a small thing either. So, you know, all around that would be an issue.

But I do think that what you're seeing in the plan at this point is probably about as tight as it's going to get. I don't think that given the budget and acquisition cycle and the types of clearances that we will need in order to move this forward that it could possibly happen sooner.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Tim?

MEMBER KEY: Kind of a follow up to Allan's question on that: Sylvia, do you anticipate that the GAO audit will be helpful in that sense of if they feel that the plan is moving forward with this project is important that they would be a positive for you?

MS. KARMAN: We certainly would hope so, but I guess that remains to be seen what the final focus will be for the GAO with regard to the overall audit that they're conducting. You know, so it isn't really completely clear to me how our project might necessarily map onto what the total formal statement is for the GAO audit, so I'm not really sure. But I do think that any light that either monitoring authorities or anybody can shed on how complex this project is and how important it is for the disability programs, you know, can only help us. So in that regard I do see that people taking note of it and recognizing that, yes, well, we're not perfect, but we do work hard and we have been working very well with you all and with others to, you know, glean as much as we can about something that the agency heretofore has never done. So I think it could be helpful.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Other questions?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I have a question, Sylvia. I was going through as you were describing how many of the projects are Phase 4. And we have a new Web site up there for OVRD. And so my question, because as you know, from the very beginning, starting with our report in 2009 through to today, one of the constants; and it's recommendation No. 7 as well from our report, is the transparency of this. And so are these Phase 4 documents as they get finalized by SSA going to be available to the public on the OVRD site?

MS. KARMAN: I do think that when we have completed a Phase 4 document and it's information that would not impede our ability to, for example, prepare requirements and put a request for proposal on the street, you know, I mean, if it would not undermine our ability to do something along those lines with regard to contracting, things like that, I see that once our management has had an opportunity to review it that we would want to make our documents available to the public so they can see frankly where we're going, what the results have been. So they may be hearing us talking about these activities and then seeing, well, not necessarily the results, because sometimes the report is nothing more than just reporting on activity, and so it again forms a window onto an activity, but at least you can have a sense of where the project is and what's going on. So I do think that that's a very important piece to our whole communication strategy, is to help people understand what we're doing, what we're not doing and, you know, have an opportunity to read it for themselves.

I just want to mention that this table is getting longer and longer. I'm like really far away from the Chair. It used to be closer together, but now as we've expanded the number of people on the panel, it's quite a long time. It's very good to see. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think part of that is because you used to sit closer when you were on the panel. And I just want to also say I'm looking at the Gantt chart, page 53, on the project OIS plan and it's very stark between 2011 and 2012. I mean, it's very obvious there are a lot of things finishing and a lot of things starting, a lot of very important things starting. So we look forward to fiscal year 2012. Should be an exciting year. So thank you for all your work.

We're running a little early, so let's go ahead and take a break and come back at 10:30, because I have a feeling that the next few presentations we're going to be very intent and had a lot of questions. So let's take a 20-minute break. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:10 a.m. off the record until 10:32 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. We're back on the meeting and the next presentation on the agenda is the OIS baseline activity. The services for development and reporting on strategy for training, certifying, and recruiting job analysts.

Behind the third tab, or the third

red tab on the second numerical tab you will see some bios for the presenters. We have Debra Tidwell-Peters, social insurance specialist. From the Office of Vocational Resources Development, we have Brian Cronin, Ph.D., the senior manager; welcome, from ICF International. And there's somebody else sitting there. Lance Anderson, Vice-President, ICF International.

So their bios are in your binders.

Welcome.

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Good morning, Mary, and thank you very much.

I am Debra Tidwell-Peters. I am the contracting officer's technical representative for a blanket purchase agreement awarded in September of 2010 to ICF International. This work is listed in the OIS R&D plan under baseline activities, those that are intended to explore and document background information on various project activities.

To date we have executed two call orders under the BPA: Call order 1 is for services to provide and investigate and benchmark job analysis methods and procedures; and Call Order 2 for services to provide input into the development of a business process to recruit, train and certify job analysts. We recommend and we should keep in mind that this work has occurred prior to the development and delivery of the OIS work taxonomy and instrument and all findings and recommendations are made with that in mind and will be revisited and refined once we have those two vital pieces in hand. Once finalized, the final reports for calls 1 and 2 will be available on the OIS project Web site.

Now I would like to introduce Dr. Brian Cronin, the ICF lead on Call 1, the investigation into job analysis methodologies.

Brian?

DR. CRONIN: Thank you, Debra. It's a pleasure to be here, everyone. Thank you for your attention this morning. As Debra mentioned, my name is Brian Cronin. I work for ICF. I was the project manager for Call 1 and I'm here with Lance Anderson. He's the project director for the entire BPA over all the call order.

I have an agenda here up on the screen. I'm going to be moving pretty quickly through my slides, and there are actually a couple of tweaks on the overheads, but if you have a handout in front of you, it's mostly the same. But I do want to hit on a few key points this morning. First, I want to introduce our team at SSA, key team members, ICF members and our subcontractors. Then I'd like to look at our project and its purpose. And then the project methodology, our recommendations related to job analysis procedures and then our recommendations related to some of the job analysis models that we looked at. And then I'll finish with our overarching recommendations and potential next steps under the BPA.

Before I go on, are there any questions or things that you'd like to discuss off the bat?

(No audible response.)

DR. CRONIN: Okay. Great. So in terms of introductions, here's an overview of our team. On the SSA side, the team was led by Debra Tidwell-Peters. The team also included David Blitz, Michael Dunn, Elizabeth Kennedy and Mark Trapani. They were all instrumental in getting us to where we are today. Their direction and guidance was extremely important to us.

On our team, that included myself, Lance, Beth Heinen, Jessica Jenkins, Allison Cook and Daniel Fien-Helfman. And all of these folks really had significant roles on the project. All of these folks have backgrounds in I/O psychology.

And then we had three expert subcontractors. Paul Davis, who is an exercise physiologist and recognized authority on the subject of fitness standards; Dr. Kelly Day, who is an occupational therapist; and Dr. Len Mattheson, who is a leading scholar and practitioner in the area of industrial rehabilitation. So all of these folks contributed our ultimate project results.

Okay. Moving on to an introduction to our project and its purpose, we've talked about this some this morning already, and I'm sure you're well aware, SSA is in the process of developing its new occupational information system tailored specifically to SSA's disability programs. And the OIS will replace the DOT and its companion volumes, the SCO and the RHAJ.

To develop the OIS, SSA needs a detailed methodology and strategy for analysts who perform job analysis throughout the U.S. labor market. And so the purpose of Call 1 was to perform the research needed to identify the useful features of existing practices that might support the development of SSA's ultimate job analysis methodology.

Now looking at our project methodology, it's just one slide here. We cover it rather quickly, but it was actually about eight months of work. So it all boiled down to the three major tasks. The first one was our meetings and discussions with SSA. It was extremely important, given the importance of the project, that we stayed in close contact with SSA and that we met with them weekly or biweekly, gave them monthly reports and addressed challenges as they came up to keep us on track and meet our timelines.

The second task was really the core of the entire project. It was the review and evaluation of job analysis practices. And that involved three sub-tasks. The first was our documentation of our detailed project methodology. We wanted to have a record of all of the steps that we took to collect our data so that it could be referenced in the future. The second sub-task was our lit review and background research. We looked at about 200 different articles across a variety of disciplines. And then the third sub-task was the conduct of our focus groups, which included exports from a variety of fields including vocational rehabilitation, human resources, I/O psychology, ergonomics and occupational health. So we had a really good mix of people participate in those groups and they really helped to inform some of our results.

And then the final task was reporting our job analysis practice results. And we had an enormous amount of information, so what we determined was we would look at the procedures, the practices and models that had the most support in the literature, focus on those major practices and dedicate a full chapter to each one of those.

And what I want to do is point you to the structure of that template. I don't know if you have a handout that looks something like this. You guys have that? It should be in your folder.

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: It has the chapter 20 Threshold Trait Analysis handout. Does everyone have one?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I don't see it in our folders. I do have the whole report, so it's in the whole report. Page 20-1.

DR. CRONIN: So if you flip through really any of the chapters, and the chapters in the back, they all follow the same structure. And so I just wanted to cover the structure, so as I'm going through my slides I'm going to dedicate one slide to each chapter, but you'll know there's a lot more information back in the report.

And so really the way these are structured is on the front page you get an overview of the practice and then some key highlights Underneath that there's a bar that goes across and it shows which disciplines use that particular practice or what we saw in the literature about disciplines that use that practice. Underneath that we report our quality and data considerations related to that practice which includes things like level of detail and data collected, job performance measured, security of data, validity, reliability, things of that sort. And those are just a report of what we found in the literature, what we heard in our focus groups.

Going onto the next page, which would be 20- 3, you can see we have our data sources listed. So when you use this practice, where do you get the information from? And in this case it's incumbents, occupational materials, direct supervisors. Below that, target data collection procedures. Which ones are used within this particular practice, within this model? And in this case, review of written materials, job observation survey, etcetera, etcetera. And then underneath that for this practice what types of data are collected? And you can see here for the TTA, personality characteristics, environmental conditions, importance and frequency of activities, so on and so forth.

And then if you flip on to 20-4, we provide information that we found in literature, we heard in our focus groups about the resources needed to administer this model or to develop this particular practice. So you have length of time to develop, monetary costs to develop, length of time to administer and monetary cost to administer. And then below that data documenting resources. This one uses a job analysis instrument, an off-the-shelf instrument. And then what additional resources are needed for this practice? And in this case access to the work place, meeting space, and then a computer, access to organizational materials.

On 20-5, you can see for each template we end it with a listing of kind of overarching pros and cons. And then in the final section we have our expert evaluation, which was basically ratings provided by our ICF team and our subcontractors related to the validity of the information collected, the reliability of data, likelihood an analyst could be successfully trained to use this practice, and that sort of thing.

So as I mentioned, for each of the major practices that we identified, there were 6 procedures and 10 models. We dedicated a chapter for those. Now of course there are a lot of other techniques out there, and those are represented in our supplemental chapters, and there are two of those in the report which provide sort of a paragraph or a two-paragraph overview of that particular technique.

So that's an introduction to the report. I want to emphasize again that the report was basically to set the table. It was to sort of be a benchmarking study of available job analysis practices that exist.

We wanted to document all of that information and then when the taxonomy, when the content model are finalized, we can go back to that and see which procedures might work best and which combination of procedures might work best together to conduct SSA's job analysis.

Okay. Moving onto some Call Order 1 terminology. We collected all this information, and it was across a variety of sources, and we realized that there were five times that we were using frequently and sometimes interchangeably. So we decided for at least the purposes of Call 1 we would define these terms and try to use them consistently throughout the project. And so they are as follows:

Definitely in the report we've been consistent. I'm going to try to do the same in my presentation, but when we refer to "project methodology," that refers to the steps taken to conduct Call 1. When we refer to "job analysis methodology," that refers to

SSA's ultimate data collection process that will be developed to address the OIS needs. When we say "practice," that includes all job analysis approaches, techniques, models and procedures that we reviewed. When we say "procedure," that refers to a general data collection technique identified for this call, like a focus group or a survey, review of written materials, that sort of thing. And then the last one is "model." And that refers to an established off-the-shelf job analysis approached identified for this call order.

The reason we looked at the models; and I'll talk more about this a little later, is we wanted to see how procedures could be combined and how they work in different contexts. We know that SSA is not going to adopt one particular model and use that for the purposes of the OIS. We may be able to learn a lot from the way procedures are used within that model and use that to develop the ultimate methodology.

Okay. So next I want to take a look at our recommendations related to job analysis procedures. As I mentioned, there are six of these, and the first one I want to look at is the review of written materials, but I want to emphasize -- I'm going to go through these six. We understand that no one procedure will fully meet SSA's needs, so I'll talk about them individually, but our recommendation is that we'll need a combination of procedures to develop the job analysis methodology. So each one of these has some pros and cons that I'll talk through, but in the end they'll need to be combined in some way to develop the ultimate job analysis methodology.

Okay. So the first one is review of written materials. You're probably all familiar with this. It's looking through position descriptions, training curriculum, materials that exist within the organization that might give some information about the job. It's an effective and cost-efficient starting part for almost all job analyses and we feel that it should be included in SSA's job analysis methodology. It allows the analyst to become more familiar with the target job and to get some I understanding before they go into other procedures.

The challenge is it cannot be the only procedure of course because it's dependent upon what documents exist within the organization. So if we're looking at a job that is just emerging, those documents may not be there. If we're looking at one that's a job that's been around for years, the documents may not have been updated. So it's really a starting point to get a baseline and then the knowledge gained can inform the development of other data collection procedures that might follow.

Okay. The second procedure is job observation, and this involves the analyst going to shadow incumbents on their job for a specific amount of time. It's really nice for jobs that include more manual labor and less cognitive tasks and we feel that it should be included in the SSA's final data collection methodology. It gives detailed information about the job tasks. It can provide information about equipment and materials used which can add some context. For instance, someone may say over the phone or you might see in a document that they use a printer. Well, a printer for an office job sits at a desk. A printer for a magazine factory could take up this whole room. So it's good for the analyst to go in person and see exactly what the equipment looks like. And then of course it provides information about the work environment. And the nice thing is it does not rely solely on the testimony of incumbents like a survey might or an interview, so you can get some first-hand information.

The challenge is it can be costly and time consuming and then it may not be appropriate for all jobs, so we feel it should be used in combination with another data collection procedure. And it may be something that's used for part of the sample so the analyst can get an understanding of what the job is and then another procedure is used for the full sample.

Okay. Now looking at the next procedure, survey, a survey of course is a very effective and efficient way to gather data. It's particular useful when you're trying to get information from geographically dispersed incumbents. And because it's efficient, because it's effective, we feel like it should be considered for inclusion, but we're not ready to give it a full recommendation yet. And the reason is is because although you can reach a lot of people quickly and give you information about work activities, the drawbacks include there are threats to the validity because incumbents may inflate ratings, supervisors may inflate ratings, maybe not intentionally. Maybe they just don't have the understanding of how their job fits into the economy. There also could be a lack of understanding of rating elements. And then finally, it's just tough to get people to respond to surveys. So we're currently on the fence with the survey and we want to see what happens with the taxonomy, the content law before we go forward on that. And if it were used, as I've said with other procedures, we think that it should be supplemented to make sure that the information collected can be validated.

Okay. The next procedure is the structured interview. It's creating a structured protocol to ask the same questions across a variety of data collection events. It's really nice when you have more complex jobs that need additional clarification or when comparison is needed across jobs in different locations. And we think it should be incorporated into SSA's job analysis methodology. What we like about it is it allows analysts to get information through direct questioning of incumbents and/or supervisors and to drill down if something's not clear which you might not get in a survey or some of the other procedures. If this is used, of course the analyst would need to be trained in interviewing techniques and there would need to be multiple interviews conducted to gain the full value of this procedure.

The next procedure we reviewed is focus groups, and we've all participated in focus groups before, but the essence is it's a lot like a structured interview except there are more people in the data collection event. So it can be time efficient and cost efficient, however, you introduce group dynamics. And one of the drawbacks of focus groups is that if you get someone who's particularly boisterous in the group, they may dominate the conversation and then you miss the insights of the other people that attended and it's sometimes difficult to get five people on the phone or in a room at the same time. So we prefer structured interviews over focus groups. We think you get more detailed information in structured interviews and they're just more reliable. So that's our preference, although the focus groups are still of course an effective procedure. We just lean towards the structured interviews.

Okay. And then the last procedure I'll cover in this section is the instrument measurement of physical demands. This involves using things like a stopwatch, a scale to measure how heavy an item is, a tape measure, a video recorder. So it gives you a precise measurement of what the incumbent is doing on the job. It's really nice for jobs requiring manual labor, given the disability determinations that SSA must make. But although you have high reliability, high validity and the data's easy to aggregate, we recommended using this sparingly. So only use it when it's absolutely necessary because it's time consuming, there may be special trainings that are needed on the part of the analyst and you can get at some of these physical abilities through some of the other collection techniques like interviews or surveys. So use it when it's appropriate, when the construct requires it, but don't overuse it, I guess is the message here.

Okay. So that was the review of the job analysis procedures that we covered. Again those are the general practices. Next I'm going to talk a little bit about the job analysis models, but I wanted to pause for a second and see if there are any questions about the procedures.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think we're okay.

DR. CRONIN: Great. Then we'll move into the recommendation on the job analysis models.

What I want to emphasize here is in terms of the job analysis models, again we are not in any way recommending that SSA use one of these models to collect all of their data. What we are saying is that the models have taken the procedures and combined them in a certain way and used them over and over again, so you can look at the models and see what features might be effective for creating SSA's ultimate methodologies. So you can take bits and pieces of those and use them to develop a methodology.

So I'm going to talk about ten models, one per slide, but I'm not going to focus on the model itself as much, but on the features that we thought worthy of further consideration down the road.

Okay. So the first model is the AET and it involves conducting observations at interviews to complete an ergonomic questionnaire. Things that we really liked about this was the use of the structured observation interviews together along with the completion of a standardized tool by the analysts. So the analysts observing, asking structured interview questions and then completing a tool which we thought was a nice format. We also liked the use of descriptors that isolate specific types of physical effort, descriptors that measure work context and the use of scale that focused on things like frequency, duration and significance. So those are the positives.

On the negative, you know, we were look at the AET and building on some of the items that they have. It's good to keep in mind this was developed in Germany, and so there was a context of the German culture and language. And the other thing is that although the coding, the anchors that are used are very nice, they would need to be updated so that they stay consistent with the changing nature of work over the years. That's going to be true in any case, but that was one of the things that we noticed here.

Okay. The next model we looked at was the CMQ, and the CMQ collects data via a survey administered directly to incumbents and their immediate supervisors. Some of the things that we really like are the matrix structure of the question. It's a very comprehensive questionnaire. It collects information over 2,000 data points. And what it does it lists the generalized work activities in the rows and then it has your rating scales in the columns. It collects detail on things like interpersonal activities, physical activities, decision making activities. So it's very comprehensive. It uses behavioral and observable descriptors that are easy to rate. And it measure work context in a variety of descriptors involving data, people things. So very nice model.

On the downside, again you have the issue of administering this directly to incumbents and their supervisors, so you run the risk of inflated ratings. So, you know, this sort of technique would need to be bolstered by other procedures. And in addition, it would be nice to have a set of descriptors that are at the broad level so that you could compare jobs across settings and see how they are related. And then the other thing is that some respondents may not have computer access, especially in manual jobs.

Yes?

MEMBER GIBSON: Hi, Brian. This is Shanan Gibson and I have a quick comment here, because this is an instrument I'm actually familiar with, and I would say that I completely disagree with your assessment that it does not include a comprehensive set of descriptors at a broad level. It was actually designed for that purpose. It does include them and they're gathered at a level where they can then be combined into broader categories if you so desire.

Now we did look at the CMQ as part of the Taxonomy Subcommittee and determined very early on that it wouldn't meet the needs of SSA at this time, but that's simply not correct.

DR. CRONIN: Okay. I'll go back and look at our report and make sure that what we represent is correct. So I may touch base with you to make sure that we've addressed that appropriately. Thanks.

Okay. Moving onto the next model, cognitive task analysis, this is an approach that involves using a variety of data collection procedures to ultimately identify the cognitive processes underlying a job with a particular focus on the processes that would distinguish an expert from a novice. Again here, we like the use of structured observation and interviews together. We also like the identification of the various types of knowledge needed to do the job. So obviously both are very important.

On the downside, this particular model by itself lacks the detailed information that SSA would need on various physical abilities and there would be a large training requirements for analysts, because again you're looking at things that are not necessarily observable.

Okay. Moving onto the Fleischman's Job Ability Requirement Scales, this data collection procedure involves administration of ability requirement scales to collect data on 52 types of abilities, and they're organized to four categories: cognitive; psychomotor; physical; and sensory. We really liked the use of an instrument that focuses on generalizable person requirements, skills and abilities and provides data for cross-job comparisons on the aspects of the job that are really most directly affected by disabilities, and we like the use of the scales with observable anchors.

On the downside, it tends to provide details on variations of jobs at the high end of many abilities; so distinguishing between an athlete and an astronaut versus a parking attendant and a cashier, so you can see the big differences but maybe not have the detail that you need to make the fine distinctions.

Okay. Moving onto functional job analysis. This was originally developed by the Department of Labor and it gathers a variety of different types of job analysis data through interviews and observations, but it may also include some other data collection procedures. Some of the nice features, it includes measures of work context and worker environment variables. It has a set of procedures that are easily trained. It's the foundation of the RHAJ. And the procedures build validity through the use of multiple methods, structure framework and structure protocol, so there are multiple checks on whether or not the data is correct that's coming in, and the focus is really on what the worker does.

In terms of the model, one of the drawbacks is is that it lacks the standardization on important issues that we'll need to address in developing the final methodology in terms of how jobs are sampled, how interviews are conducted and then how many interviews should be conducted, things of that sort. And then the DOT could also be improved by adding detail in cognitive abilities, interpersonal skills, which depending on the content model might be important.

Okay. Looking at the job elements model, this focuses on the human attributes required for superior performance on the job and collects data via focus groups, interviews and surveys. It's very useful for identifying the critical KSAs associated with the jobs and the elements that are identified include a range of behaviors related to intellectual, motor and work behaviors.

Again, it's a good model, but the drawback here is that it focuses on the high end of the scale, on high performance rather than obtaining data on minimally necessary abilities. So that could be adjusted, but because it focuses on superior performance the elements may not be appropriate for the job analysis methodology.

Okay. The next model is O*NET and obviously, you know, this is I think a model that we can learn a lot from in terms of the way that it's arranged, the hierarchical arrangement and the use of content domain. It has a nationwide database of job information representing the full U.S. economy. So a lot of things about the process, the data collection that we can learn from, it's not something we could adopt for SSA's purposes by any means. However, there are things about the way it was formed and the way that the data collection was conducted that will be informative for this project.

On the downside, some of the items will likely have low reliability relative to other instruments because the constructs are not always observable. And again, it focuses on some of the high-tech jobs as opposed to the low-skill jobs that are in the economy.

Okay. Three more. The next one is the position analysis questionnaire. The PAQ is an off-the-shelf standardized job analysis instrument that includes 195 items. It's typically completed by a job analyst and it includes observations, interviews and maybe even focus groups. The nice thing is it gives you data on a variety of different variables including the work environment, physical abilities, the tasks that are performed and it usually focuses on observable behaviors which ensure greater verifiability of findings.

On the downside, the constructs are at a level of distraction that may not provide a clear enough picture of the job when we're talking about disability determination. So you get a nice picture of the job, but it's not quite detailed enough for what SSA will probably need.

The next model is the task inventory, and this is a little different than some of the off-the-shelf models, more of a technique that's used across a variety of spectrums, but it involves collecting data through procedures such as review of written materials, job observation, interview and surveys to develop a list of task descriptions, and something many of us probably see in the task lists at the beginning of a position description are usually informed by this sort of task inventory.

We like the way that these procedures are combined to get this information, but on the downside there are no generalizable constructs or scales that will allow for cross-job comparison. It's basically just getting a task description of the job.

Okay. And then the last model is the threshold traits analysis. It collects information on worker traits, job demand and job functions using review of written materials, observations, interviews and surveys. And this slide is the one that is related to the chapter that we looked at earlier. So you can see the level of detail that's behind each one of these. But in terms of the TTA, it has 33 traits which makes for a nice parsimonious arrangement of job information. It has a simply-worded set of constructs and it provides some perspective on how to sort and locate jobs.

On the downside, SSA will more than likely need a lot more detail than the 33 traits that are represented in the TTA, and therefore it's probably not something that could be used, but it is an interesting model and the way they put traits and demands and functions together works rather nicely.

Okay. So that concludes the overview of the practices. We talked about the six procedures and then the ten models. There's a ton more information in the report.

I have a few overarching recommendations that I'd like to talk about, but I'll stop a minute and see if there are any questions.

MEMBER GIBSON: I'd like you to just quickly clarify one other statement that's on a slide. When you were discussing the effective features of the Fleischman Job Ability Requirement Scales one of the things you said that you thought was effective was the use of level scales anchored with observable behaviors. Do you not have any concerns about the fact that those anchors are frequently irrelevant to the jobs being rated, are difficult anchors for individuals to understand and apply to their jobs, the integral properties of those scales, the things that had been brought up in the research literature frequently regarding problems with the Fleischman scales and why they might be difficult or lack validity?

DR. CRONIN: Yes, I'd point out that we like the use of those observable scales, but we're not necessarily supporting the ones that are used in that model.

MEMBER GIBSON: Observable scales, but not their scales?

DR. CRONIN: Yes, exactly. Exactly.

Questions?

(No audible response.)

DR. CRONIN: Okay. So I'll move into our overarching recommendations, and there are really just a few of these, but I think they're important to mention.

The first is the identification and finalization of the work taxonomy and the constructs to be measured. Once those two pieces are in place, we'll be able to go back to the report and say, okay, we have our benchmarking of all the procedures and practices that are represented in the job analysis literature. Which ones could be used best and in which combination to measure the constructs that we're after? So that will be obviously a very important step and I think the work that we did on Call 1 will set that up, that follow-up step very nicely.

Next recommendation is that we recommend that the data be collected and stored using a computerized system or an online application tool. This will provide a standardized way to transmit the data from different parts of the country back to a centralized location and minimize potential security issues and concerns. So that may be something that the analyst does to get the information back and they'll be trained on how to enter that detail.

The third recommendation really goes hand in glove with the first one. It involves determining the factors that are most important and then considering the job analysis practices accordingly. So we talked about a lot of different practices, and they all may have merit in different situations, but once we finalize the taxonomy and the constructs, then we can go back and say, okay, in this situation which ones have the most merit and then we can create a job analysis methodology that is as efficient as possible and uses the best procedures possible for the different constructs.

The next recommendation discusses developing multiple prototypes of the occupation analysis system, which is basically the stem to stern analysis. You know, how do you contact the organization? How do you figure out if you have the right person in the organization, if they're performing the right job? How do you collect the data? How do you transmit it back? And looking at multiple prototypes side by side, probably the best ideas that we have and then the next best set of ideas, because in one prototype you'll have what we feel is the best approach. And in the second one you'll have some of the trade-offs, you know, in some of the things that -- the procedures that may offer a different look at the job than the other ones.

So we recommend putting those prototypes side by side, designing them, getting the prototypes on paper and then evaluating them and then refining. So we might have our best choice and then the second best choice. You might take some pieces from the second best and insert it into the main prototype and then finalize it before we get too far down the road. So we think this prototype and pilot testing is important.

On the next slide, something I mentioned a little bit earlier, the full methodology must include a comprehensive set of procedures that include guidelines for maintaining data security and confidentiality.

That's some of the things that we're going to be looking at in Call 3. How do you get OMB clearance? What's the best way to sample? How do you verify jobs? Things of that sort. So that's an immediate next step. And what's nice about that is those are some things that can be sorted out in advance of the taxonomy and content model. We can look at how to get OMB clearance and, you know, how you verify a job is the right job in the organization.

The next one is something I've been mentioning throughout. Once the taxonomy and the content model are finalized, go back and look at some of the models and the procedures that we identified and then look at how those features might be adapted to meet SSA's specific purposes. So we don't think that any of these could be taken wholesale, but you could look at these effective features and say, okay, this might work well for getting at these constructs. How do we adapt it and make it fit into the final methodology? And then as I've mentioned, the final thing is pilot testing to ensure the methodology meets SSA objectives before the full methodology is launched.

Okay. So that concludes our slides. Any questions or things people want to discuss?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, Dave.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Thank you. One of the things that this panel has heard from claims examiners, from vocational experts, from adjudicators, from many sources is how important it is that the new OIS better capture the cognitive and mental demands of jobs. And in your review of the literature on these models, one of them clearly explicitly focuses on cognitive demands of work, and that is the cognitive task analysis model. So I have a couple of questions.

One is do these other models that you've described, even though they don't have the word "cognitive" in them, also capture substantial cognitive demands of work?

And the second question is in the CTA model, in the available literature on that model, how reliably and validly are those demands of work captured?

DR. CRONIN: It's a good question. I think the first part is there are other models and procedures that can reliably and validly assess cognitive processes that are on the job, but there is the one with "cognitive" in its title, so that one sticks out.

I think the ultimate constructs that are measured will be more defined by the content model and the ultimate taxonomy and then we'll use the procedures to measure those particular constructs. So some of the models here may measure some cognitive abilities, but we were more looking at how to measure them rather than what they abilities themselves are, if that makes sense.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Yes, so my

question is, given that's the methodology that's used in the cognitive task analysis, how well does it do it, regardless of what they are? I'm just wondering how well do they get at those characteristics or demands of work?

DR. CRONIN: In my view, and what we found in the literature, is very well. You know, once the constructs are defined, there are a lot of different procedures and approaches to measure those constructs accurately.

DR. ANDERSON: But specifically with cognitive task analysis, I think it's true; and, Brian, you can let me know if I'm correct on this or not, but with cognitive task analysis there are a lot of different ways to do it. It's a very flexible system and it's hard to assess how that method specifically does it because there's just so many different ways of implementing cognitive task analysis.

DR. CRONIN: That's a good point, yes.

MEMBER FRASER: And at this point do you think that we'd be using some type of hybrid approach to each job, or would be using a different job analysis approach depending on how physical the job is versus how cognitive it is, etcetera?

DR. CRONIN: That's a good question. That's something that we discussed yesterday. Of course there are different ways to look at it. We had talked yesterday about it; and nothing's final; we need to do more research on this, but having maybe a decision tree that the analysts walk through so they do some initial data collections, review of written materials, observation and then maybe even a structured interview. And that part's standard, but if there are some physical abilities that come up in that first part of the process that need to be further measured by maybe an instrument, then they would take that road, whereas if those physical demands don't pop up, then they might conclude the data collection or move into -- or some other procedure. So, yes, definitely a combination of procedures and maybe some hybrid depending on how the jobs are defined and what the data shows while it's being collected.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Allan?

MEMBER HUNT: So that confuses me a little bit. I was going to ask -- I mean, you've got 10 models here and each of them is sort of an attempt at capturing the world of work. Maybe I'm slow, but I don't see how you would combine models. And now what I hear you say in response to the last question sounds like you're -- it's more like, you know, take one off the shelf for the purpose that you perceive after you've done a little preliminary investigation. So could you kind of address both of those?

DR. CRONIN: Sure. In my estimation it's going to be the generalized procedures that we talked about initially that will comprise the ultimate methodology that SSA uses. So it would not be the case for taking a model off the shelf to use it. And the procedures will be laid out in a standardized fashion. And as you walk through the procedures, there may be some decision points in there where you realize, okay, now I need to do some instrument measure of physical demands, or it's just not necessary in this particular job. Like an office job night not involve carrying things or walking.

So the process will be focused on the procedures. And then we looked at the models to say, oh, I see, this model used observation, instruction, interviews to get a pretty well -- you know, what is the ratio that they used or how did that sample, that sort of thing. So, yes, the process will be standard, but there may be some decisions toward the end of it to drill down if needed.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY:

Abigail?

MEMBER PANTER: This just reminds me that that's a tailored kind of approach and adaptive, some little essence of adaptive approach that would be in there. So, and I see that needs to be an important --

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: It sounds like they didn't hear your comment.

MEMBER PANTER: This reminds me of a tailored kind of approach or an adaptive kind of approach. It can be useful in some situations, but I don't know in the form that we've been discussing, but I can see some kind of adaptive approach.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: How cooperative are employers in allowing data collection? And a lot of these models are going to involve somebody going to the workplace and maybe they're strapped to meet their goals for the month and you're going to take somebody off of the line or off of a task for awhile. How easy is it to get reliable information as opposed to say get these feds off my case so I can meet my goals for this month?

DR. CRONIN: And that really depends. I've had a lot of experience conducting job analysis and there are some organizations that welcome you and are happy to participate. Sometimes there's an incentive that goes along with that to get them on board. And then there are others that there's some resistance. So I think the process and the analyst training will have to allow for that, but there may be some resistance. And when there is, we need to adapt to it and identify a parallel job in another organization if that's the case.

DR. ANDERSON: Yes, that's a really good question because I know of other data collection efforts where it's really a challenge, particularly when it's not a mandate coming from the employer. It's a mandate coming from the program and the employer really has no particular reason to respond. It's quite a challenge and it is going to be something that we're really going to have to think really hard about, and hopefully we'll learn a lot from what they're doing with O*NET and some other tools. But it's going to be a challenge.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: As someone who just isn't familiar with the world of job analysis, can you help me get a better sense of what does it mean when you are observing a person on the job? I mean, I get what it means to interview a person, but is observation strictly an unobtrusive kind of thing, or is it a combination of observing and talking, interacting with the person?

DR. CRONIN: In my experience it's a combination of both. So you'd go in with a structured observation protocol, and there might be 10 questions on it, you know, and the first one might be what are the main activities of the job? You know, the second one might -- what skills do you see the person using? What equipment are they using? What tools? And sometimes that's real clear to see and then other times you need to ask clarification questions to say I see you doing this or I see you interacting with that person? Are you making some decision there, or is that routine, is that scripted for you? So it's typically an observation with some questioning involved in it, unless it's something where it's dangerous for the analyst to interfere. Then they might just stand back and watch and ask the questions in a structured interview afterwards.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, John.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Thanks for your presentation. I just have a couple of questions as I'm thinking about this. First of all, in your detail chapters you may have some of this information that I was looking for, but as you talked about the limitations did you find any scholarly reviews of these models in the literature?

And then also, how old are these models? I see this threshold is 1970, so that goes back 40 years. Are some of them more recent and more widely used in the job analysis research right now?

DR. CRONIN: Yes, we did find a lot of research about the models that we describe, and the chapters are really a result of the research that we uncovered. I really just scratched the surface on the slides. A much better summary is in the executive summary. That's going to give you about a half page table about each one of these practices, which is very nice. And then of course in the chapters themselves you can get a lot more detail.

In terms of the age of the models, some of them are older than others. All of the ones that had a full chapter dedicated to them are still in use and they're still being used by HR departments, things of that sort.

Did that get at your --

MEMBER CRESWELL: Yes. And then I was wondering, too, as I looked through your limitations, most of these limitations addressed what I'd call construct validity issues and some reliability issues. I didn't see anything; and maybe this wasn't within your call, your charge here -- I didn't see anything on data analysis. Are some of these instruments more complex to analyze than -- and models, or are some easier? I mean, was that a factor that you considered and thought about as you looked through these different models?

DR. CRONIN: That wasn't a part of our charge in general to look at the data analysis. We were looking at the data collection. However, we couldn't help but notice it when we were reviewing the articles because it was there. And so what we did is in the chapters there's a section on data consideration and you'll see there's a rating.

It's information about ease of data aggregation. So an instrument like the PAQ where you have a lot of Likert scale items. It's very easy to aggregate and make that assessment. In some of the other models it's not quite as easy.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Other questions? Tom looks like he has a question.

MEMBER HARDY: Not so much a question as just a thought and a reminder. As I'm looking through this, it makes perfect sense to me, and that's why I don't have a question. everything's very well done. But as you were talking about combining these models and at some point making a decision tree, the thought that occurs to me is down the line when I as an attorney representing a client -- I'm going to come back to you and say, well, for my client's occupation you chose not to do blank. So as you make those decision trees, I'd encourage you to keep in mind that those decision points need to be very clearly defined and very defensible because that would be my first question to you is why did you not do this when you did it for the other jobs? It's just a reminder.

DR. CRONIN: Yes, I think that makes a lot of sense, and any sort of process that was developed along those lines would err on the side of inclusion. You know, if there's any reason that we should take this extra step, we will. It would have to be an absolutely -- definitely there is no reason to do it, to opt out, but for the most part I think you're right. Inclusion's much more important here.

DR. ANDERSON: And just to clarify a point: What we're recommending is taking the procedures and looking at them together and figuring out how they need to be combined as opposed to the off-the-shelf models. We viewed looking at the off-the-shelf models as having value because we could see how different procedures were combined and how things worked in a complete model. But we're not really recommending taking one of these off-the-shelf models and saying, hey, let's bring that in and use at SSA.

MEMBER LECHNER: In your critique of the models, the examples that you show in chapter 20; and I'm noticing the writings of general, moderate, precise and minimal, average, maximum, did you have specific objective criteria on which those ratings were based that were established before you did the ratings?

DR. CRONIN: Yes, we did, and those are laid out in I think chapter 2 or 3. We have an introductory chapter and then a method chapter. And I think it's provided -- in the method are definitions for each one of those scales. It may be in chapter 3 though where we talk about the results template, but yes, it is definitely in there.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, along the

same lines on the ratings that were provided for each methodology, if I remember the report correctly, I understand that these ratings were based on a sample of eight experts, the folks that you mentioned plus a few people from your own team, right? And I was going to ask you your opinion how representative do you think this average gradings of these eight people are from I guess the experts in general. I guess the reason I'm asking this is because I noticed for example that the CMQ got relatively low ratings across the board and I noticed that O*NET got relatively high ratings across the board. And I know that Lance was involved in O*NET. So what I'm assuming is that perhaps methodologies with which those eight people were more familiar with may have received higher ratings that may not be reflective of the quality of the methodology but more of the familiarity that you may have with those.

DR. CRONIN: That's a very good

question, and I think what he's referring to is at the end of each chapter there are 10 or 11 expert rating questions, and we had the members of our team; that included the ICF folks and our subcontractors, go through and rate each one of the practices along these 10 questions. It is not representative of the full community of bio-psychologists and ergonomic experts. But what we tried to do is just give us -- while we were in the midst of Call 1 and we were all looking at this information, stop and do some ratings about how we think that each one of these practices would meet SSA's long-term objectives. And that gives us something to go back to and refer to. Now, they will need further consideration once we know the constructs, and it may turn out that the ratings need to be adjusted based on the constructs and the taxonomy, but they give us something to refer back to in Call 1.

I also want to point out that the

information above the expert ratings in each chapter is from the literature, and we tried to report in black and white what we saw in the articles and some of it we heard in the focus groups, but mainly the literature.

MEMBER GIBSON: Could I just ask a follow-up then on what Juan stated, because I think familiarity with instruments is obviously an issue and people provide their expert opinion on them. Was some effort made to provide all eight experts with some baseline of knowledge, or were they even asked, you know, to what degree are you familiar with the CMQ, the O*NET, the F-JAS, etcetera, so that we knew what their familiarity and their expertise was as it related to the instruments that they were making judgments on?

DR. CRONIN: Very good question. So the folks that participated in that rating activity were all folks who worked on the project and made significant contributions to the chapters that overview each one of the practices. And so, because they worked on the chapters they had some knowledge of all of the practices that we laid out. And part of the activity was for everyone to read through the chapters again and sort of compare them side-by-side. So we feel like they did have a significant amount of familiarity. Whether or not they were the developers or expert on that particular model, no, but they did have knowledge of all the practices they were rating for sure.

DR. ANDERSON: I wanted to encourage you to not focus too much on those ratings. Really, as I was saying earlier, what we found valuable in looking at those -- the reason we looked at the models really was to understand how to best combine different practices. So those ratings aren't really -- the quantitative ratings I think really aren't the thing that's most valuable in this report. Really I think it's the qualitative write ups that we've done and the descriptions. And I would encourage you to focus on what we wrote about the different practices.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I just wanted to make sure: So we will have an opportunity though to submit our comments to the panel and when we review the report, right, in detail? Is there a procedure for that?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Any feedback should go to Debra, yes.

MEMBER CRESWELL: I just have to ask this question, because one of my specialties is qualitative research. In what you've outlined here are structured close-ended approaches to observation, to interviewing. Well, what about some open-ended questions during an observation to find out about job analysis? Is anyone pursuing that within the work analysis literature? Anyone talking about that being a valuable adjunct procedure to more structured ways of gathering data? I mean, the whole world out there is moving rapidly into this more open-ended approach of really talking to people, getting their views. Could you just comment on that as you've looked at the literature?

DR. ANDERSON: Yes, I think that actually a lot of the practices that are out there use open-ended questioning at the beginning. Generally the way a lot of them work are, for example, task inventory method. You ask a lot of open-ended questions about what you do on your job, how does your day start, asking questions about things like what's something that would be a big problem on the job, how do you differentiate really good employees from really bad employees, things like that, really open-ended questions that then help the researcher to generate some more specific task statements that are then validated in a survey. That's how the task inventory works. And a lot of the techniques have used that method also.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Now, there's a mixed method design for that. It's called an explanatory sequential design where you first start -- or exploratory sequential design where you first explore qualitatively in order to develop an instrument. There's a lot of literature out there that speaks to that model, which is something to consider here for our task at hand as well, I would think.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Other questions? I think we heard from almost everybody on the panel. Janine? Tim? Any questions or comments?

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Just more of a comment, and again as we're looking, as you're saying the descriptions of these jobs need to represent the real work that our claimants are doing. And one of the thoughts that occurred to me that I was thinking about; but maybe it's too early in the process, is you were saying that if there is an instrument and you've done the portion of the instrument that everybody's doing, and then there is some, for lack of a better word, room to roam for additional information -- and again, I'll defer to the scientists on the panel, the more leeway you give the analyst, isn't that giving it more of a possibility that that particular job analysis isn't going to be valid, that you're not going to get -- I mean, here's my dilemma here, because I do job analysis on occasion: I realize there's not going to be a one-size-fits-all job analysis for every job in the general economy, because you're going from very unskilled jobs to very skilled jobs, but if you allow for that by the analyst taking more liberties with the instrument, are we then not giving valid information back if you're allowed to add things, take things away? I guess something that will have to be dealt with down the road, but maybe not anything that we can even answer right now.

DR. CRONIN: It's a good point. I don't think we can answer it right now. And I was speculating earlier when I said there might be multiple options towards the end of the instrument. Because you're right; it does introduce judgment on the part of the analyst and that requires a variety of other things like additional trainings, and it opens us up to speculation that we could have gone further. So I was really just -- I had a hypothetical earlier when I said there might be a decision tree. That's not the decision quite yet, but it's something -- a bridge we'll have to cross as we finalize this and it's something to consider for sure in future calls.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions? Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Just more of a general comment along the same idea that Janine just voiced, the fact that issues of cost effectiveness are important. Because we could talk about such and such procedure is better to collect data for this type of job and it has the strengths and weaknesses, but we don't really have the luxury. We are faced with the task of analyzing every single job whether or not we like it, right? So we need to find some common ground, some common methodology that may not be ideal, but that is, you know, pretty good for most jobs in most cases. And it also has to be cost effective. So, you know, it's not just asking ourselves how good or how bad this is, but how cost effective and feasible it is and all those --

MEMBER LECHNER: I had a question on your criteria for example on validity of the different methodologies. Is there any reason that you didn't cite the literature on the reliability and validity of each procedure rather than just have a rating by the panel?

DR. CRONIN: Actually, if you look on what's usually the second page of the template, we report from the literature what we found in terms of validity of data or reliability of data. And so that's what we found in the literature. And then those expert panel ratings at the end were more in the context of this project. But what we found in the literature was reported in the quality and data consideration section of the template. So you will see some slides there.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, I guess this is another take at an answer to Deb's question. But the literature on job analysis, when looking at the psychometric qualities of job analysis, most of the data we have has looked at the types of data so that a couple of meta- analysis that look at the reliability of work activity ratings, then look at the reliability of worker attributes. We do have already two meta-analysis that I could recall and there's another one in the works by somebody else. We don't have any meta-analysis on the reliabilities of these methodologies because these methodologies combine lots of different types of data. And sometimes they combine lots of different sources, so it's difficult to isolate exactly -- I find the -- you know, I think this question may have been better framed along the lines of let's look at the reliability of the types of data and let's look at the strengths and weaknesses of gathering different types of data from different types of sources rather than focusing on methodologies. But that's just my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I have a question. The AET, you said it was a German? So did your literature compose English or other non-English instruments, or this reported in the English literature language?

DR. CRONIN: What we cited was research cited in English literature. So it's been translated and used in English-speaking situations, and we cited that literature.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Sounds like we're out of questions. Go ahead.

DR. CRONIN: I just want to make one final comment. It really is a pleasure to be here. Lance, Jen and I, and then the folks at ICF are really excited about this project and to be a part of it. And I appreciate your questions today and your feedback on some of the things that we have done throughout the project and look forward to working with you in the future, because this is really exciting stuff for us. So appreciate all your efforts.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for your efforts. I know that there have been some panel members involved in some of the calls, for Call 1 and Call 2, so this is exciting to be at this point.

We are 15 minutes to the hour. We are ready to break for lunch. So I would like to turn the meeting over to Leola who will formally adjourn for lunch. And then we will come back from lunch at 1:15.

So, Leola?

MS. BROOKS: If there are no objections, the meeting will adjourn.

(No audible response.)

MS. BROOKS: Hearing no objections, we are adjourned until after lunch at 1:15. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the hearing was recessed at 11:46 a.m. to reconvene at 1:15 p.m. this same day.)

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

1:17 p.m.

MS. BROOKS: Good afternoon. I am Leola Brooks, the designated federal officer, and would like to call the meeting to order.

I would now like to turn the meeting over to the panel chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Good afternoon. Thank you, Leola.

This afternoon we're going to have additional presentations from ICF. Welcome. And I'm going to point the panel to again behind tab 2 in your 3-ring binder, and it is the second to the last red sub-tab, and the Call 2, or Call Order No. 2, Business Strategy for Training, Certifying and Recruiting Job Analysts.

We have Jennifer Harvey, a technical specialist with ICF. And her bio is at the front of that red tab. And with her we have Lance Anderson again.

Welcome. Good afternoon. Thank

you for being here.

DR. HARVEY: Good afternoon. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you had a good lunch and I hope to keep you engaged here this afternoon.

As Mary said, my name's Jennifer Harvey and I was the project manager for Call Order 2, so I'm here to present the results on Call Order 2 this afternoon.

Okay. Our agenda for this presentation is kind of similar to Call Order 1's agenda. We'll briefly introduce the team that worked on Call Order 2. Then we'll briefly talk about the project and its purpose. We'll overview the methodology that was used on Call Order 2. But the bulk of the presentation will be focused on the conclusions and recommendations around training, certification and recruitment. We'll wrap up the discussion with some of the strategic decisions that SSA needs to consider and potential resource needs that they may have.

So for the team that worked on Call Order 2, on the SSA side it was the exact same team that worked on Call Order 1. So we had Debra Tidwell-Peters, David Blitz, Michael Dunn, Elizabeth Kennedy and Mark Trapani. Again, it was very invaluable to have them and their feedback throughout the project.

From the ICF side we had a number of individuals working on Call Order 2. Actually Dr. Candace Cronin there was the one who started off the project as project manager. I stepped in when she went on maternity leave and have continued. Dr. Anderson serving again as the overall project director on both calls. And then Allison Cook, Jessica Jenkins, Chris Riches, Dr. Beth Heinen, Katina Gracien and Daniel Fien-Helfman. And as you can see, there's quite a bit of overlap in the staff that worked on both Call 1 and Call 2 and we felt like this was really advantageous for both of these calls.

And in addition to our ICF team, we also had the support and assistance of our subcontractor Dr. Joan Knapp, who is the CEO and founder of Knapp & Associates International. She has over 35 years of experience developing, validating and evaluating credentialling programs, so she was a very valuable resource for the project.

The overall purpose of Call Order 2, again of course the overall purpose of why we're all here is the development of this large occupational information system. And to do that, SSA is going to need to recruit, train and certify job analysts and they're going to need a business process and standards to do that effectively. So the purpose of Call Order 2 really was to review the training, credentialling and recruitment practices for job analysts. And it's really important that SSA have this comprehensive review of existing practices so that they can evaluate current techniques and really make informed decisions of existing practices that might be useful to their needs.

Given the complexity of the OIS project, the number of moving parts, the interdependence of all of those parts; and this is especially impactful for Call Order 2 we think, we thought it would be helpful to kind of try to graphically lay out how Call 2 fits in the larger OIS project. And I admit and confess here that you cannot see or read anything on this slide, so hopefully you can see it in your handouts.

But on the left-hand side of this graphic we have really just -- I will certainly walk you through this. On the left-hand side of the graphic we have displayed the two key decisions of the OIS project that are really going to direct all of the remaining pieces. And that first decision is the content model and what will be included in it. And then the second decision, which is the work taxonomy, which is really going to serve as that organizing framework for all of the job information that's to be collected. And the input driving these two decisions is the vision of the end state of the OIS and what decisions are going to be made using the OIS.

And then once these two decisions are finalized and determined, they will result in the development of that work analysis instrument. And then all of that information feeds then into the three decisions on the right-hand side of this graphic, and those are three decisions really related to our BPA, the first being the determination of the SSA job analysis, which you talked about this morning on Call Order 1. So the input from Call Order 1 will feed into that decision as well as future calls.

The selected SSA job analysis method will then drive what knowledge, skills and abilities are needed of job analysts and will impact the identification of training factors. And those KSAs will also impact the identification of training factors. And training though is just one of the components of the on-boarding process.

So if you go to the next slide, we tried to graphically portray here the interrelationships between the three different components of training, credentiallinging and recruiting job analysts. So to the left side of this graph we have those three key decisions of identifying training factors, determining a certificate program strategy and determining the recruitment strategy. And each of those decisions is going to be informed obviously from these results that I'm presenting to you this afternoon.

And as you can see from the arrows going to each of these decisions, each of these components affects the other two components. So while we have graphically displayed them here in a vertical fashion which might suggest -- it's a linear step-by-step development process, really these components need to be worked on concurrently to the extent possible with consideration of how decisions for one component will affect the other components.

And then to the right-hand side of this graph are some additional decisions that are going to impact the overall business strategy for training, certifying and recruiting. And SSA needs to consider these decisions and some of these need to be made before we can really have a final overall strategy. And we'll discuss some of these decisions later on at the end of the presentation.

So really the take-away points from these two slides are just the complexity of this project, the number of decisions that have to be made and the interdependence of all of those decisions.

I just want to give a brief

overview of the methodology for Call Order 2. Call Order 2 consisted of just two main tasks, the first task being again meeting and discussing the project on a fairly regular basis with the SSA team. And then the second task, the overarching task there of looking at a business strategy for training, certifying and recruiting job analysts. And that was broken down then into several smaller sub-tasks, the first of those being that we documented our plan methodology for completing all of the other sub-tasks.

The next sub-task there was the research we conducted on training. For this task we first conducted a literature review and then we also conducted focus groups with job analysis professionals across a wide variety of disciplines. And this was done in conjunction with Call Order 1. And in those focus groups we asked questions about the KSAs and the minimum qualifications needed of job analysts and about existing job analysis trainings.

Next we conducted for that sub-task individual interviews with training experts and trainers of job analysis to get more specific information about training design, training features and training logistics.

The next sub-task involved conducting research on credentialling practices. And for that we began by identifying the different types of credentialling and determined that the most appropriate for SSA would be an assessment-based certificate program, and we'll kind of discuss that conclusion a little bit later in the presentation.

From there we researched and identified different credentialling organizations and standards, and we reviewed those organizations to assess what are the different credentialling requirements in the different disciplines that are relevant here and the different processes and procedures involved in developing a certificate program.

The fourth sub-task was the research conducted on recruitment strategies. And for this we identified several benchmarking partners who have faced similar workforce challenges that we anticipate SSA will face as they go to recruit for these job analyst positions. So for example, recruiting for on demand or temporary work, for doing large-scale national recruiting. We interviewed each of these benchmarking partners and gathered detailed information on their recruitment practices and then we developed case studies and identified lessons learned for SSA.

And then our last main sub-task on Call 2 was to develop a candidate tracking database. For this step we first identified all the potential purposes of uses SSA may have for a candidate tracking database. And then once they reviewed those, we developed a Microsoft Access database in which you can enter and store candidate information along with tracking training progress, certification and then eventually also job assignments.

As I said, the bulk of the presentation will focus on our recommendations. Does anybody have any questions at this point on our methodology?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, Tom. And before you start, if I could just make an announcement.

I know there are about 30 people listening in. If you go to our Web site, ssa.gov/oidap, and you go to the meeting information and click on our agenda, and all the PowerPoints that are being delivered today and tomorrow are on that agenda and you can follow along remotely. So I just wanted to get that in.

Go ahead, Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: That's great, Mary. I'm glad to hear that, too.

I did not get to read all the way

through the entire document, so if my question's answered, just tell me to read.

You spoke about focus groups at one point. Is the constitution of those focus groups described in here, how you found this focus group, who the people were, that kind of stuff? Is that in here?

DR. HARVEY: Yes, it is. And as I said, those were done in conjunction with Call Order 1. So if you read through Call Order 1 and read about their focus groups, it was the same focus groups.

Okay. With that, I'd like to move forward then and focus first here on the recommendations and findings from our research on training strategy.

Part of our task here was to identify the knowledge, skills and abilities and minimum qualifications needed of job analysts. So through those focus groups that Tom was just asking about we talked to the job analysis experts about different knowledge, skills and abilities and minimum qualifications needed and we developed an initial draft list. But of course that list really needs to be revisited and reexamined once SSA has the final job analysis methodology and work analysis instrument.

Now the minimum qualifications here, they really should serve as an initial hurdle to screen out individuals that will absolutely not be able to successfully perform as job analysts. So based on our recommendations, we suggest using MQs that include specific and relevant course work or experience. We did gather some initial data from the experts about the KSAs and KSA ratings that would indicate three KSAs as potential criteria for minimum qualifications, and those included ability to perceive objects, people and environments, the ability to understand written materials and the ability to adapt to situational circumstances. And then we also developed some specific MQ statements for each of those KSAs, but again we want to revisit that once the job analysis methodology and work analysis instrument are finalized.

Okay. We gathered information on 11 different job analysis trainings and we found that the typical characteristics of these trainings are that they are classroom-based. And typically anyone can participate, so there are no prerequisites. The content of the trainings tends to focus on the data collection skills that are particular to that job analysis method and the trainings include a lot of opportunities for practice.

Our recommendation around the existing job analysis trainings is really again to reexamine the trainings once the job analysis methodology is finalized so that SSA could explore the possibility of perhaps maybe using some of the methods or materials that align with their methodology.

Based on our interviews with

training experts and our training literature review we identified a number of recommendations around the design of training. First we recommend that all of the training activities be linked to learning objectives and that those learning objectives be specific, measurable and observable. We also recommend considering the background and experience level of participants as the training is designed.

We recommend that the training start with concepts to create a general understanding of the material and then allow participants the opportunity to perform the relevant behaviors. We also recommend keeping the training sessions relatively short and including review questions and interactive components so that it keeps participants engaged throughout the training.

And we talked with the training experts as well about budgetary concerns, and there was strong agreement there that budgetary concerns should not at all dictate training material or content, that that really should only impact the sophistication of the materials and the range of activities that can be offered.

And then lastly here, they also recommended using the instructional system design model referred to as ADDIE, which stands for Analysis Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation. And they recommended this model because it has a flexible set of guidelines and it focuses on evaluation at every stage.

Some of the features that were recommended from the training experts that should be include were the following: lecture to provide information on content; discussion to provide an opportunity for clarification and reflection; practice so that participants have the opportunity to build their skills, feedback so that they can gain information on their progress and help them improve; and then resource materials so that they have something to refer to once the training is complete.

We also talked to the training experts about what would help increase participant engagement during the training and then transfer of training after the training. Their recommendations for increasing participant engagement include having a variety of activities, communicating the importance of the training and then highlighting how the training can benefit them beyond the SSA contact. So for example, highlighting how it can build their résumé or give them opportunities to gather information that they might not typically capture in the way they do their job analysis.

And then to increase training transfer, they suggested emphasizing throughout the training the expectation that they need to strictly adhere to the process providing significant time to practice in the training, providing feedback and using knowledgeable instructors, and then having a network of peer support, which we thought was a really good suggestion.

Regarding the actual training content, of course our first recommendation here is to reevaluate the KSAs that need to be focused on during the training once that job analysis methodology and instrument are developed, but we did gather some initial information on the KSAs that might be most difficult to learn, thinking that that would be what needed to be focused on during the training.

Some of those KSAs included the ability to judge or make decisions, the ability to recognize ambiguous conflicting or incomplete information, the ability to discern KSAs that are needed to perform a task, skill in observing a job in order to gather information about the job, and an ability to estimate the value or worth of something. So these KSAs were rated as most difficult, and so they are ones that will probably need to be focused on during the training.

The training experts also recommended that the main component of the training be focused on the data collection procedures that are going to be used in the methodology and to emphasize the importance of ensuring quality data.

We also talked to the training experts about how to train for data security concerns, knowing that this would be an important issue for SSA. Their recommendations around that included having discussions with the participants about data security, emphasizing the consequences of failing to adhere to data security requirements and including practice scenarios or case studies that highlight data security concerns.

Then as we've mentioned repeatedly, it was recommended and suggested the importance of comprehensive practice here, and that would include practice with any of the materials or instruments that they'll use on site conducting their job analysis.

The last set of recommendations around training here cover several different topics. So first, regarding the training assessment, assessments can be used to assess participant learning throughout the training; and those are typically referred to as formative assessments, and then at the end of the training. And so those are referred to as summative assessments. And those assessments can really take any form, but whatever training assessment is developed, it needs to be developed and integrated with the certificate program, as we'll discuss in a moment. And our recommendation here is of course to tie the assessments to the specific training or learning objectives and also to include a knowledge component as well as a behavioral component in the assessment.

Regarding training delivery, we

recommend using a blended delivery approach, so it would include an online component and a classroom- based component. While online training would be very cost-effective for a national geographically-dispersed training, it doesn't allow participants the opportunity to practice or to get the appropriate amount of feedback. So having an online training that would perhaps serve as a first hurdle would be very beneficial because it could reduce administration costs and help participants come to the classroom-based portion with a really strong knowledge and then they could just focus on building their skills. So of course having a blended approach will probably involve more effort. We feel like that effort will -- the benefits will outweigh the costs.

Since we are recommending a classroom-based portion to the training we also recommend developing and administering train-the-trainer sessions to ensure consistency and standardization of training.

And then lastly we recommend evaluating training at three of the four levels of Kirkpatrick's training evaluation criterion. That's in reference to Donald Kirkpatrick's famous model of training evaluation. And the three levels would be reactions, learning and behavior. So that would include assessing participants' reactions to the training, assessing their actual learning of the training material and then assessing their behavior once out into the field.

So those are our recommendations regarding training. Does anyone have any questions on those before I move onto the recommendations on credentialling?

(No audible response.)

DR. HARVEY: Okay. Great. There are three different types of credentials that we looked at, the first being a certificate of attendance or participation, and that credential just really attests to the fact that a participant attended and/or participated in a given training. The next type is an assessment-based certificate program, and in this type individuals attend a specific training and then are assessed on their learning of the training. And then the third type is a professional certification and that attests that candidates have met some predetermined level of competency in a particular discipline or area of study.

Now the assessment-based certificate program is the one that really we feel is most suitable to SSA's needs. It's the only type of credentialling that attests to both the fact that someone did attend a specific training, that they did learn the training material and that they have met some predetermined level of competency. So that is the one that we have recommended to SSA.

And then given the legal scrutiny that SSA is likely going to face, we really feel that they need a credentialling process that is of the highest quality and can be recognized by an outside third party as valid and rigorous. And we've also found that accreditation and third-party validation has had significant value to other agencies that are similar to SSA and that the public and the Federal Government are becoming more and more familiar with certificate programs and program standards and are increasingly requesting third-party validation.

So as such, we have recommended to SSA that they follow one of the two approved industry standards for an assessment-based certificate program and that they seek accreditation. The two approved industry standards: One comes from ANSI, which stands for the American National Standards Institute; and the other is from ICE, which stands for the Institute for Credentialling Excellence. As you'll see in our report, we have reviewed the requirements of both of those standards very thoroughly and that there are a number of requirements in each of those standards.

We've also recommended to SSA that they follow up with either ANSI or two agencies that we interviewed, the FBI or the FDA. The FBI and the FDA have sought accreditation for their certificate programs and we talked to them about the benefits and the process of that and provided some information, but if SSA has any additional information or questions, we suggest that they follow up with them. We also suggest even if accreditation is not desired or feasible that you still build the program to comply with the standards, because the standards really represent best practices.

We did also look at the credentialling practices of existing job analysis methods and found that most methods do not really have a credentialling associated with them. Of the ones that do the process typically involves a participant taking a specific training and then completing an assessment that's usually either a multiple choice test or a work sample and then having to, you know, meet some passing score on that assessment. But in the information that we have gathered we just have not found that any of those practices would really meet SSA's needs, nor would they fully comply with either one of the standards, so we really recommend that SSA seek to develop their own certificate program.

As I said, the two standards; the ANSI and the ICE standards, really have a number of requirements in them, and we go through them in detail in the report. Here I just wanted to highlight a couple of the overarching ones or key ones, and the first involves developing clear policies and procedures for program operation and administration. And this also includes information about how the program can be communicated to stakeholders, because that's important. The training that's associated with the certificate program should be based on the learning objectives and should follow generally accepted training guidelines, which we just discussed in the training recommendations.

Now the requirements of an assessment-based certificate program are really quite extensive, as I said, and could be really difficult for someone unfamiliar with them to implement, so we've also recommended involving an assessment or credentialling specialist and involving that specialist early on in the process even when learning objectives are being developed. Also to meet the standards SSA will need to conduct a quality control check or an evaluation of the program on annual basis, will need to maintain records on participant and on how the program was developed and administered, and also need to have a designated authority to oversee and manage the program.

And lastly, in regards to

credentialling we talked on numerous occasions with SSA about data entry and the criticality of data entry here and the numerous concerns that could interfere with quality data entry such as the delays between assignments the job analysis might have or the fact that job analysis might have experience with other methods and that might impact how they enter the data.

And so given those concerns we looked specifically into the training and credentialling practices for data entry and for some of the large national databases like the Traumatic Brain Injury Database, and we found that these existing large scale databases use a combination of having training for data entry personnel and providing very detailed resources along with having preset limits in the databases to help control quality of data entry. So we've recommended both of these two suggestions here to SSA, that they develop software that includes data checks on data entry and to provide a detailed data entry handbook or guidebook to job analysts.

Another check on data quality is to include an audit process, and audits could be conducted on a predetermined schedule or they could be conducted if a problem in data quality has been identified, or if certain triggers have met. For example, if it's a new analyst or if the analyst hasn't performed an analysis in a number of months or for a long time period. And so we recommend that SSA develop an audit process and develop policies and procedures on how that process will occur, how often it will occur, who would be audited and what measures would be used to do that.

That concludes our recommendations on credentialling. Again I'll pause here to see if there's any questions on those.

MEMBER HARDY: I had one quick question. Earlier when you were looking at a certification program you said something about it, that it was under two years. What led you to address this program lasting less than two years? Why did that become an issue?

DR. HARVEY: It's my understanding that to seek accreditation a program needs to have two year's worth of data. So SSA will need to evaluate how long their certificate program will be in place. If it's only going to be in place for a year or two years, it might not be worth seeking accreditation. If it's going to be in place much longer than that and will get that two year's worth of data, then it makes sense to seek that accreditation. Does that answer the question?

MEMBER FRASER: I was just wondering whether you sought any input from the existing SSA VE group, VE constituency in terms of this type of work activity.

DR. HARVEY: No, we did not.

MEMBER FRASER: Yes, it's just that it is a large group, over 1,000, I think, 11 or 1,200, and they're used to doing contract work. And although they're steep in the DOT, I think they could be retooled for some of this work activity.

DR. HARVEY: Thank you for bringing that to our attention.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think there were VEs involved in the process in terms of the focus groups.

Debra, were you going to say something?

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: What I was going to say in answer to Bob's question is that as we continue our recruitment efforts we will be reaching out to certain stakeholder groups.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: And I had a question on the credentialling. This is an area I'm familiar with because of my previous involvement in this area with the Commission on Rehab Counselor Certification, so I was really curious that you included ANSI and ICE. CRCC is accredited by ICE and so are a variety of others on their Web site; the health care providers and the addictive disorders practitioners, nurse practitioners, wound management, medical assistants, the certification for orthotics, prosthetics and a variety of health-related organization that credential. But ANSI -- I'm a bike rider and my helmet is accredited by ANSI. So when I'm on the ANSI Web site, they talk about accrediting construction materials, products, that kind of thing. So I was very curious why you included both and if there was a preference one way or another because of the task associated here with one credentialling standard over the other.

DR. HARVEY: We included both. They are the only two in existence for the certificate programs. And ANSI has a number of different standards and certificate credentialling programs, and so we were just focused on their assessment-based certificate program standard. And, no, we do not at this point have any preference or bias towards one or the other. We just feel like it would be important to either follow one or both. I mean, if you follow both, then you're comprehensive and you could seek accreditation with either place.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I have some familiarity with ANSI from my work, so I just thought I'd share that they do product certification, but they also do accreditation of personnel certification. So you have to go the right part of their -- and it's completely different people and process. And also, ANSI uses often international standards, ISO standards and I don't believe that ICE -- I think they use national standards. So that's one of the differences.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: I guess we now are certifying job analysts, so the assumption is this project is going to have job analysts and it's going to have quite a few of them. I'm not sure that -- I haven't been on the panel for such a long time, but I haven't really heard that, that a decision has been made to have job analysts, because for simple if you use survey methodology, then you don't need job analysts and O*NET is ran without any job -- I mean, there are analysts that make some gradings looking at, you know, paper descriptions of jobs, but there are no job analysts that go talk to incumbents or anybody else. So it's more of a general comment that I think the nature of this training, it's going to depend on the nature of what the analysts do, assuming that we do have analysts.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Yes, job analysts are one form of data collection and I think that is an area that is being looked at.

Any other questions?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

DR. HARVEY: Great. Then I'll continue on to move to our recommendations regarding recruitment.

As I said our research here involved identifying benchmarking partners who we interviewed about their recruiting practices. And we talked to them about a number of different topic areas, and one such topic area was the potential source of candidates. We found that our partners typically recruited graduate-level professionals in fields such as vocational rehab, physical and occupational therapy and I/O psychology. But they also did mention sometimes using graduate students as they can be a less costly alternative but still have the knowledge needed, however, they would need more careful supervision and more training.

Some of our partners also recommended or gave the suggestion to use retired professionals, but it's unclear at this point whether there would be enough candidates within either of those sources to meet SSA's needs, so we are really recommending that SSA focus recruiting on candidates with some type of training or experience in job analysis and then to conduct additional research to determine the numbers and interests of people in these different potential source groups to work with SSA.

Our interviews with the benchmarking partners also talked about different recruiting frameworks that SSA could use, one such framework being hiring for internal staff. This option would provide the greatest control over the work, but of course would result in a lot of work for SSA and a huge workforce at the end of the project that they may no longer need long term.

Another option could be recruiting independent consultants or practitioners. This would provide a lot of flexibility for SSA, but also probably requires a lot of management, control and quality control.

And then a third option would be perhaps having SSA contract with organizations that already have a network of providers. This would be a very simple approach then and really reduce the burden for SSA, but it's really going to require some further analysis to determine how many organizations are out there that would have such a network, whether those network of professionals would have the skills that are needed and what the cost would be involved in that. So we recommend conducting a cost benefit analysis of these different recruiting frameworks.

And then regarding recruitment logistics, given that SSA needs to have occupational data collected throughout the country to ensure that their disability determinations are justifiable nationwide, we've recommended here the consideration of establishing a few temporary regional offices for that initial wave of recruitment.

Then we also recommend of course developing a recruitment and hiring process that is efficient and moves candidates through the process as quickly as possible. I'm sure we all know that the longer that process takes, the more likely candidates will be to drop out and move onto something else.

One of the key elements that we heard from several of the benchmarking partners regarding successful high-volume quick turn around hiring was to have a competitive pay, and that competitive pay will vary based on education, experience, even the discipline and the location of the analysts. And while we did gather information from each of our benchmarking partners on pay and compensation, it really is not enough information to provide a really accurate and concrete recommendation on a competitive rate.

So what we recommend really is that SSA conduct a more comprehensive compensation study to really get more definitive information on what might be a competitive rate. However, we have recommended that SSA provide that compensation as an hourly rate. We feel that this would most accurately compensate analysts for their time spent, but we also recommend putting a cap on that, on the total number of hours that can be spent and maybe setting those caps by different job categories, so that would guard against any abuse.

Information gathered from the benchmarking partners on candidate tracking suggested that by logging candidate information along with screening and selection data and integrating that with any performance auditing would be the most useful. And so as I said earlier, the candidate tracking database that we've developed does include all of those components.

And then we also asked the benchmarking partners about training for rotational or temporary staff and they suggested including modular training when the experience or education levels of participants would vary. We were talking with SSA yesterday about that recommendation and it sounds like that would probably be very beneficial here for them.

That concludes our recommendations on recruitment. Any questions on those before we talk about some of the more overall strategic decisions that are needed?

(No audible response.)

DR. HARVEY: Okay. Great. As I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, there are several decisions that lead up to or are going to impact the overall business strategy for training, certifying and recruiting job analysts. So in the next slide I wanted to call out just some of those decisions. And then after that, I want to mention some of the potential resources SSA may need to assist them.

Of course that first decision,

again as I've said repeatedly throughout this presentation, is the need to identify the work analysis instrument and the method for job analysis. That's going to be the driving force behind all of these components; the training, certifying and recruiting of analysts.

Then next we need to establish those learning objectives. The first step in designing a job analysis training is going to be identifying clear, specific, observable objectives.

Next would be to determine the size of the candidate pool. The size of the candidate pool is obviously going to impact the type of candidates that SSA needs to target and the type of candidates then impacts the training and how much training is needed and the level of training needed. Of course whatever candidates are selected, they at least need to have those minimum qualifications that are identified.

We also recommend that SSA consider the amount of time available to trains analysts. The amount of time that's available to train analysts is really going to impact how the training is implemented, so while we recommended a blended training approach, the amount of time that SSA has for that training is really going to impact how that's implemented, whether it's a two-month window, a six-month window, a year.

And then we need to identify the length of time over which SSA will recruit and train job analysts. And this goes back to the question that was asked earlier. That will impact whether accreditation can or cannot be sought.

And then we need to estimate the expected tenure and experience level of analysts, because this will impact that audit process. If you are recruiting and hiring less experienced analysts, like a graduate student, you're probably going to want to have a more thorough or rigorous audit process than if you're using more experienced professionals.

And then another one of the key I think strategic decisions that needs to be made is to determine the deployment strategy, and that speaks to how many job analyses will be conducted, when those job analyses will be conducted, the location of the job analyses, the frequency of assignments, because this is really going to impact recruiting.

And then articulating a selection strategy kind of goes hand in hand with that. So identifying how many analysts will be needed and the regions where those candidates will be needed.

And then identifying the employment status for analysts, like we talked about, whether they'll be internal staff or whether they'll be contractors, things like that, because that will impact the attractiveness of the position for different candidates.

And then once we have the work analysis instrument, the methodology and the KSAs finalized, then we can focus on specifying a selection test batter to be used to select candidates into the training program. And then lastly, selected a compensation approach.

Some potential resource needs that would either help SSA with some of these strategic decisions or with some of the recommendations that we've made are listed here on this next slide, the first being a contractor with occupational or job analysis experience.

Then an assessment specialist, as I mentioned already in the presentation, who has experience developing assessment-based certificate programs.

A contractor with training design expertise. I think we can see how all of these fit with our recommendations.

But the next one, the headhunter

agencies, professional organizations or societies, or credentialling organizations, these could be important for SSA not only to help them find people, but help to get the word out about the positions.

Existing networks or providers or organizations like BTE and BTE Technologies is one of the selected benchmarking partner that we spoke with. Again, they can also help get the word about these SSA positions.

Unemployment agencies or temporary staffing agencies. Again, they could help find and recruit. They could also perhaps be part of the management of these analysts and perhaps help with things like payroll and things like that.

A technology vendor who can provide information on information technology services regarding that database and developing a data entry database that has those data checks.

A contractor with knowledge of existing audit software packages that SSA could evaluate for their needs, software compatible with the OIS database that could be used for quality control.

Auditors who can implement that audit process that we've recommended.

And then a contractor with expertise and experience in testing.

So that concludes the results and our recommendations from Call Order 2. Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, John.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Thanks for your presentation. I'm going to build on Juan's question earlier and ask it a little bit differently. How does Call Order 1 relate to Call Order 2, and have you given thought to that, or is that within the scope of your work to think about that relationship? In other words, are there some models in Call Order 1 that lean in the direction of having the job analyst and then going through the training and recruiting process you suggested?

DR. ANDERSON: Yes, I think the assumption with both of those going in was that -- and not our assumption, but the assumption that was provided to us, that we would at some point be needing to use job analysts. We aren't really sure how we're going to be using them. One of the things I think -- for Jen one of the frustrating things about doing this presentation is she has to continue to say, well, we're not sure. We can't really settle on a firm recommendation because we don't' really know exactly what analysts are going to be doing. So, yes, the two really are dependent on one another. And also, both of them are dependent on what happens with the taxonomy and other decisions that are going to be made later this year.

MEMBER CRESWELL: So is it fair to say that the models that lean in the direction of using observational data procedures might require then job analysts? Is that a fair assumption?

DR. ANDERSON: Yes, I think that's the assumption that we went with, that probably that we'd have to be using analysts for that. If you noticed, as we we're talking about Call 1 we didn't completely rule out the possibility of using a survey to reach incumbents. There's a potential role there.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Juan, go ahead.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, I thought that your presentation was very complete, very comprehensive. I guess my only concern is; and I understand this is not your fault because the assignment was broad, like you said, some of these recommendations on the PowerPoints, for example, link training activities to specific measurable and observable learning objectives, consider background and experience levels of participants, I mean, I agree with this, but they're very generic and we'd probably pull this out from any training book, right? So I guess I'm not blaming you because this is the assignment you were given. I'm just questioning the utility of some of the assignment itself.

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: You know, Juan, indeed some of the utility of the assignment is that not only do we have to think out loud about some of these issues, but we do have to provide documentation that we have strategically looked at them. And that is a large purpose of this project, to provide that documentation that we have done the legwork, we've done the background work and we've done the benchmarking on some of these issues.

DR. HARVEY: I'd also like to add that as we talked with the training experts I think they also wanted to be able to provide more detail or more information but were unable to when we did not have that content model or the job analysis methodology or the work analysis instrument. Because when they didn't know what the content would be, they couldn't really speak to any more specific types of recommendations.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: I guess what I'm questioning is I don't think -- do I need an external consultant to tell me that training activities need to be linked to objectives and to be told that I need to consider the background and experience of the participants? Could I just pull it out from a training book, and undergraduate textbook perhaps? But, you know, just a thought.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Pam and then Shanan.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I wanted to ask, you mentioned graduate students as a possible source, but did you look at what majors those would be from, like would they have to be in I/O psychology, or could they just be in psychology, or economics? You know, which fields in particular was that looked at?

DR. HARVEY: Yes, our benchmarking partners included organizations that represented various different fields, not just I/O psychology, but vocational rehab, occupational therapy. So I think it would be grad students in any one of those fields. But we haven't really focused in on the combination of experience and what education levels at this point, so we would need to do more research on that. And again, as I think my fall back statement is, it's really going to depend on the methodology and the instrument and what kinds of procedures are involved and skills are needed.

MEMBER GIBSON: My pseudo-question; I'm going to try to frame it as a question for Debra, I guess, in response to Juan's comment is that while any professor in I/O psychology or business school probably can pick up 10 different handbooks on training design and put together this, I would ask if the resources within OVRD allow you to have an expert on hand to design a training program for you or to even do due diligence in developing background on what are the practical best practices in training. And if you do not have those resources, then having someone like IFC come in and provide that due diligence for you, is that helpful?

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Yes.

MEMBER HARDY: I recognize a lot of this is vague and has to be vague, and as a lawyer that offends me deeply, but I'm okay with that. But there is something in here under the minimum qualifications that was vague that I didn't understand. So you have down here "participated in personal activity for six months where visual cues had to be gathered and interpreted." What does that mean?

DR. HARVEY: Again, that relates to the KSA of meaning to be able to visually perceive people, objects and environments. And what we were trying to do again is make MQ statements that are tied to specific types of experience or course work. That one's pretty broad. It's really the KSA of being able to see, yes. So we were trying to make it broad enough to encompass anything that anyone might do, but yet tie it to something specific, to, you know, work experience. So that's the statement we've come up with at this point. But again, we really want to revisit those.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: I guess this is a question for you guys. In general will you have felt more comfortable if you knew the content of the training, if you had more guidelines in terms of we're going to job analysts? Had you had more information from us in terms or from -- as to say in terms of who was going to be trained and for what, would your task may have been easier?

DR. HARVEY: Certainly the more information -- it would have been helpful to have more information, but I still think this was a very valuable process that we went through. I think that helped to give us some initial starting part and helped to clarify and identify some of these other decisions and considerations that SSA needs to make in order to develop that overall business strategy.

MEMBER HUNT: Taking for granted that the challenge was there because the subject is unclear; maybe this is a question for SSA, but is the status of this report such that it will be revisited when we have the specifications, or at least an instrument maybe?

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: We definitely intend to go back and look at the recommendations that ICF has made once we have the instrument, the draft work taxonomy prototype. I mean, this is the beginning of the conversation. This is not the end. This is the opening of the box. It's not the closing. And so, we will go back when we can give them more specificity about who, what, when, where and how we're going to do the data collection.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: That reminds me of two years ago when our report came out and people thought it was the end and we kept on saying it was the beginning. So you're talking about the same thing.

MEMBER LECHNER: I have some questions related to your comments on the disadvantages of eLearning, and I've had the opportunity to look pretty closely at your executive summary, but I haven't had a chance to read the full report, so forgive me if it's already in here. But my question is how did you arrive at your conclusions regarding the disadvantages of eLearning and do you have someone on your team or that is a consultant, a subcontractor to your group that has expertise in eLearning?

DR. HARVEY: Yes, we do. We have someone that's a specialist in instructional system design and we have developed at ICF a number of eLearning types of trainings. And we spoke with several of them for this project in regards to this specifically and a lot of those disadvantages that we document there came from our interviews with the training experts.

MEMBER LECHNER: You know, I think that I don't know the research in this field of eLearning, but it occurs to me that possibly, like the comment that participants receive limited feedback -- I think in my experience with eLearning the feedback is through a different medium, but it may not be limited. It may be even -- depending on how the feedback is provided, it could be even more immediate than say in a classroom setting where you can't ask a question until the lecture is finished. So I think I would encourage you and SSA to sort of revisit this whole idea of eLearning and, you know, what does the literature show about learning, the effectiveness of, you know, teaching the material taught. Is there any significant difference in different mediums? And just because I think that there is so much of a trend towards eLearning and there are so many advantages in terms of cost effectiveness and reaching people in a variety of geographic locations that can be achieved, I think some of the perceived disadvantages may or may not be present.

MEMBER GIBSON: To follow up with what Deb is talking about, I have another question, too. Your ultimate recommendation is eLearning kind of combined classroom learning to help handle the distinctions there. When you talk about eLearning, were you specifically referring to wholly asynchronous eLearning, because there is synchronous eLearning which frequently mimics the very same aspects of classroom-based learning. And so a program that's eLearning could be synchronous and asynchronous. So what was the breakdown there in terms of the pros and cons when they were doing that? Were they only talking of purely asynchronous eLearning?

DR. HARVEY: I think we were probably thinking more asynchronous, and again, thinking about cost and ease for the participant to take it at their own pace. But you're exactly right; we can re-look at that and think about the synchronous eLearning. And I know we talked with SSA yesterday and it sounds like they have a lot of capabilities in that area to do synchronous online learning. So we can explore that a little bit more and maybe address some of the concerns that have just been raised.

In regards to the feedback, we can certainly re-look at that, but I think perhaps what we were thinking when we were talking about the limited feedback was the limited feedback on practice and then being able to practice in front of an instructor and get that hands-on feedback.

MEMBER LECHNER: And I think some

of the research that I've been involved with in the past we were able to do and provide that practice by using some videotapes and then feedback of the analysts that we were training watching the videotapes. I think the hardest thing to teach, whether you're doing it live or doing eLearning, is just the structured interview component that requires the analyst to ask a question and then ask the question behind the question and teaching that logic and getting practice in that logic. And so, if there's anything that's difficult to teach, period, whether it's online. or Web-based, or synchronous, or asynchronous, or live, I think it's that rationale and that questioning to do the structured interview.

MEMBER PANTER: I view this report as a big to-do list and I think that some of the issues that are coming up, including this last issue about what should the format be of the training, are dependent on these design decisions, and that is a design decision. So

I think some of them have to be viewed that way and removed and thought of as design decisions. And so we need some kind of mechanism so that we are literally revisiting each aspect of this, because there are specifics that need to be put into each one and it's premature at this point to close anything because we don't' have a design.

MEMBER KEY: One of the things as an occupational physician, we wrestle with issues of merit badges. We get certification in medical review officer so that we can do drug screen testing. We get certification now in doing CDL examinations and so on. Now what that does is it frees up the federal agencies that are involved in that from having to be involved in training. They have outside sources that provide -- not that they're accredited by the federal agency or anything, but they've met either ANSI or ICE standards of training and certification. So is that an approach that would likely work for SSA in this endeavor having outside sources such as the occupational therapist, the physical therapist, the I/O people, their groups or accrediting groups doing this type of certification for them as a kind of merit badge?

DR. HARVEY: Yes, we certainly looked at the credentialling requirements of different disciplines. I think that's definitely a good thought. I think the concern there is that this certifications that would be out there would be at the overall hierarchical discipline area and are not bound specific to the job analysis of that discipline. So they're not getting certification in job analysis, but they're getting certification in voc rehab, or they're getting certification in occupational therapy. And so they're getting certified at having this board knowledge of how to do voc rehab or occupational therapy and you wouldn't I don't think have the level of assurance that you are looking for that SSA needs that they can actually do job analysis the way -- or have the level of competency that's needed to do job analysis as SSA needs.

MEMBER KEY: Well, as a follow up to that, I guess what I was getting at is that like our professional organization has organized these training programs for its constituents and that helps the federal agencies that are needing these services because they don't have to be involved in the training. They don't have to hire people to do the training or even be involved in it. There's an overriding accrediting group that certifies that these are applicable training programs. I mean, sure, an occupational therapist and a physical therapist would have a different approach than an I/O, but if they had common standards of certification, then this additional certification would seem like it would meet SSA requirements for this individual work analyst.

DR. HARVEY: Yes, I would agree. We've done the research. There is no certification out there, you know, currently on job analysis. And I would say in response, too, that the certification requirements or credentialling requirements across the different disciples are not equivalent or similar. So I think those will be some of the concerns that you would need to look into and consider, thinking about something like that.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: I don't have a question, but I have an observation that in looking at your recommendations it seems to be very resource intensive in terms of money and in terms of people. And we live in an age of shrinking budgets and shrinking government and, you know, it's shrunk some and it looks like it's going to continue to shrink, and how these two conflicting interests play out should be very interesting. We may have to have another set of recommendations for the poverty of the future.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

MEMBER HARDY: This kind of falls back into another kind of caveat as I had for the other call. As I was reading this under compensation there's a line here that says "compensation hourly rate that caps on the total hours that could be spent based on various categories of jobs." Conceptually I understand what you're saying is different methods may be utilized for different categories of jobs which will have a different cost impact. I'd be careful with language as to how you get there and how you describe the process because for me sitting here I can also look at that and say you're placing a different dollar value on different categories. Is that what you're doing? Are you allocating resources to one type of job over another? So I would just as a warning say be careful how you arrive at that and make sure your justification is very clear.

DR. HARVEY: I appreciate that and

I want to follow up with your comment. I agree that that's going to be struggle and it's going to be a challenge to try and balance cost with doing something that's really rigorous and valid. So thank you for both of those comments.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, I guess I'd also comment. I've been involved on a couple of cases that I've been involved in. The qualifications of the assessors and the job analysts were challenged, right? And issues that came up with those challenges were for example the employers' inability to identify who were the assessors or who were the job analysts, where can we find them, right? Who are they? And I think that has to do with turnover. So this is an issue that will have to be kept in mind, the fact that these people cannot be a revolving door kind of format, because then you have lots of trouble. And also, you know, oftentimes we say -- like Andrew, for example, was saying, well, it looks like this proposal is kind of like an ideal world, right? You know, in an ideal world how would you do this.

And I would say that's what happens when you ask psychologists, right? They give you the psychological version. If you want the cost- effective angle, then you should probably ask an economist. But along those lines I have also seen that often assessors are questioned in terms of who are they? They might be a psychologist, they might be industrial/organizational psychologists, but what do they know about this job, right? So the fact that somebody has a given degree, that doesn't mean that they are qualified who is going to be the best police officer or the best fire fighter.

Sometimes what counts in court is how much contact did they have with incumbents. How many times did they talk to them? Did they actually talk to them, because oftentimes they don't, right? These things are done. It's called arm chair job analysis, right? You see it in your office and you do it from there. So those are the things that come up in court.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions or comments?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I have a question. I know we've talked a lot this afternoon about that to move forward there's a big contingency, but are there things that with everything you've looked at, all the people you've talked to that you think SSA can be doing in this regard while those other contingencies, the instrument, some of the design decisions are being done, some immediate things, and how would you prioritize them?

DR. HARVEY: Yes, we have thought about that and we kind of looked at those strategic decisions that I went through at the end of the presentation, kind of looking at the order of those. And course right up there was the instrument and the method as being one of the most important things to work on first. But that being said, I think there are other things, and looking at the deployment strategy would be the next probably step that I would recommend. We could go ahead and start work on looking at that compensation study. Without detailed information that study might be a broader endeavor, but I still think it could be valuable to begin looking at compensation, because that would key in about costs as well and help identify different costs for different types of candidates that might be targeted.

I think from there looking at again selection strategy would be one of the other things that we could start thinking about and really identifying and that then would dictate the size of the candidate pool. That will also help with the recruitment strategy and identifying the right source of candidates there. So I think that there are some things that we can start working on in the meantime.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Any other questions from the panel? Thoughts or comments? Go ahead, Pam.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I just have one more comment. You know, you're talking about the cost and the quality, is that there are literally thousands of personnel certifications out there and a very small percentage of them are actually accredited, usually in cases like health where there are some safety issues, there are liabilities implications. So I can see, you know, because this is information is used in court that there's a recommendation for accreditation, but it is actually fairly rare because of the requirements.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Any other comments or questions?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

Thank you for your time. We appreciate it. We learned a lot and thank you again.

We have next on the agenda JA scaling question. I let this session go over specifically because we don't have any public comment this afternoon, so we have some time to work with.

So I will ask the panel, do we want to take a break now and come back and do scaling and then go into deliberation, or do you want to go ahead and go with JA scaling?

I'm getting nods that we should go into a break, so let's take a 15-minute break and come back at, what is that, 2:47. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 2:23 p.m. off the record until 2:47 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. We are back on the agenda. And for those listening in, if you would like to follow along, again if you go to ssa.gov/oidap, and you go to meeting information, the first meeting listed on there is quarterly meeting for September 21 and 22. The second bullet you will find is our agenda. If you click on that, you will see not only our agenda, but hot links to the PowerPoints that are being discussed today and tomorrow.

So a little bit of an introduction to this session. At the last meeting Dave had posed a question about JA scaling issues, and what we wanted to do was again to maybe start discussion on this topic. So we're going to have Deb do a short presentation in terms of some scaling issues from her perspective, mostly from the physical demands and also in our three-ring binders we have something that Shanan put together called types of items that look at scaling from a work analysis perspective. And so these become kind of stimuli to start talking about these issues as they apply to the project.

So I will turn the presentation over to Deb Lechner.

MEMBER LECHNER: Thanks, Mary. Appreciate the introduction.

And I want to start my presentation with a little bit of a disclaimer here by saying that my discussion today is really focused on some scaling possibilities and should not at all be perceived as my recommendations or the subcommittee's recommendations or the panel's recommendations on scaling. Just sort of sat down after our request from the last meeting to kick off a discussion and just put down some ideas. So it's not based on a literature review of all the possibilities or suggestions, just some thoughts for us to think about. My comments are going to be directed primarily to the physical demands, and then I'm going to turn it over to Juan. He may have a few comments about the cognitive or behavioral demands. And then Shanan may have some additional comments as well. So just want to preface my remarks.

And just also to say that any final scaling recommendations or scaling procedures would really be predicated upon a variety of things, some of which would probably be certainly the variables that Social Security chooses for their taxonomy, the purposes for which they will use the data, the data collection methods that they choose, and certainly SSA has plans to study the reliability and validity of their methods. And so that would certainly drive the ultimate scales that will be used. We can all sit around the table and speculate about the best scales to use, but if we get out there, or if SSA gets out there and pilot studies and sees that our ideal scale that we thought would be perfect isn't very reliable from writer to writer, then we've got a problem. We've got to back up. We've got to change directions. And certainly cost effectiveness will affect not only the methods of data collection that we use, but it will affect the scaling properties that are used. You know, what is going to be the most cost effective way to collect and utilize this data?

In the whole area of physical demands the type of scales tend to vary by the kind of data that's being collected and the different categories of data in the physical demands area. There's a variety of ways to conceptualize it, so this isn't the only way, but we tend to think about manual materials handling, which is the lifting, the carrying, the pushing and pulling.

We also tend to think about the position tolerance demands of work. So, you know, what kinds of static positions do people have to obtain or achieve and how long do they have to sustain those positions or postures? It's things like sitting, standing, stooping, crouching, reaching and kneeling. And again, those are the DOT terminologies. When the SSA creates its taxonomy, it may not use those same terms.

Mobility and movement and repetitive motions tend to get sort of grouped together as a category or a dimension of physical demands. And it's things that allow the worker to move from point A to point B, like walking, crawling, climbing. And then you'll notice; and I highlighted the terms, the stooping, crouching, reaching again, because those things can occur either statically or they can occur on a repetitive basis. And the physiological demands are different depending on whether it's a positional requirement or a repetitive requirement.

And then hand function is typically looked at in terms of not only the duration or how long you can utilize your hands and fingers, but it's also typically looked at in terms of skill and force. So if you have to do forceful gripping, for example, how much force can you exert? Or if the job requires forceful gripping, how much force is required.

And the balance, typically most classification systems that look at physical demands also have some component of balancing, and balance can be operationalized a variety of different ways; static, dynamic balance are traditional ways that balance has been evaluated.

And then most taxonomies of physical demands look at some sort of coordination; bilateral, eye-hand-foot coordination, eye-hand coordination, eye-foot coordination are all possible combinations that have been reported.

And so the scaling varies significantly according to the type of physical demand that is being evaluated. And so for the manual materials handling component, we're typically looking at the weight that's handled or the forces that are exerted. Some classification systems, job analysis systems look at the size and shape of the object that's handled, whether or not the object has -- what kind of hand coupling is required. So does the object have handles? Does it not have handles, because that does affect the level of difficulty of the materials handling. And then is it a one-handed or a two-handed activity? And that's one of the things that in the testimony that we heard from SSA very early on in the process was this issue of is there a job or are there job activities that can be done that can be done one handed? And I guess that's a question that comes up fairly frequently for this organization.

And the oftentimes documenting the vertical height of the material that's moved, so how far up or how far low down do you have to lift it? And then if it's a horizontal movement, what distance, over what distance is the material moved? And so all of those things are possible scales and again not advocating that all of these be measured, or any of these be measured, but just saying this is sort of the possibilities that are out there.

And then the other challenging piece with manual materials handling is that it can occur in a variety of positions. So the job can require lifting and lowering a load and it can happen while the person's standing, it can happen while the person's kneeling or squatting or stooping or while they're in a rotated position. And so then the analysis can become very complex if all of those factors are included. And I think one of the challenges for Social Security is trying to decide again, as we've had many discussions among panel members, how complex does this need to be in order to fairly adjudicate these cases in order to determine whether claimants can perform the physical demands of work, either previous work or any work in the economy.

So and forces can be exerted while someone is moving or walking as well. So pushing can occur, pulling can occur while someone's walking or it can occur while a person is standing still. And all of these things can typically occur one handed or two handed. So those are just some of the complexities that drive the scaling.

For the non-materials handling demands, physical demands of work there are typically some comments about the duration of the activity, and the duration can be described as cumulative throughout the entire work schedule, or it can be described in terms of continuous duration. And I think at least in the field of rehabilitation and disability a lot of the discussions and battles tend to occur around how much continuous, how long continuously can this person sustain work or this particular activity. So I think we'll have to give some thought or SSA will have to give some thought about a measure of total duration and a measure of continuous duration.

And then beyond duration there's

the intensity. So if I have to squat for this job, do I have to go to a full squat? Can it be a modified squat? And there are all kinds of scales of intensity ranging from very specific degrees of range of motion to general ordinal classifications like minimal, moderate, severe. So there are decisions to be made regarding scaling in that regard as well.

And this whole idea of the non-materials handling demands, is it a balanced activity? Is it symmetrical or is it asymmetrical, because being asymmetrical puts a different demand on the body and requirements on the individual.

With mobility the mobility or the ambulatory tasks, physical demands you have the issue of distance. How far do they have to move from point A to point B to get the job done or the occupation performed? How many repetitions do they have to do within a given amount of time? How fast does this activity have to occur? What's the duration? And there's been some discussion among the group about percent of day versus absolute hours and, you know, I think as long as the percent of day is tied to some sort of absolute value so that it's a percent of how long the day is or is it a percent of the job, I think you have to be pretty specific about that in order to be able to combine the data from across jobs into a single occupational classification.

The repetitive movements get into scaling that can include repetitions, frequency, cycle time, percent of day, continuous duration, intensity and then again the balance in symmetry. So you can see some of the same scaling properties for both the repetitive movements and the position and tolerance movements.

The balance can be, as I've already mentioned, the dynamic versus static, the duration or percent of job that balancing is required. And many of the balance scales get into how sophisticated does your balance have to be or how skilled does your balance have to be? Is it even surface, uneven surfaces? Is it climbing ladders, stairs, poles? Is it for beam and scaffolding work? So all of those are different types of balance and require different levels of balance. And then surface conditions, if you're climbing a ladder and that ladder is wet versus dry, if there's ice on it, ice or snow on it, if there's oil on it, that changes the level of balance that's required. So those can all be work conditions that would affect the level of balance required.

The scales for hand function again include the duration, the repetition, the cycle time, the grip strength required. Is it whole hand versus individual finger motion? Is it one handed versus two handed? And what level of dexterity, coordination or speed is required?

And then again going back to the fact that you can have combined postures versus individual joints further complicates the issue. And frequently SSA has raised the issue about ability to change postures and positions during work. If this person for example has to sit for driving long distances, what's the possibility for pausing and altering that position? If they're working at a computer work station, is there opportunity for rest breaks and how much flexibility is there within the work schedule for that?

And then one of the challenges with making these determinations or utilizing these skills accurately is when the job analyst goes on site to make these observations they're observing things that happen simultaneously. So you've got a whole body position typically while you've got things happening with the arms, and there's a variety of things can be happening with each arm movement. A variety of hand motions can occur.

And so one of the things that I've had some experience with in training job analysts is teaching them not only what scales to look at, but how to assess things that are occurring simultaneously and giving them a structured process for doing that, that simultaneous assessment piece. So I think that's an important piece to recognize as we think about any kind of observation methodologies and the scales that will be used.

And then one of the things that becomes important to employers is correlating what I've been talking about are these physical demands, correlating them to the tasks. And this gets a little bit away from the scaling piece, but I think it's important to think about particularly as we heard folks this morning discussing the fact that, you know, what kind of incentive does an employer have for allowing SSA to come in and do an in-depth job analysis that will certainly distract their employees from their main work activities and create some inefficiencies in their system.

And I think possibly the answer to that question could lie in the fact that if the employer gets a very useful functional job description as a result of participating in SSA's research then that might be an incentive piece that could drive employer participation. And one of the things that employers want to know are not only what are the physical demands and are they scaled in ways that are meaningful to me as an employer. So if the person has to lift 60 pounds from the floor up to 50 inches, where does that occur, what task is that, what part of the job is that correlated to? You know, if we're talking about let's say a housekeeping position, is that correlated with wet mopping the floor or does that occur when they have to clean the patient rooms after discharge? And so those are the kinds of things that become maybe not so important to Social Security Administration, but just thinking globally about how employers will perceive this project and is this useful information for them, it might be worth considering?

And then, you know, just the whole idea of how much detail we provide, and we've had numerous discussions about that as a panel. It really boils down to, you know, balancing that level of detail versus the feasibility of data collection and what does SSA really need in order to make its decision process? And I think SSA is doing some very important work currently that helps identify what it is they need in order to make good decisions. So I think that will be something that drives the decision making process and that will help SSA make these determinations.

Just to give you some examples of what's in; and most of us in this room are very familiar with, the current DOT manual materials handling, it's classified according to a range of weights lifted in a given category ranging from sedentary to very heavy and how often or what part of the day the person is handling that weight. And then the non-materials handling demands are typically focused on what percent of the day that activity is performed.

So again, this is not saying that we recommend that SSA continue to use this scaling. It's just here's what we're doing, here's what's being done currently. In the dexterity and coordination area there's a rating system, an ordinal rating system that's based on analysts' expectation of what the population could do. Strength is currently not addressed in the DOT, and keyboarding is not addressed. So those have been two big areas that I think we've heard from SSA in the past that were important for assessing hand function given our current work environments.

And then the handout that Shanan had prepared, I'll let her speak to this in a minute, because I think she's got some insight into the different types of items. And again, the whole idea is the type of item and how it's defined is going to drive the scaling to a great extent. And so that one of the things that we all agree on universally is that we need to classify and scale the variables that we are measuring or that SSA is measuring in job analysis has to be cross-job relative. In other words, you know, you have to be able to combine job A and job B and job C to get a profile of the occupation as a whole. So it's very important to create scales and define the scales in ways that data can be combined.

So I can turn it over now either to Shanan and let you go ahead since the slide is up and make some comments, and then we can move it onto Juan, if you'd like.

MEMBER GIBSON: My comments will be very brief. When I put this together I was really just trying to think back to what I had told David I would speak to when he asked his question about the scaling issues that we were likely to encounter as we moved forward to the last minute. And this actually hearkens back for people on the panel to put -- a lot of this was covered in our educational session yesterday, so I'd actually put this together before that.

But I just want to point out something that's interesting to me because we've had this discussion before. Flipping back through Deb's slides to the current DOT MMH scalings; slide No 13, Deb, one of the things we've talked a lot about or what we talked about in our within-panel training yesterday was that the nature of scales is either being cross-job relative and absolute or within-job relative and only applicable to said job. And sometimes people ask about, well, why -- we don't get it much, but why not the DOT, or what are some of the issues with the DOT and the scales there, or the scales in any existing, pre-existing work analysis instrument?

And I think this is a very good example. When you look at their scaling here what they've done is they've taken and created a compound scale that includes absolute items in terms of weight and crossed it with a within- job relative scale of frequency thereby basically making the scale within-job relative only. Because although we are interested in the weight and the weights are absolute, when you ask someone what percentage of their time is spent, they've changed the nature of the scale and how it can be used completely through creating this complex measure, or this compound measure. And you see this in a lot of places.

So it's very important that as we move forward one of the things we think about is consistently -- you know, we're very comfortable with the occasional, frequent, constant because that's what people have been using, but when it's done this way instead of in terms of absolute minutes or hours, we compromise the degree to which this allows us to make cross-job comparisons, and I think that's problematic. The duration scaling is inherently -- I was sitting here trying to decide the next slide, on the duration is that a relative or is that a within -- or is it cross-job relative? And I thought, well, depends on what your day is.

Is two-thirds to the full day meaning six to eight hours of a day? And if it's six to eight hours, then that's absolute. But again you have to make certain when you're utilizing an instrument that whoever is administering the instrument or completing the instrument very much understands the definition of the terminology, which kind of goes back to one of the reasons many of us have conceived for a very long time that we'll probably have to use analysts for whatever instrument is developed because incumbents may literally interpret this as two-thirds of their day and their day may only be a four-hour working day, or they may have two part-time jobs. And so the training and the definitional issues in scaling are going to be very important as well.

So those two slides just to me helped illustrate some of the things we have to be thinking about or SSA has to be thinking about and we think about as we make recommendations and give them advice.

The two slides that Deb inserted for mine were really just designed to help us once again think about by providing examples. I broke it down into first types of items and then types of scales.

So this first one just refers to types of items and just to make certain we all understood the language. You know, the cross-job relative items were those that can apply to any job as opposed to within job relative or job specific, company specific. I use the word "task" there, but as I've said before, task can be company specific or they can be broader. So when I give the definition of cross-job relative, I said general work activities designed to apply to many jobs.

If you have the other handout, my longer handout, which was the ugly one; I don't know why they actually handed it around, but you'll see that what I actually put was work activities or task inventory items. Because when people create task inventory-type work analysis instruments they are inherently writing items that are designed to be cross-job relative. So there are organizationally specific tasks and then there are broader tasks. Again, that level of abstraction matters. And I know all of those words wouldn't fit on this slide, so that's why they're not there.

And then I've just given some examples. Another type of example there within the types of items are context items.

And that column didn't fit either, so if you have the other handout, the two pages stapled together that are plain white paper, context items; exposure to heat, cold in or outdoors, those are types of things which are also cross-job relative items, which makes sense for what we know about disability adjudication at this time.

The next slide talks about scales. And once again, I was just trying to reinforce and give people examples, because we sometimes struggle with this. So cross-job relative being those absolute frequencies, the weights, the types of things that Deb talked about earlier versus the within which only pertain to the person who's completing this job or the job of question. And there is another type of scale that we haven't talked about and we probably won't, but you know, there are also qualitative scales out there which produce no numerical ratings. There's no scale. There's no one to five. It's just a job description or a list of job components, a simple list of tasks. So this was just designed to give us as a panel and external people who are listening in and want to see an understanding of the language we're using when we talk about scaling issues.

MEMBER LECHNER: Thanks, Shanan. And I want to just add a caveat to the current process that's used out in the field in terms of the percent of the utilization of the percent of the day or the portion of the day is that as -- using this out in the field we do quantify what the full day is, so then it then is translatable to an absolute time. And the challenge with some of the scaling that's used in the current DOT that I think all of us have faced is that while it provided some degree of operational definitions of some pieces, it also left out operational definitions of some pieces so that within the written documentation there were not absolute times that were tied to what is a full work day?

I communicated to some of the field job analysts and generically I was told that they assumed that the work day was an eight-hour day when they made these ratings. But this whole issue really speaks to the fact that however SSA decides to do it that the operational definitions of all the terms be very thorough and as quantitative as possible and still allow that cross-job comparison. So I think that just sort of speaks to the part of the challenges and implementing any system of job analysis across a variety of analysts and across a variety of occupations is that everybody has to speak the same language and use the same terminology in order to get meaningful consistent data.

Juan, you want to speak a little bit to the cognitive issues and the behavioral issues?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: I feel that my role was exhausted yesterday when we had our discussion basic building blocks of job analysis. And yesterday I was left with a feeling that the panel wanted time to discuss many of these issues, so I think it will be better -- probably time will be better employed if we just open up the floor.

MEMBER LECHNER: Okay. All right. So, Mary, as long as you agree we can open up the floor for some discission.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Sure, let's go ahead and open it up. And I saw Dave pull up his chair, so I think that marks a question coming.

Go ahead, Dave.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: And you would be right. I actually have a few questions, Deb, and some of them are not entirely -- they're not well formed, so please bear with me as I might be sort of struggling to put them into words.

But if you look at the preceding slide, the manual materials handling demands, you can see that these -- whether they're relative, as Shanan was pointing out, or you could turn those frequency of course into absolute, you know, by number of hours, or as you pointed out, a percentage divided by the denominator of the number of hours spent; we'll give you that, but I guess in some ways I guess one question is how did they get this? How did they get these numbers? And did they look at the world of work and look at how heavy items were distributed across jobs? Was it arbitrary? Do you know if anyone has ever looked at the sort of world of work and looked at what proportion of jobs in the national economy?

If you were to turn that into a little matrix and just say what percentage of jobs fill each of those cells; the one, two, three, four, five down and three across, you know what I'm saying? If you will, are we carving nature at the joints, or are there empty cells, or essentially empty cells here and does it make sense from a scaling perspective to use this sort of a priori sense of, well, more than 100 pounds, more than 50 pounds, more than 20 pounds, or does it make more sense if we're going to develop an OIS to have those cut points be defined somehow empirically by what's out there in the world of work, or matching more closely what people's abilities are? In other words, maybe you have to know whether someone can lift 50 pounds or more, period. And beyond that it doesn't really matter whether they can lift 150 pounds or 75 pounds or 51 pounds. They can do it or they can't, almost.

So what I'm trying to get at is sort of it's a peculiar question, but I'm wondering about what is the most sensible way to partition the range of physical demands of jobs?

MEMBER LECHNER: I think the good news and the bad news is that, yes, there are some jobs in each of those categories, and I know that there have been studies done about what percent of the current occupations or the occupations that are defined in the DOT, what percent of them occur at every level. And I don't know if Jeff can share that information. He's got that information on a little card. And if I remember correctly, Jeff, most of the jobs fall in the light to medium level.

Yes, about 60 percent of them fall in either the light or medium level. And to answer your question about how those categories were developed, I absolutely think it was, you know, an arbitrary let's set these are categories.

And your point about like when you get down to an n of one and can that person return to a specific job, then it doesn't matter whether, you know, what category you fall in so much as the job requires 53 pounds and you can only do 48. But when you're trying to develop an occupational classification system, then if you don't group things a bit, it's hard to combine, you know, multiple jobs into one occupational description.

So if you have the same job that you're trying to say -- let's say there's 10 jobs that you've analyzed and they're in one occupation. If you have to create a separate category for every single pound, then it becomes a little bit more challenging, particularly when the n of one gets compared to can you return to this occupation, or can you return to any occupation? Then you're trying to match that one person up to a bunch of jobs.

So, you know, I think there probably needs to be some sort of classification system of ranges, and we've had often had people in the field complain, well, you know, medium category from 21 to 50 pounds, that's huge. The category's too broad. We need more narrow categories. And then there probably could be some arguments on the other side of the fence. We need fewer categories. But I do think it probably becomes important to have some kind of categories based on the need to be cross- job and combining information from jobs into one occupational description. That's kind of my gut feeling.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: I believe that these numbers and these categories are in the regulations. So if SSA wants to do something different in the OIS, they're going to have to modify the regulation to match, and SSA got them out of the DOT back when they published these in the late 1970s.

MEMBER LECHNER: And, you know, that's a piece that I think would be really helpful for the panel as we think about appropriate scaling and as we make recommendations. I'm aware of some of the things that are in the rules and regulations, but I am not personally aware of every rule and regulation within SSA that is then tied to the current DOT. And I think that it would be perhaps helpful at some point if we as a panel could hear a presentation from someone within SSA to say these are the things that are linked and how easy or difficult is it to change, because I think that would help to inform us and to guide us as we look at scaling.

MEMBER HARDY: I believe we did a couple meetings back have a presentation; I think it was Debra or someone, about what pieces in the regs came from the DOT.

Am I correct, Mary? I think that happened awhile ago though. Or was it Sylvia?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think if we had that, it was probably at the inaugural meeting where they talk about -- we'd have to go back and look at those PowerPoints on the agenda for the inaugural meeting when a lot of that was discussed.

Shanan?

MEMBER GIBSON: All right. So I'm

going to ask a question based off of my ignorance and going along with what Deb just was talking about and what you said, Andrew.

Does the regulation actually have these numbers or does the regulation simply refer to things as sedentary, light, medium and the like? Because if the numbers are there, that's a little -- actually the weights are being -- there's not a problem at all. Those numbers aren't problematic. But if it's the occasional, frequent and constant and it's within scale, if that is there, that's more of a problem. But if they use sedentary, light and medium, the definition of those changing isn't a problem because we're not adjusting the words.

And if it is the case that it actually requires us to refer to both those scales, I know we can't change policy and I understand that, but I can't imagine that any organization would want to rely on existing definitions which are inherently flawed if they have the opportunity to update those definitions with more absolute data that has better psychometric properties at some point.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: That's a sales question rather than a legal question. But you're right. I think those numbers are in there.

MEMBER KEY: I think at least on the RFC; and Andy and Tom can correct me, they're on the first page.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: I think in definitions, actually. I think they proceed the grid charts. Been a few years, but yes.

MEMBER HARDY: It's in the grids for sure. The definitions of sedentary, light, medium and heavy are in the grids. I know that. And I'm digging through regs; but it'll take me a little bit, but I believe they're in the regs, too. But again, we're supposed to be creating something neutral of policy and creating the best thing and then our product may at some point be integrated in the policy. But that's not one of our concerns at this time. We're to create the best measurement. Policy is not our issue.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: That's something that would be flexible enough to change over time but meet current standards.

Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, I guess along the lines of David's comment about the empirical soundness of these anchors, these scales. I'm pretty sure they were arbitrarily set because 100 pounds is a very round number. You know, had they done this in Europe, they would have said, I don't know, 50 kilos. So the lack of decimal points leads me to think that this is an arbitrary anchor.

But what I was thinking is that, you know, I keep referring to let's take a look at the claims, let's take a look at what happens on the people side, because I think when we look at claims we might see that for some of the second, the medium interval from

21 to 50 pounds, that seems to me a much wider range from a qualitative point of view than for example the light range that is only from 11 to 20 pounds. Because, you know, there may be people who could life 25 pounds but not 45, and it's a very significant difference. So I wonder if an examination of the claims filed from accounting point of view might give you an idea of where do these cut offs need to be?

And something perhaps more important, if we mess with this, right, what would be the economic consequences? If we redefine medium as 25 to 35, what's the dollar and cents cost, because I think they might be one.

MEMBER LECHNER: I think you raise some really good points, Juan. I think one of the challenges with looking at the existing SSA data and claims and trying to get at the answer that you're asking for is that the claimants have abilities and their RFCs have been classified according to these categories.

And so typically SSA is not testing these claimants to see what they can do. They're having a physician fill out a form that says I believe their abilities fall into this category. Check. So I'm not sure we'll have the answer to the questions you're looking for by looking at SSA data.

The other comment that I'd like to make; I know that a variety of our discussions over the past couple of days have alluded to the fact that we're developing something specific for SSA claimants, but the reality is that the current DOT classification system is widely used by not only Social Security Disability claimants, but private disability claimants and the work comp system. So if something is developed that's not useable for those fields, it could ultimately affect the number of claimants that land at the door of SSA.

And so I think, you know, when we look at the societal value of the taxpayers' dollar, yes, we want to make sure that the system is applicable to SSA, but we also need to be keenly aware of how this could be used in the broader economy by the employers that are a very big player in collecting this data, by the other insurance carrier systems that will be using this data. If they cannot use this data or use this classification system, the implications will be huge.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think, Shanan, did you have a question?

And Dave looked like he had a question. Okay.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Can we go down one more slide then to the duration scaling, because I'm virtually certain I was not clear with my question now.

If you look at this, what it partitions the duration into is jobs that don't require it at all and then the rest of the universe is up to one-third, one-third to two-third, and greater than two-thirds. It's just an even split of the rest. And while that may be a good representation of the duration of activities in the world of work, it's not clear to me how that maps on to people. And we've often talked about the importance of bridging residual functional capacity with the demands of work and I wonder if at the outset, at the front end of developing an OIS Social Security should be thinking about whether things like this scaling should be tied more closely to the way people's abilities or residual abilities are distributed in the universe of people, of potential workers.

So in other words, maybe constantly, which is two-thirds of a day to a full day, combines work that has very different significance in terms of the ability of people to perform it. If a job requires you to do something two- thirds of the day or six hours out of the day, many people could do it, but if it requires it eight hours of the day, far fewer people could do it. Do you see what I'm saying?

In other words, maybe even a little bit of relief would help some patients. You used an example of if someone is sitting, it's a sitting job, but they need to occasionally stand up and walk around. Does the job permit that? And if it does, that might be a hugely significant difference. So the difference between a job that requires one to sit eight hours out of an eight-hour shift or seven hours-and-a-half out of an eight-hour shift might be very significantly different. Do you see what I'm getting at?

In other words, that is partitioning duration into parts of a day, but I'm wondering if it would make more sense to partition it in some other way that ties more closely to the way tolerances or capacities are distributed in the population of healthy people, and more importantly in the population of people with impairments so that maybe the whole thing could be captured between not required, rarely required, required anywhere from an hour to seven hours a day, and then required more than seven hours. You see what I'm getting at? And I'm just raising it as a question, because this is again not my area, but I'm wondering if it makes sense to think about some of the job demand characteristics in the context of what we know about people who work in those jobs or are applying for benefits because they say they can't work in those jobs.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: We have Bob and then Shanan and then Deb.

MEMBER FRASER: This one has always kind of stymied me because, you know, for one thing all the other scales are pretty much five- point anchor scales and for some reason this is three.

And the second one is, you know, looking at so many jobs. For example, security system installation, okay? The amount of time actually setting up the computer, you know, the final thing you do, is, you know, maybe five percent of the week. Rest of it you're pulling wires, you know? Or an attorney who actually goes to court, you know? May go to court every eight weeks, you know, and yet in terms of criticality that court presentation is used.

So I think the whole context has to be reframed as to, you know, a week or a month or something like that. And then it has to be more discreet than that because, you know, up to a third is 13 hours a week and, you know, and is such a big range there. It makes no sense.

MEMBER GIBSON: I was going to say that when I was putting together the activities we did in the past where we put together the sample job analytic activities and when I've done it for other things, I defaulted to an hourly scale, a more discreet scale, because duration to me, I thought of it in terms of hours.

And you talk about things being arbitrary, Juan? The fact that they took 8 hours and divided by 3, or 40 hours and divided it by 3, you know that's arbitrary because it's not an even number and we don't do multiplication that way; we just don't, and division. So that throws me off to begin with. So if they say six hours or six to eight for a third, well that's really not a third, you know?

One of the things that concerns me though in terms of what I'm understanding David to say is that it would require us -- and at least how I perceive what you're saying is that for any given activity, to look at what is the typical capabilities or inabilities of individuals, which means we could end up with a whole lot of different scales. Whereas, if we were to at least go to a more discreet -- even if it's just hourly, at least whoever is administering and completing an instrument would have the continuity of knowing what the categories are so that for each item -- I mean, the reason people who've been doing this for years like constantly, frequently and occasionally is that's what they know. That's what they've always done. So within an instrument I think the scales need to be as consistent as possible. So whether do that by becoming more discreet or not, you know, that's to be discussed, but I don't think -- for me it seems viable to look at each activity and figure out what makes sense for it and create a scale specific to that, because it would create confusion in the process, if I understand what you're recommending correctly.

MR. LECHNER: And I heard what David's saying just a little differently in terms of what -- I thought you were asking what occurs most frequently in jobs rather than what people can do. Is that --

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: I was actually

thinking about both, because in some ways the scaling that we're seeing here, the DOT scaling, seems arbitrary, and it seems arbitrary both in terms of the distribution of demands in the world of work. But it also doesn't seem to correspond in any obvious way to the distribution of abilities among people who do those job.

MEMBER LECHNER: And I want to clarify that at least based on my own experience in listening to feedback from the professionals that I teach nobody likes the scales. So let's just get that out on the table. No offense to the folks that did the DOT, but you know, I think the complaints that I hear, the two biggest complaints I hear about the scale is that it's way too broad. You know, there's so much difference between a third of the day and two-thirds of the day, or you know, literally occasional is anywhere from one percent; does it occur at all, up to a third of a day. They're huge. You know, some people can do things rarely, but they can't do it up to the full occasional. So you're forced to classify people in either occasional or never. And so I hear that complaint.

The other thing that I alluded to in my presentation was this idea of maximum continuous duration, because this scale can be interpreted -- and I've had several discussions with folks when they had the field -- I'm dating myself, but when the field job analysts were still around, I had several discussions with them about does that mean continuous? And they were like it's defined the way it's defined. We can't further define it any better. And so literally it can mean either up to a third of a day continuously or it can mean up to a third of the day intermittently, all added up together. So there's that ambiguity that's related to that scale that's created a lot of problems for job analysts and interpreting claimant abilities versus job requirements.

I think it was very much arbitrary that they set those parameters. And I've forgotten now what the rest of your question was, but I do think there are significant problems with having this set up this way that need to be addressed by any scaling system that SSA puts out there. Certainly duration is an issue. But the other issue becomes this whole thing that you alluded to with the sit versus stand and the cycle time and how much of a rest break, and is there enough rest break for recovery, because physiologically that's what creates the fatigue. And, you know, you have to be careful again not to get too detailed, too technical, but all of those pieces are important.

And, you know, you asked the question did they look at how things are distributed? If you go out and do job analysis and you strictly apply these definitions, most everything of the non-material handling, and even the materials handling -- most of it is all going to fall in that occasional category. The only things that typically fall into frequent or constant are sitting, standing and walking. If you literally apply these definitions to the world of work and you get out there and you do job analysis and you're very objective about the time actually spent in the various positions like stooping, kneeling, squatting, crouching, the things that are the extreme postures never occur constantly because the human body can't do that constantly.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Okay. So that's perfect, you know, because first of all, in the manual materials handling there is precedent if you look at the weights of unequal categories, right? So there's like 1 to 10 pounds. That includes a nine-pound range. Eleven to twenty is nine pounds. Twenty-one to fifty is obviously much more, and so on. So they're not equally distributed. And then, you know, the next slide of course time is sort of broken up into these equal one-third -- the duration is broken up into equal units. But what you just said is very interesting. I wonder if it would make more sense to consider altering that scaling so that there's never and then, you know, less than one hour per day of something and then two to seven-and-a-half hours, and then constant. Do you see what I'm saying?

I'm not suggesting those as cut points, but I'm trying to make the point that it might be a more natural way of looking at -- the way abilities are distributed is either you can -- there's gradations of not being able to do it at all, and then in the middle there's a whole wide zone where if you can basically do that, you can do it for most of the day, but you might not be able to do it for the entire day, something like that. I'm just wondering if a modern OIS might think about the distribution of these things slightly differently.

MEMBER LECHNER: And when you get down into the decisions that SSA makes, you know, at step five at least it's driven by this ability to do sedentary-level work, which means that you're not kneeling and squatting and, you know, the big issues becomes sit, stand and walk. So that's another piece that I think kind of has to be taken into account with this whole situation.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: So maybe what's needed is a much further specification of what we now lump all together under sedentary. Maybe, you know, something like that, sort of a finer grained discrimination of jobs at various ends of the distribution and a much bulkier or coarser lumping of job demands in the middle or something.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Well, you know, there are entire books written on scale development and principles such as the scale needs to be comprehensive, the scale points need to be mutually exclusive, the scale needs to be consistent pretty much, and most importantly on this double-barreled one that you were pointing out, you know, they need to be unambiguous because you have more than one folded in.

You know, the task before us is to work from a taxonomy and constructs and develop an instrument that has items and scales, so let's go back to that for a second. In your presentation there are two parts for me. One is for this whole area of physical demands what are the items or the scales -- no, the items that go into the constructs, and then what scaling would be appropriate? And you really have both of those dimensions running in this PowerPoint slide presentation.

So let's take the first one: Constructs. You've shown how complex this is with a lot of different components. Do you have a recommendation as to what level of detail to go into in terms of the construct on physical demands that might appear in the taxonomy?

MEMBER LECHNER: Putting me on the spot, John. I think, you know, to answer that question varies by the category. You know, what would I recommend, for example, in the materials handling? I definitely think you've got to have some component of, you know, absolute measure of force, but I don't feel prepared to make a recommendation about where I think those ranges should fall. You know, and sometimes I ask myself the question does it really matter where we set the ranges as much as it -- you know, when you're compiling data from a variety of jobs, we've got to have a range that's broad enough to allow combinations, but not so broad that it's not meaningful. And where that magical cut point is, I'm not really sure.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I think we have two people. Tom and Abigail. Did you

-- oh, okay. Oh. Oh, sorry. John and then Tom and then Abigail.

MEMBER CRESWELL: So we need to take a stand and try it out and see how it works in pilot.

I do have one little thing, Shanan, with your list here on your last couple slides. On the qualitative one I could see where a job description might have in it something like heavy that could be assigned a numeric value. So we call this data transformation. You know, transforming qualitative data into quantitative indicators. And so, those job descriptions might be useful in compiling a profile of the physical demands of a job, don't you think?

MEMBER GIBSON: My personal experience with job descriptions is that they are as useful as the data which was utilized to craft them and that many times when I work with an organization and I say let me see your job descriptions and they pull out a narrative job description, basically what they've done is they had the last person who held the job, who's getting ready to leave and go somewhere else -- say you need to write a job description so the next person we hire knows what to do. And they might write a very good job description; they may write a very poor job description, but usually there's very little analysis that goes into it and sometimes very little thought processes either.

So when I go into larger organizations with more structured human resources functions, typically they have a job description which might include things such as having categorized the job according to the government standards of sedentary, light, etcetera. So that does exist in some cases, but it tends to exist in the larger organizations with more structured human resources functions in general. But to just take the average narrative job description that I find in your average company, I think you'd have a very hard time quantifying it with any degree of accuracy, at least just going by the job description itself without going in too and perhaps doing some interviews and interfacing with the people who actually hold the job.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Tom and then Abigail?

MEMBER HARDY: I'm kind of circling back to your original question. It took me a few minutes to look up a couple things. But, for example, the Code of Federal Regulations, subchapter 404.1567, "Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met." That is the definition. And everything in here is again defined in the CFR somewhere else.

Another answer to your question. In the grids. They're called the grids. I don't know if everybody's familiar with those, but the grids. 201, "Maximum sustained work capability limited to sedentary. Most sedentary occupations fall within the skilled to semi-skilled, professional, administrative, technical, clerical and bench work classifications. Approximately 200 separate unskilled sedentary occupations can be identified each representing numerous jobs in the national economy." And it goes on. And I've got a whole bunch of other cites, if you want it.

But what happens is we can talk about all these scaling issues, but what -- and I can't speak for the administration obviously, but what needs to be done is there has to be a level at some point wherein you have a scale big enough that you can kind of work within what we now have, which is called the grids, and the grids are used for making determinations of disability or not based on age, exertional level and skill level. So they've taken all that DOT information, boiled it down to basically three things. And then you get plopped in the grid and a decision's made. Maybe I'm defining it wrong, but that's how it looks from my side. But that's also a reality that Social Security has to work under. And, you know, again we're doing reg neutral and all that stuff, but all of this is there.

And the final piece I wanted to bring up. I knew I knew this. We did in fact go back and pull up every reg and match it. And we did it in Ralph. It's under appendix G. Every relevant SSA regulation as it fits to the RFC form. So it is there for us to go back. The work is done. It's under G in

Ralph.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I have to explain Ralph. Sorry. For the new panel members, that's the 750-page report we issued two years ago. We got to call it Ralph because he became a member of the family.

And just as you were reading the description of "sedentary" in CFR, it's a composite. So you're not talking just about weight. You're talking about positions there as well and all of that is thrown into the same scale. And so was "light," because that includes upper extremity movement in "light" that is not included in others. So they're different composites.

Okay. Other questions? Abigail? Sorry.

MEMBER PANTER: Thanks. I enjoy speaking about measurement and scaling and I've enjoyed this presentation very much, so thanks.

But here's why scaling issues are

so important for all of us. There's a significant cost efficiency and there's increased accuracy that's associated with our using response formats that do not discriminate too much when they shouldn't be discriminating and do discriminate when they should. And it sounds obvious, but when there's a huge backlog related to how do we fit people into a particular category there's a problem with the response format. And when certain categories can be combined easily and always are, that is an inefficiency that we can get around at this point. So there is a lot of time savings and cost savings that will be in the future if we can solve these problems.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, this is going back to what Tom said and a theme that has been coming up. I guess we might be trying to kill a fly with a gun in the sense that, you know, we like to be precise, right? You know, my training's in psychology measurement, so we like to be very precise. But when you look at the manner in which adjudications decisions are made, I don't think they are made with the level of precision that we pretend they have. You know, all the DOT data is compiled in three factors and they go to these grids, and then a very clinical -- I mean, you know, I apologize for using the term, but it seems to me that it's a very clinical decision that takes a lot of things into account. So the fact that our anchors go from 20 to 50, or perhaps from 20 to 40, perhaps it doesn't really matter that much in the overall picture and perhaps we don't need to make an investment to ensure that precision because it's not really needed.

You know, I have the O*NET anchors here in front of me, and they don't pretend to be that precise. They are more of the -- some of the other formats that you have in there. They will say how much time you spend bending or twisting the body; and I guess Pam is here. Less than half the time is one. Or never is one. Two is less than half the time. Three is about half the time. So, you know, I agree that it'll be nice to have very precise anchors that reflect the world of work, or like I was thinking perhaps that reflect what goes on among the claims, or from a physiological point of view, anchors that correlated with disabilities. But perhaps we just don't need that. So it's just a thought.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

MEMBER HARDY: In true lawyer fashion I'm going to argue back with you and myself. We are trying to kill a fly with a cannon, really, because in essence what you need to adjudicate a claim sometimes is can a person do sedentary, light or medium? Have they been to high school or not? Can they read? What kind of job did you have before? These are all the bases for either a Social Security, a workers' comp, an LTD. We're looking kind of at the same things. What have you got? What can you do? And I don't care what your finger dexterity is at this moment. Can you get yourself to a place where you can sit and do something for eight hours? That's fine.

When you're looking at the life of a claim going through the system, decisions are made at different levels of specificity. And so, yes, in the beginning if you can't get up, get to work and sit in a chair for eight hours and you can't read, we're okay. That's all we need to know. But the further you dig through these claims and the farther you go in the process, the more detailed the information does end up getting until finally I am worried about my surgeon who cut off the tips of his index and middle finger.

So we do and we don't. We need the scales, but it's when and where and how are we best benefitting the biggest amount and where do we want to again maximize and do it, because we keep talking about let's go at those first 100 jobs. Well, those 100 jobs are all falling in those kind of broad categories, but we will still at some point need to get to these very detailed things, too. So it's a yes and no, is what I'm trying to say, I guess, if that makes any sense.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Pam?

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Can I also clarify something? I did understand that we're supposed to be working within existing legislation, but are we also supposed to be working within the existing regulations, because they're very specific. I mean, you might not even be able to redefine some things if that's the case.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan, did you want to address that? I could address it, but go ahead.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. It is my understanding we could ask Sylvia when she comes up for the beginning of the deliberation that we are supposed to help with advice and recommendations to develop a system that at least meets the current system but is flexible enough for changes in the future. We're in a specific point in time and how long has the DOT been used within SSA? If we project out that length of time, a lot of us might not be in this world by then, you know, in this room. And so I think we have to think about it in terms of flexibility as well.

Shanan?

MEMBER GIBSON: I was just going to say that from my perspective I try not to think in terms -- and maybe this is distinctive from other panel members and if I don't speak for you, that's fine -- in terms of what we have to develop as being constrained by the current rules and regulations, because if we are truly constrained by them, then we might as well just redo the DOT and go home. There's nothing to be done if we are fully constrained by current rules and regulations because they are DOT based. So there has to be flexibility in what we're promoting here so that maybe we create a system that then allows -- the system has different types of numbers and they can use it or they can change, but I can't say we're constrained by the DOT because then we can't do anything.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. We've talked about this quite a bit and it looks like we are maybe done for today on this issue. Was there anything else that was burning for anybody on this topic before I move on to the deliberation?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you, Deb and Shanan and Juan, for your input into this, and I know we'll have a lot more discussions on this.

And I'm going to go ahead and move us into deliberation, and then from there we'll go to the end of our meeting.

And when Sylvia was on the panel, it was really easy to ask her a question on some of these issues. And now that she's no longer on the panel, we've gotten to the point at the last meeting, and I've asked her that at the beginning of each deliberation if she would come to, you know, maybe clarify some things that she heard, or if there are questions that we have specific to that such as Pam's question that she might be able to clarify, or anything that we would like to speak with her about before we go into deliberations.

So, Sylvia?

MS. KARMAN: Yes?

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead. I'll kind of open it up to you and see if there were topics or questions or anything that you heard in terms of what we were talking about, particular questions that you wanted to address, particularly Pam's question.

MS. KARMAN: Okay. So good question, and I think this is a good opportunity for Social Security to explain how it is that we perceive what we're doing in light of the rules that we operate under currently.

And the way we can understand this is very much what I heard Shanan articulate, which is no matter how the agency would like to use the data that we gather, it helps us to gather in a way that is I guess, you know, deconstructed, decomposed. So if we were to gather information about, you know, how long somebody needs to stand or walk or sit, or how much they're lifting and how frequently, I think we need to be mindful of gathering that information as it occurs in that particular assessment for that position for that given occupation and then return the information to the Social Security Administration. And SSA can certainly roll that data up and serve it up that way, if that is how they wish to do that, if they want to continue to do that.

So then they can say, okay, these jobs or this particular occupation fits into that category as described and therefore is considered light or medium or whatever based on the definitions that are in the regs. But that does not mean our instrument necessarily has to show those scales. I don't see why we would even want to do that, because that would really limit -- as Shanan pointed out, we may as well just all pack up and go home and just -- well, we'll just recreate the DOT, not on the DOT, but the DOT as it was in 1991. So, you know, I think that's my assessment of what I was just hearing.

But it looks like, Pam, you may have another question.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: When Tom read that one regulation that says approximately 200 separate unskilled sedentary occupations can be identified, I mean, what if when we do our research we no longer identify that and it's in a reg, you know? I didn't realize it went to that level of --

MS. KARMAN: Again, one of the things that I think of, okay; and again this is now my opinion, it would not prevent an adjudicator from making a decision if it turned out that there were 2,701 that fit into that category, I mean, you know, or there were 2,699, you know? So the point being to me if we are providing the data that the agency needs in order to adjudicate its claims, under our rules, given what we must do to assess the individual's medical evidence, their vocational history. Like Tom suggested, there are other factors of course that go into that; education, age. So I think that a literal reading of, well, could you say that there are 2,700, I mean, honestly I think if you did that sort right now with the DOT, you probably would find that there weren't 2,700 or whatever in certain categories. So I'm just thinking that if we were to be delivering something that would prevent the adjudicator from doing their work as it's stated under the regs then I think we could have a problem.

So it's not so much that our data have to meet the regs. Our data need to allow the agency to conduct its business as currently stated; and, yes, that's a really difficult position to be in, but that kind of is where we need to be only because it does -- we do need -- as the agency would need to be able to, you know, go through their whole administrative procedures and process to change its regulations at some point, if it decided it needed to do that. And change it to what?

So it would probably be helpful if we already had some data that we could say, well, you know, here there are sedentary jobs. And as they're defined, given that we've gathered information about, you know, the exertional requirements of work, even if we deconstruct them and say, okay, we have measures for standing, we have measures for sitting, we have measures for lifting, when you put them all together the way it's described in the former DOT and now in the regs you would consider this to be sedentary. So if that is the direction that the agency would want to go, I think we would just be able to provide data that could substantiate what they need to do.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Well, if I understood the regulation that Tom read correctly, it was defining sedentary. But also bootlegged into the definition was a reference to there being 200 jobs, and you can't regulate how many jobs there of a certain kind in the economy. You know, I mean, if at the end of the day we find out that there are only 30 jobs, but in fact they're everywhere, you know, there's only 30 of them but they're in every state in every community, that's the reality of the world of work and the only way to get it up to 200 is to raise the limit for what defines sedentary to up to 50 pounds. We'll call that sedentary now.

MS. KARMAN: Also one of the things that we understand is that, you know, the way in which that was reflected was taken from the "Dictionary of Occupation Titles'" definition. SSA brought that in. And I think to give the public an understanding for what the comparison point would be, not so much as in the sense of, okay, literally, you know, you have to be able to cite a job for which there are, you know, this many representations or incidents throughout the United States. I think the idea was that we not be citing work at step 5 where we need to meet our burden, where in fact the work may be, you know, more difficult to find.

I think it was an effort for the agency to try to say to the public we will cite things that are realistic that you can expect that it exists. Like you said, even if there are only like 30 occupations but there's literally hundreds of thousands of them throughout the country, I think the way our regulations are written is to reflect that that is how we see that, you know, that each of these occupations could reflect, you know, many, many jobs throughout the economy. So I don't think it was meant to be literal anyway.

But that's my saying that. I'm not speaking for, you know, our policy component, but that's my understanding.

MEMBER LECHNER: And I think that's really helpful, Sylvia, to clarify that, because I think as we develop our scales for the different variables that are going to be analyzed, it's important for us to think about reporting in ways that then can be translated. So for example, if we're measuring exertional activities and we report our data in terms of minimal, moderate and severe instead of it requires this amount of force or this amount of weight, then minimal, moderate, severe, unless it's then anchored back to forces and weights, are not going to be translatable to the current guidelines. So I think as we make recommendations about scaling, we need to kind of keep those things in mind. So I think that your directive was very helpful.

MS. KARMAN: I just had one other thing that came to mind, Debra, when you were mentioning, you know, that ability to translate. And, you know, whatever anchors we use, whatever scales and measures that we come up with, I mean, there are a number of things in the world of work that are directly observable. There are a number of things that are not directly observable. And, you know, where possible, given the amount of time that we could afford to spend with a particular employer entity and, you know, have a job analyst observing it or however it is that we end up doing this, that we want to make use of that time as best as possible.

So when there is something that you can actually observe and measure, it seems to me we'd want to be able to do that to the best of our ability, you know, given the need to be judicious with time and judicious with expenditure. So you want to get, you know, the bang for the buck. And so to just try to group things already walking in the door into these large buckets without -- I don't know, it just seems like -- and that doesn't necessarily translate very well for an adjudicator either, because they would need to have something that translates into actual measures that have something to do with human function that are relatable.

So this, you know, extreme or moderate or whatever those things that -- you know, unless, like you said, you give them an anchor of some kind that relates back to something in medical evidence that would be very difficult for an adjudicator to work with anyhow.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, this is a comment. It's kind of like a comment/prediction. I think the more precise we become in the scales, the more we refine them in terms of -- for example, if we go to observables and we split the scale in seven anchors with very precise intervals, I think what we are going to observe when we start collecting data is that within occupational title variability is going to go up, and therefore it's going to be more difficult to decide where does the occupation begin and where does it end and another occupation starts?

I know you guys follow me. What I'm saying is that if I become very precise in my scales and I ask somebody who is a cashier how often do you do this, or how much weight do you lift, what's going to happen is that one cashier is going to tell me I left 15 pounds. Somebody else is going to say I left 16, right? So I'm going to see an increase within title variability within that occupational title, which might be good, because we may find there are significant differences among cashiers and that we need more subdivisions among cashiers. But I think it's also going to make it more difficult to have a single occupational taxonomy, right?

MS. KARMAN: Thank you, Juan, because I think that's a very interesting observation, and certainly we've been discussing that over the last I think two years on and off.

One thing that comes to mind for me is that, you know, we're not complete with this discussion. I mean, you know, we do need to have more work in this area and we're just now embarking on that hoping to get our recommendations from our two I/O psychologists to help inform our taxonomy development process. But also with that there are a number of things that, you know, we know we're going to need to deal with in terms of within-title variability or, you know, how it is that jobs are very different among, you know, a variety of entities? And, you know, so maybe we'll have to come up with some other creative ways of dealing with that, like, you know, do we report the probability that a cashier, something that we've defined as a cashier based on our instrument, you know, the probability is that they may need to lift overheard 20 percent of the time? I don't know. I mean, so there are other things there that -- and then go back to our, you know, adjudicators and do some useability investigations to see if, well, would that be useful to people to know that kind of information? So I do think that this is a good point to have that kind of discussion.

But with regard to do we literally need to go out an use the same scales that the DOT did to evaluate work in the first place?

My assessment of that would be no, that we don't need to be confined by that, but you know, we do want to be able to do the translation and I do appreciate Juan's point about the more specific you become, after awhile it's like you can't discern any difference at all among any of the activities.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: A follow up is that to get -- the more precise and the more fine grained our scales are, the more within-title variability we're going to get and therefore we're going to need more incumbents per occupation to get a stable estimate. So that's another consequence for sampling.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan and then Deb.

MEMBER GIBSON: I was going to kind of tongue-in-cheek say, well, yes, the more precise the scale the more variance we'll have. That's a statistical absolute. We know that. But we also know that if we're not careful and we use scales that are not precise enough -- for example, given a scale where an excessive number of people choose does not apply, that can mask differences and similarities in the job as well. So you can't be too abstract and too broad. So again, we're still looking for what is the right number of scales and what is the right measure?

And to build onto the discussion, for example, earlier on portions of the day; one- third of the day, two-thirds of the day, and I was thinking in terms of discreet timelines, discretionary time units, if SSA chose to measure it, for example, in hours, that is something that would very easily -- could be rolled and translated into one-third of the day, two-thirds of the day, three-thirds of the day as the current definitions work. But we'd be measuring it at a more precise level, we would have it a more micro level and we could then combine it as we need it. But if we measure it at the more abstract level, we can never take it down.

MEMBER LECHNER: And I would sort of add to that whole idea about with increased precision and within increased within-title variability may not mean that we have to so much look at more incumbents, but look at more organizations. Because what I find when I go out to look at occupations even within an organization or jobs within organizations, the location, you know, can create variability in the amount of weight lifted or the amount of walking required just based on the physical plant that the person's having to deal with. So I would vision occupations that have ranges of all of the variables we collect.

Even if we collect very discreet variables, we would have say -- let's say the cashier could lift anywhere from 26 pounds to 75 pounds, depending on what kind of organization they work for. And the beauty of our capabilities, with our databasing capabilities today that the DOT didn't have we could look at the probability that -- or the likelihood or what percent of the cashier jobs require 50 pounds versus 75 pounds and how likely could that individual acquire a job where they only had to lift at the lower level. So I think we should expect a range of variability within all of these occupations, and being able to look at the frequency and the degree of variability will drive how many different organizations we have to collect data from to have meaningful information. And, you know, our challenge is going to be that -- I think on a lot of these occupations there will have to be many, many jobs analyzed to create that occupational unit.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Any more questions for Sylvia specific to let's say the scaling discussion that we had?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: How about we had presentations from ICF. Any questions to Sylvia or SSA, who Sylvia represents, in terms of Call 1 or Call 2?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I did have a question on that, just a general question going back to what I asked this morning. When you were presenting and you were talking about the different Phase 4 documents and I asked whether those would be put online, could you speak to that in terms of Call 1 and Call 2 as well?

MS. KARMAN: Sure. We certainly anticipate putting the final reports for Call 1 and Call 2 up on the project Web site so people will have access to that and they can read that.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions of Sylvia before we break kind into more deliberation, if there are other areas of deliberation the panel would like to engage in?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Sounds like one more question.

MEMBER LECHNER: You know, as we've listened to the reports on Call 1 and Call 2 today, it's obvious from questions and comments that have been made that this area, like any other area, when you pull experts together from a variety of backgrounds and experiences even within disciplines, you get a variety of "expert opinions."

So I'm interested as you receive feedback from ICF and then the panel, and then you have your internal scientists and you have your internal consultants you're going to obviously get a lot of expert advice and it's going to differ. So is there a plan or a process for deciding when you get conflicting advice, you know, how to make these decisions? It would just seem very challenging.

MS. KARMAN: Yes, it's very challenging. So what we have been doing; and I think we're going to obviously be continuing to do that, as we are moving into an activity and we are through our business process developing the methodology for a particular activity, or if it requires a study, you know, the study methodology, one of the things that we do in consultation with you all, as well as in consultation with our work group and in development within our own office, is to develop the research questions, and frequently, where it's relevant, what the parameters are. You know, so do we have a boundary, for example, with regard to time or money, or whatever? And we do. We have boundaries in those areas as well.

So that then, you know, I think will help the agency narrow down the decision making in terms of, well, what are the priorities for a particular activity? And given the advice that we've received, you know, what can that advice help us get to in terms of an answer based on what we have identified as our priorities? And so what it requires us to be doing as we're moving along is to be really very clear about what we're intending to do with a particular activity. And it may not even be the entire overview of the activity all the time. Like sometimes we just need to take -- like the scaling issue. You know, we may need to take that and break that down into, okay, well, you know, number one we have adjudicative needs. You know, at the end of the day that's going to be a really big item for us, is to be sure that whatever we deliver the agency can provide to adjudicators and that it corresponds with what they're familiar with in terms of medical evidence. So I mean, at a minimum, you know, that we know.

And so there's certain things that become priorities for us, and that's where it's important for us in our documentation and in our consultation with you guys that we are doing that, that we are defining as we go into it what we think the priorities are going to be, what we think the parameters are. And then as we learn more, use that to help shape the decision making. And at the end of the day, you know, like any other, you know, group, just like you all do in your professions, we're going to have to make the best decision that we can with the information we have at hand. So, but that's where we've been.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other questions or comments of Sylvia?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Sylvia.

And we have about a half hour left for any other deliberation that the panel would like to have on any of the topics for today. The two main thematic areas I think were job analysts in terms of work analysis, job analysts, and also the scaling. So, I'll open it up.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Implications for the particular subcommittees? Any of the work that we're doing? Anything we're going to into tomorrow?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Are you all talked out? Janine?

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: (Off microphone.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Not yet.

MEMBER GIBSON: I think we've been deliberating all day, which is something we enjoy. Because if I tried to remember everything I wanted to say until the end of the day, well, I'd be a lot quieter and you all would probably be a lot happier. But, no.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, along the lines of scaling, something that Debra said, would it make sense to ask users, adjudicators what type of a scale do they find easier to use? Why is it that they don't like the scales now? Deb said they hate it. I'd like to find out why. Why do they find it difficult and how can we make it easier, more along the lines of the useability of the scale.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: And I guess maybe this is -- I"m looking over at Sylvia. I don't remember in terms of the user needs analyses. Did they cover scaling or was it more, you know, the data elements, physical demands, that kind of thing? I don't remember if there were comments regarding scales. There were? Dave's saying yes.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Over the course of the panel's life we've heard a number of presentations by claims analysts and so forth who've talked about the problems with coarseness of scales. They'd like finer grain, but not always.

And I guess I also want to sort of circle back to your comment. I think that your concern about being overly precise, in that concern you're knocking on an open door. I really share that concern. And in fact in the Mental Cognitive Subcommittee we really tried to simplify things and, you know, we had suggested some changes for a way to conceptualize a mental RFC that drops the number of questions from I think 21 down to 15, or something like that. So we actually tried to cover a broader territory, but with a much smaller pool of items. So, you know, I really share that concern.

But as I was thinking about things that Debra was presenting, it may be that we don't' have to necessarily increase the number of gradations of scales to better capture variability within the world of work or applicants. It might actually be a smaller number of gradations, but crossed orthogonally with some other factors like maximum duration of time. You know, you've pointed out that we just may not be capturing the most essential characteristics of the job demands in terms of what's rate limiting for people with impairments? It may be some of the other kinds of factors that Debra has pointed out in that talk. And I think that there may be parallels of that in the cognitive aspects of job demands.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Abigail is an expert in IRT, right, item response theory, meaning, you know, not everything is linear, right? And, you know, the line in some of these skills may be totally flat, so between four and five we may not be picking up any variance, in which case it may make sense to go with a three- point scale. So, you know, I think it's going to be difficult to explore that empirically given every time I bring up the point of let's take a look at the claims, I'm told let's not do that because the claims are not coded in a manner that is helpful. But any database that gives us actual raw data, right, on limitations, on weights, things of that nature, I think it's going to be helpful.

MEMBER PANTER: And I completely agree. I mean, our best situation would be if we could operate from something we know very well and know how items operate and move forward from there. I mean, it depends. If we're using completely different constructs or completely different scales, we obviously can't do this. But if there are data that will tell us that people don't use the upper end of the scale, or they especially use this piece, or at steps 4 and 5 we really need to maximize the information that's available in the middle part of the scale, this would be helpful information for us. And it's really an opportunity for us to walk in with our eyes open about what we could be doing.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

MEMBER HARDY: Kind of just a repeat warning again. I read you one little paragraph out of the CFR. That's one little paragraph out of the CFR. And I just remind everybody as we talk about these things, when we pick a scale and we pick a top and bottom, that will become memorialized in another place called the CFR. So we've got to be very careful because what tends to happen in my experience is for ease of adjudication and swiftness and all the other things that Social Security also has to keep in mind, they're going to drop down to the bottom rankings of whatever these things are and that is where you're going to have decisions made. So we need to keep that in mind as well.

So getting at the scaling and ranking, but remember also we're still going back to an n equals one, and oftentimes that one is going to be the bottom of that scale. So we've got to be very precise in how we do it because that's where this is going. Just a reminder.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Deb, you looked like you wanted to say something. And then Allan.

MR. LECHNER: You know, Juan, I think your questions about going back and looking at the data require probably a little deeper and longer thinking than what I have the ability to do right off the top of my head and particularly at this hour. But there are a couple of data sources that I think could inform some of your questions; and one is, looking at job analyses that have been done in the past and what kind of data that gets collected and how that data is distributed is possible.

And then the other thing is looking at testing of or RFCs of the claimants. And, you know, I think which data source and whether it's going to be useful or not may have to do with how that data's been collected and what information is really there, but I think it's worth exploring.

And my comments earlier about the data that was collected on the RFC weren't meant to say we can't use that data at all or we shouldn't use that data, it's just I have questions about whether the data will help us, but I think it's worth looking into.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: And the question I had that I didn't remember the answer to was those of us who have been on the panel since day one remember that we had four face-to-face meetings in seven months to be able to comply with our charter of four quarterly meetings and we started way into the quarter, I mean, into the fiscal year; excuse me. So the staff, in response to my question, if you remember, when we were meeting, the staff was off doing user needs analyses in some of these offices at the different places where we met. And so in the user needs analysis; and I think Michael you were involved with that heavily and you were one of the presenters on that from what I recall, that was done in 2009 did ask adjudicators what they'd like to see in general, what information would be most helpful. So that was asked. And then also the importance of distinguishing between the work-side measures versus the person-side measures.

And, Juan, a question for you in terms of your question. How do you see that fitting into the R&D plan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: What exactly? The data analysis that we were just discussing? I guess the answer is I don't know, but my thoughts are I've been thinking that many of the answers to our questions are not on the job analysis side but on the person side, because that tells you what goes on with the claims with people, right? And I agree with Deb that if everything is coded according to the DOT, which is simply the procedural function and capacity form, then it may not be that helpful because we are stuck with those anchors.

But if we could find a data set that reports raw data, right, that is more precise and it gives us data that is not subject to the constraints of the DOT scales, then you know, Abigail could I'm sure analyze it and find out that perhaps the most discrimination or the curve is most steep between 10 and 20 pounds and that having five points on that scale doesn't make any sense because a three-point scale gives you as much discrimination as you need. I don't know that that data set exists, but, you know, I've been talking to Mark and Michael about the data set, so it might be helpful for us to take a look at some of those data sets that have been put together.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan?

MEMBER GIBSON: Tim said it quietly and I was going to say it loudly: I think if those data sets exist they're in the private sector. I think it's the individuals who have created their own job analytic tools and are using them privately to do what Deb does, or do what R. J. Harvey does, or who have created the scales and are using absolute measures to measure whatever functions they need. We'd have to get a hold of their data, because my understanding is what we have from the RFCs and stuff is based on the DOT scales, period, and it's not entered even at the local or the regional, at the DDS office level at any other scale level. It's what's on the forms and that's it. So the private sector probably has that data.

MEMBER LECHNER: And, you know, thinking about the data that we collect and archive I"m sure we have literally thousands and thousands of tests that have been done on individuals that are applying for disability in the private sector or who are being tested for work comp. The challenge is all of those individuals have sustained some sort of illness or injury that affects their physical abilities. And so if you look at where their abilities tend to fall, you're going to get a very skewed perspective of, you know, these people are not typically functioning in the medium to heavy level.

But does that mean that we don't need to capture information about those heavier demands when we go out there to evaluate jobs? I think it shouldn't dictate that. So that's why I say it's important to look not just at the folks that are being tested and where their abilities fall, but to look at the existing job analyses that are out there probably in the private sector that, you know, where do job demands typically fall? And I think, you know, just reacting on a very gut level without having spent a lot of time thinking through any kind of methodology I think you can't just look at the claimant or the applicant for disability or work comp.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes, then let me I guess pick your brain. What criteria do you think should guide, for example, the number of points that a scale should have?

MEMBER LECHNER: Well, and John I

think spoke to that kind of pretty eloquently earlier in terms of the scale being -- I forget; I can't replicate your terms, but comprehensive and mutually exclusive categories and so on and so forth.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Unambiguous.

MEMBER LECHNER: Unambiguous. Thank you. So, you know, I think there's certainly some measurement principles that can guide us. And I think you raise a really good question, Juan. I don't know exactly what empirical data we could or should collect in order to drive our decision making on that. Others may have a more enlightened view.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan?

MEMBER GIBSON: Our research plan allows for pilot testing, you all. There's no reason we can't try a five-point scale, a seven-point scale and a nine-point scale, run the discriminate analysis, run the -- granted, it takes a large sample size. Been there, done that. But there's no reason we can't empirically test this to some degree ourselves.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Well SSA that is, since we're not developing it, right?

MEMBER GIBSON: (Off microphone.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I know. I know. We mean SSA.

Go ahead, Abigail and then Tom.

MEMBER PANTER: I'm not sure if we've ever had cognitive interviews with adjudicators using the scales. I mean, we've visited and we've talked to them about general concepts about the use of the DOT, but conducting cognitive interviews while someone is adjudicating would be very valuable I think. And, you know, it wouldn't take too much to do I don't think and we could really do something. I mean, one situation would be using the existing system, but also as we're moving forward with each iteration we could be talking to people about that.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: So you're talking about during the useability analyses part of the OIS R&D plan.

MEMBER HARDY: Quick reminder though. Whatever skills we use then go out into the world and I, as an attorney, take it to Dr. Jones on the corner of South and Main Street and say, Dr. Jones, please assess my client using this scaling system. So there's a real world application that you've got to keep in mind as well. And Dr. Jones not only has to be able to understand, but be able to actually rate and do it with some confidence.

MEMBER PANTER: It also means that we have to speak to many Dr. Joneses and have cognitive interviews with Dr. Joneses and whomever are the important stakeholders before -- I mean, it's part of a process and I believe it's in the -- I'm not sure if the cognitive interview aspect is in there, but it's very valuable so I think we should make sure it's incorporated.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: I don't think the plan goes to that level of detail, but for 2012 iteration maybe they could include that.

John looks like he wants to say something.

MEMBER CRESWELL: You may recall back in our telephone conversation in July I asked this precise question. My question was what information do we have from the adjudicators that can really help us as we start to develop this information, the OIS? And, you know, something like that would be valuable information. At that time I was referred back to the useability report saying it's already been collected. And I"m not sure now as we're beginning to think about the different facets of this entire project, because the scaling has to be suitable for data collection to populate the database. The scale also has to be useful for the adjudicators when it's translated into practice and so there are several dimensions of the practical impact of coming up with really good scales.

And I do think this is like a huge puzzle and we've got all these parts and, you know, moving parts, and it's probably valuable that different parts have come in. I mean, today we were going through a whole discussion about the job analysts and then we switched to scaling. And then bringing in the DOT you then switch to the adjudication process. So we're thinking across the different dimensions of this project, which is I think a great exercise. But now as we start thinking about the exact scaling and, you know, we're returning to the adjudicators and thinking about what kind of information do we have from them that can really help us in this process of scaling? So that's my synopsis of the day.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. We're in the last 10 minutes or so of our formal agenda. Any other comments or questions?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. At this point, before I turn the meeting over to Leola to adjourn, I know that User Needs is going to be providing us with something for us to take a look at tonight, a one-page description. And I'm going to have Janine talk about it very briefly and then I will turn the meeting over to Leola.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Thank you. Something was called to my attention just before this meeting took place and unfortunately it predated my activity on User Needs, so I thank those people that got me up to speed on this. And I'll just read the email that was sent to me.

"We were alerted that there was an unresolved issue with the operating procedures for the subcommittee review and discussion at the User Needs meeting. In September 2010 meeting, the panel voted to accept the User

Needs Subcommittee recommendation but did not vote to incorporate it into the operating procedures."

What I'm going to pass around -- and this has been approved by our resident attorney, but Tom said that, you know, one of the worst things is to just be handed a piece of paper and need a vote or a discussion. So we said we would give this to you this evening. You have already approved this as a portion of this, which is the summary of the public comment and the user needs, but we neglected to vote it into the operating procedures. So this is what this will look like in the operating procedures and tomorrow I will be making a full motion. So this is just so you can read it tonight and ask any intelligent questions you have tomorrow, which you'll direct to Tom.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. I believe we are at the end of our very full agenda today. Thank you for all your time and thank you for all your comments. This was a very good day.

I would like at this time to turn the meeting over to Leola.

MS. BROOKS: If there are no objections, the meeting will adjourn.

(No audible response.)

MS. BROOKS: Hearing no objections, we are adjourned until tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. Thank you kindly.

CHAIRPERSON BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, all.

(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 4:51 p.m. to reconvene tomorrow at 8:30 a.m.)