UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT
ADVISORY PANEL (OIDAP)

QUARTERLY MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
MAY 5, 2011

+ + + + +

The Meeting was held in the Radisson Plaza Lord Baltimore Hotel, Calvert Ballroom, 20 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland, at 8:30 a.m., Mary Barros-Bailey, Chair, presiding.

Reporter: Brandon Paterson

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY BARROS-BAILEY, PhD, Chair
ROBERT FRASER, PhD
SHANAN GWALTNEY GIBSON, PhD
THOMAS HARDY, JD
JANINE S. HOLLOMAN
H. ALLAN HUNT, PhD
TIMOTHY J. KEY, MD
DEBORAH LECHNER
ABIGAIL T. PANTER, PhD
JUAN I. SANCHEZ, PhD
DAVID SCHRETLEN, PhD

SSA STAFF PRESENT:

MICHAEL DUNN
DEBBIE HARKIN
BYRON HASKINS
SYLVIA E. KARMEN
ELIZABETH KENNEDY
SIKA KOUDOU
MIKE O'CONNOR
CLARE RITTERHOFF
MARK TRAPANI
DEBRA TIDWELL-PETERS, Designated Federal Official

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

8:30 a.m.

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Good morning. My name is Debra Tidwell-Peters. I am the Designated Federal Official for this Advisory Panel. Welcome to the quarterly meeting. This is day two.

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

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Debra. Good morning, everybody. We are back on the record. The second quarterly meeting for fiscal year 2011.

If you are not physically here, but accessing our meeting remotely and would like to follow along, you can got to socialsecurity.gov/oidap to access our agenda.

There, you will also find information regarding past meetings, panel documents, technical and working papers and the first report we wrote in 2009, and the two reports from 2010.

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

You can find the charter on the website, if you are accessing remotely, and it is in our paperwork here, for those who are here face-to-face.

Our task on the Panel is not to develop the occupational information system itself, that is being done by Social Security Administration. As our name implies, it is to provide advisory recommendations on its development.

Yesterday I mentioned that our

interest at this meeting is to learn about the sampling strategy and data collection efforts of other Federal agencies that could provide the OIDAP with lessons learned and insight that could assist us in providing advice and recommendations to SSA on their own sampling plan and data collection for the OIS.

Although the means for the Social Security Administration and their occupational database are different than the purposes for which other Federal agencies collect their own data, each agency's considerable experience for their particular database could provide invaluable insights to us in our work.

Today, I would like to welcome the representatives of the U.S. Census, who will provide -- present us with information about their efforts.

We have two representatives. Jennifer C. Day is the Assistant Division

Chief of Employment Characteristics of the Social Economic and Housing Statistics Division of the U.S. Census Bureau.

She oversees the Bureau's statistics on labor force characteristics, including occupations. A more detailed biography of Ms. Day is in our papers, here.

We also have Steve Hefter, who is the Chief of the American Community Survey Sample Design Branch, at the U.S. Census Bureau. He has been at the Census Bureau for 14 years, graduated from the state of -- University of New York in Albany in 1997 with a BS in mathematics.

He was responsible for the Census 2000 long-form sampling and weighing, as well as the Census 2000 housing unit dual systems estimation. Welcome.

02 Good morning. Today, I will discuss the Census Bureau's process of collecting the occupation data in the American Community Survey, from gathering the

information, from household respondents, to point information from the survey, to a data file, to coding, to editing the data.

As a household survey, the strength of the American Community Survey is asking people, rather than businesses, about their work and labor force participation.

In addition to collecting occupation data, we collect industry and class of worker information at the same time. Considered together, this information helps us learn more precisely, what kinds of work people do.

Let me point out that we refer to the occupation industry and class of worker together, as I&O, though usually, we're referring to all three measures together.

The question of what people do has been at the forefront of our nation's history. James Madison proposed asking people's occupation in the first census in 1790, to make proper provision for agriculture, commercial and manufacturing interests.

He was overruled on the occupation questions, as many Americans objected to answering questions they considered violations of their privacy.

The Census Bureau's occupation industry data date back to the 19th century. Industry data was first collected in the decennial census in 1820, with a question asking for the number of persons engaged in agriculture, number of persons engaged in commerce and the number of persons engaged in manufacturing.

We have been collecting industry data on a regular basis in the decennial census since 1910.

Occupation data has been collected regularly since 1850, evolving from a basic question asking for the profession, occupation or trade of each person, male or female, over 15 years of age.

Class of worker has been asked since 1910. Then, we asked people whether or not -- whether they were an employee, employer or working on their own account.

Together, these questions describe the work activity and occupational experience of the American labor force.

One of the questions I was asked to address today is, what are the primary users of these data and for what purposes?

So, at the Government level, I&O data are used to formulate policy and programs for employment, career development and training. It provides information on occupational skills of the labor force, to help analyze career trends and it helps create estimates used in the allocation formulas and eligibility criteria for many Federal programs.

Businesses use these data to measure compliance with anti-discrimination policies, to develop business plans and to decide where to locate new plants, stores and offices and help maintain -- to help plan budget and pay benefits.

Researchers use I&O data in a number of ways to analyze social and economic issues, such as earnings and equality, labor force transitions, employment outcomes and returns to education, just to name a few.

Here, I've listed two specific examples of how I&O data users use -- here, I listed two examples of I&O data uses, to give you a more concrete idea of what the data can be used for.

The National Science Foundation runs a survey of college graduates. Using the ACS information on field of degree at the Bachelor's level and occupation, they work with the Census Bureau to conduct their survey of college graduates.

Since they are targeting a rather small and specific population of science and engineering workers, the coverage and detail of the ACS provides them the information they need for a more targeted sample frame for their survey.

The second example shown here is the EEO Special Tabulation. This is a special tabulation created by the Census Bureau, for four Federal agencies, the EEO Commission, the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, the Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance and OPM.

Since the 1970 decennial census, the Census Bureau has created these tabulations for agencies to help measure and enforce compliance with civil rights laws. As a special project -- product, the tabulations have expanded in scope after the 1980, 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses.

The tabulation includes detailed occupation by sex, race, Hispanic origin, age, educational attainment and other variables, at various geographic levels, such as state, metro areas and county.

This tabulation, available at the Census Bureaus' website, is used as the external benchmark for conducting comparisons between racial, ethnic and sex composition of each employers workforce and the available labor market. It is used by organizations to develop and update their affirmative action plans.

We currently are working on -- with these four agencies on the new EEO Tabulation, which will be based on the five year ACS data 2000 to 2010.

We expect to release this tabulation in the Fall of next year 2012, and will be available to all users on the Census Bureaus' American Fact Finder.

This slide illustrates two concepts. One, although the ACS is a large survey the Census Bureau conducts and has a general focus -- conducts, and has a general focus, we also have several other surveys that collect data on -- I&O data.

The second concept is that we conduct surveys for other organizations -- agencies, some of which are listed here on the right column. We basically use the same I&O coding for all household surveys.

So, as I discuss our coding procedure shortly, keep in mind that these are replicated, to some extent, in all our surveys that have I&O data.

Our longest running survey, the Current Population Survey, or CPS, is in the field every month. It's primary purpose is to collect information on the nation's labor force activities and thus, is more focused on the characteristics of workers and employment, than the more broadly ACS.

For example, the CPS has 16 questions specially designed to determine employment status. The ACS only has six. The CPS asks about more than one job. ACS only asks about the primary job.

The Survey of Income and Program Participation, also known as the SIPP, is a longitudinal survey. We started collecting the SIPP data in 1984, with panels extending three or four years.

The data provide insight into the nature of the nation's labor force, with respect to occupational transitions, multiple job holders and reasons why people change jobs and occupations.

So, let's take a look at the ACS I&O data process. This could be summarized into four basic steps, data collection, capture, coding and edits, and we'll expand on each.

As Steven will talk about ACS, probably in more detail than I will, ACS has three modes of data collection, paper, CAT and CAPI.

Paper is mailed out to households, and -- paper is mailed out to households, and the household members complete the survey and they mail it back.

When they don't, we call them the next month, if we have their telephone number, and collect the information via the telephone, with trained field representatives, or FR's, using a computer assisted telephone interview, or what we refer to as CATI.

If we cannot reach the household via telephone or mail, we send a field representative to a sample of the remaining addresses and conduct a personal interview, CAPI -- excuse me, I said CAPI before, it's -- CATI was the first one, this one is CAPI.

About half of the ACS data are gathered via paper. About 10 percent through CATI and about 40 percent are sampled in the -- represented in the CAPI.

PARTICIPANT: I'm sorry, can you say that one more time?

DR. DAY: Okay, about half of the ACS -- and you can correct me, if I'm wrong -

- are gathered from paper, 10 percent via the telephone and the remaining represent 40 percent. So, there is about two percent that aren't represented. That's why I said, about.

Okay, so, let's take a look at what specifically we ask in the ACS via occupation.

In your packet of materials, we have included an informational copy of the ACS paper questionnaire. The CATI and CAPI versions are very similar, but they're not reproduced here.

The questionnaire has essentially four parts, the front page, which includes a mailing address, though not shown on your copy, and ask on what basis -- some basic information and questions, to define the universe of who should be included in the questionnaire.

Pages two through four includes five basic demographic questions for each person in the household. If more than five people live in the household, their name, sex and age are collected on page four.

Pages five through seven include questions on housing. Since the housing answers apply to all household members, we ask them only once. These questions determine the type of living conditions for household members.

The interesting population questions begin with person one on page eight through page 11.

This includes 48 questions, ranging in topics from martial status, citizenship, educational attainment, labor force status, income and others.

Then these questions are repeated for persons two, three, four and five on pages 12 through 27.

However, in your information copy, we don't include those pages, as they just repeat the pages -- the same information as pages eight through 11.

The questionnaire ends with page 28, with mailing instructions.

Labor force questions begin on page 10 with question 29, "Last week, did this person for pay at a job?"

The questions on this page refer to community characteristics relating to the job held last week, or if no job, then the questions focus on determining whether the respondent was whether -- was unemployed or out of the labor force entirely.

The I&O questions begin on the following page, page 11, questions 41 through 46. The universe for these questions is broader than just those with the job last week. It includes anyone 15 years old or older, who has had a job in the last five years.

We refer to only one job that is, that job with the most hours, and for those without a job last week, we refer to the job held most recently.

The first question in the I&O series is the class of worker item. Class of worker categorizes people according to the type of ownership of the employee organization, private, Government, self-employed or family business/farm.

This is a check box item, relatively easy to capture the information, since once the report -- since the respondent marks the box.

We ask about industry next. Industry data describes the kind of business conducted by a person's employing organizations. We use three questions to determine industry, question 42, "For whom did this person work," asking the respondent to write in the name of their employer, and then notice the Armed Forces check box, here.

Question 43 ask the respondent to ask -- to write in, "What kind of business or industry was this," to describe the principle activities of the business, and then question 44, the third industry question, is a check box, manufacturing, wholesale, retail or other.

Questions -- occupation data are collected with two questions, questions 45 and 446, both write-in style.

Occupation describes the kind of work a person does at the job and question 45 asks, "What kind of work was this person doing?"

Here, people give their occupation name, job title and -- or more of a description. Question 45 follows with asking, "What were the persons most important activities or duties?"

Here, we hope people give us more specific information or description of their job.

So, once we have the respondents -- once the respondent completes the questionnaire, they mail it back to the address on the back of the form, to our National Processing Center, or NPC, in Jeffersonville, Indiana facility.

Jeffersonville is located across the Ohio River from Louisville, Kentucky, and the Census Bureaus' J-Ville facility contains several buildings and warehouses across about 60-some acres. This is where all the ACS forms are mailed back to.

If you recall, ACS as three modes of data collection, paper, CATI and CAPI.

Since the telephone and in-person interviews are already conducted and capturing -- using a computer, the first data entry step is completed for those modes.

For paper, we need to get the information from the paper form to the electronic version. So, once an ACS form arrives in J-Ville, we begin our data capture from the paper questionnaires.

Here is the abbreviated version of what happens to the form, once it arrives.

The envelope gets checked in via sorting machine that scans the bar code, then this tells us who has mailed back the questionnaire. The envelopes are then slit and the questionnaire extracted.

The forms are reviewed by clerks to determine if there is any extra correspondence or stray materials. Surprisingly, many respondents like to eat while completing their ACS forms, so, sometimes crumbs have to be removed.

The forms are then guillotined, and if you notice, your ACS form, each page has a bar code that's unique to that address. This is helpful, in case the pages are separated.

The form is then scanned and the image is now saved. Check box information is captured via our optical mark recognition reader and written text is keyed from the image, what we call KFI.

Okay, the CATI and CAPI data are

then merged with the paper data, to create a file, what we call a Data Capture File. The ACS data capture uses about 45 keyers at NPC.

The key -- they key exactly what they see, including typos, mis-spellings, foreign language, etcetera.

However, they capture the first 60 characters for each I&O line of information. For the most part, people don't write novels to us, and 60 characters are more than enough.

At this point, illegal value responses are identified, such as multiple check marks in one field or invalid entries, such as something other than, for instance, male and female for sex. So, things that are out of range.

From the data capture file, a coding file is creating, and just so that you know, these are the variables that we show -- have on our coding file. The Data Capture File is much larger than this label on the top.

The variables listed here a fed into the coding system for the clerks to use for I&O coding. This includes some demographic information, such as age, sex, educational attainment, geography information, as well as information from the I&O questions.

Using a combination of these, coders determine a persons' occupation code, industry code and class of worker.

This is an example of some of the write-ins to two of the variables, the industry write-in question 43, shown here as IMW3, and the occupational write-in question 45, shown here as OCW1.

As you can see from these few examples shown here, we get mis-spellings, some of which could even be from the KFI, for example, the extra 'B' in boss, might be because the clerk left their finger too long on the 'B' key, but we do get lots of mis-spellings.

We also see words in foreign languages, specific industry and occupation titles, and sometimes, more general.

The last entry shown here is a 'D', which probably comes from an FR who entered a 'D' for 'don't know' in the CATI and CAPI.

These write-ins, along with other information in the previous slide, appear in the coding system in batches of 100. Each month, clerks international processing center code over 200,000 ACS I&O cases. All of our I&O occupation data -- all of our industry and occupation data are currently clerically coded.

We are working on building an auto-coder, which will help alleviate some of this clerical burden, and we expect to implement the auto-coder next year.

The coding process begins two type of -- begins with two type of production coders, qualified and unqualified coders.

Qualified coders meet certain standards of production. They can code a certain number of cases correctly, within a prescribed amount of time.

Of their workload, 10 percent is pulled out randomly and checked by a dependent verifier. All the work is done -- all the work done by unqualified coders is verified by another coder.

When the clerical coders are unable to assign a code, the case is then sent to an expert, or referralist, for a decision.

Referralists receive an additional 16 hours of training and are given access to more resources, such as state manufacturing directories, Dunn & Bradstreet directories, the Lexis Nexus directory of corporate affiliations, the Thomas register and others. They also can use the internet for finding more information about the response.

About 18 percent of I&O coding are sent to the referralists. Once these cases are assigned codes, they're placed back in the general pool of completed responses.

From the general pool, a fixed percentage of cases are then sent through an internal quality assurance verification process, awaiting QA.

Coders are independently assigned a code to previously coded cases. The codes are then reconciled to determine which is correct. Coders are required to maintain a monthly agreement of 95 percent or above, and a 70 percent or above production rate, to remain as qualified coders, and a coding supervisor oversees the entire process.

Here is a snapshot of the computer assisted coding system that the clerks work with. The top half is the coding index, either industry or occupation or Military appears, depending on which variable the coder is working on. The bottom half, the information from the survey responses appear, the employer name, industry, industry type, occupation duties and class of worker.

Usually, a coder will complete industry first and once that is complete, she moves on to the occupation and then class of worker, but she may move back and forth, depending on the information she gathered from one, to help inform making a decision on another.

The census maintains its own unique set of industry codes -- for industry and another set for occupation. The codes are derived from the NAICS and the SOC codes, but are limited, based on how well we believe we can capture industry and occupation detail.

For example, people tell us that they are post-secondary teachers, but they do not always tell us which subject they teach.

Rather than have a large 'other'

category and under-count the specialty categories, we code to a broader level, depending on the observable detail, the degree of aggregation, varies by industry sector or occupation major group. Census codes are updated, with changes to the NAICS and the SOC.

Census uses the North American industrial classification system, or NAICS, as the basis for our industry codes. The NAICS was developed to increase comparability in industry definitions between the United States, Mexico and Canada.

It provides industry classifications, that groups establishments into industries based on the activities in which they are primarily engaged.

The NAICS was created for establishment designations and provides detail about the smallest operation -- operating establishment, while the American Community Survey Data are collected from households and differ in detail and nature from those attained from establishment surveys.

Because of the potential disclosure issues, the Census industry classification system, while defined in NAICS terms, cannot reflect the full detail of all categories that the NAICS provides.

Census codes covers 20 -- the 20 NAICS industry sectors, but a differing levels of classification.

In some cases, the Census code corresponds to the two-digit NAICS codes, other times a three-digit and even as detailed as a six-digit code.

In total, the Census industry codes for the household surveys include 269 codes.

To give you an idea of how the Census industry codes match the NAICS, here is an excerpt from an industry code crosswalk.

The left column is the description of the industry, shown here, as some other services -- industries, and construction industries.

The middle column is the 2009 Census code and it's a four-digit code. All of our occupation industry codes, Census codes are four-digit codes.

At the far right is the corresponding NAICS codes. For example, bar shops, the Census code is 8970 and the NAICS code is the six-digit code 812111.

In some cases, we combine two or more industries to make a Census code, such as nail salons and other personal services, and in other cases, the Census code is based on the three-digit NAICS code, as in private household.

Sometimes we can use the two-digit -- we can only use the two-digit level, as you can see here with construction. All in the two-digit level code 23 is matched to the Census code 0770.

Similar to occupation codes -- industry codes, Census occupation codes are based on the standard occupation classification.

The SOC system is used by U.S. Federal agencies, statistical agencies, to classify workers into occupation categories for the purpose of collecting can calculating the disseminating data. All workers are classified into one of 840 detailed occupations, according to their occupation definition.

To facilitate classification detail, occupations are combined to form 461 broad occupations, 97 minor occupations and 23 major groups.

Detailed occupations in the SOC with similar job duties and in some cases, skills and education or trained are grouped together.

The Census occupation codes cover

all 23 major occupation groups, but again, at differing levels of classification.

In total, with the 2010 revision, we now have 539 Census occupation codes.

Here again is an excerpt from our occupation code crosswalk. The description is on the left. The Census occupation code is in the middle and the SOC code is on the right.

As I mentioned earlier, secondary teachers in the SOC has much more detail in the minor, broad and detailed levels, but we can only code to the major level here, thus, the SOC code 25-1000.

For the SOC, the number of zeros at the end of the code represents which level or part of the hierarchy the code represents.

For other kinds of teachers, we can get to more specific levels, teachers assistants, the Census code is 2540, and it can be crosswalked to the detailed level SOC 25-9041.

On the bottom, we show other education training and library workers. Notice the X's in the SOC code. This indicates that multiple SOC codes at the broad level combine into this one Census code.

Over the many years, we have developed updated regularly, the Census Bureaus' coding indexes, referred to as the Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupations.

These are derived from titles reported earlier in censuses and surveys, including titles often used in the economy. Some titles are not listed because they are too new to be included in the indexes, or they are rarely used.

However, new titles are added to the industry and occupation listings continuously.

Many of the original occupation titles came from the dictionary of occupational titles, published by the Department of Labor.

Here, you see a description of the occupation, the NAICS and the SOC codes, the Census industry and occupation codes. This appears on the top half of the screen, when the clerk is coding I&O.

If the write-in says teacher, elementary, the teacher -- the industry is 7860, elementary in secondary schools, and the occupation code is then 2310.

In the second line, you can see the French teacher can be coded to more than one NAICS industry, but the Census industry is just 7870, colleges and universities.

Teacher, not specified, can be a variety of Census industry and occupation codes. The coder would need to look at other fields, such as the duties or the name of the employer for more information, in order to code this entry.

Some occupation groups are

related closely to certain industries. Operators of heavy -- transportation equipment, farm operators and worker and healthcare providers count for major portions of the respected industries in transportation, agriculture and healthcare.

In some cases, the industry shows a suggested industry, or may even have a single industry restriction, where the occupation can only take place in that industry.

Following the coding operation, a computer edit and allocation process excludes all responses that should not be included in the universe and evaluates the consistency of the remaining responses.

First, we check for the correct universe. To be in the universe for industry and occupation, we consider for each person, their age, which must be greater than 15, and that they worked in the past five years.

Occasionally, responses supply --

respondents supply industry and occupation descriptions that are not sufficiently specific for precise classification, or they did not report on these questions at all.

Certain types of incomplete entries are corrected, using the alphabetical index of industries and occupations.

If one or more of the three codes, industry, occupation or class of worker is blank after the edit -- after coding the edit, a code is assigned from the donor respondent who is similar -- who has similar person, based on the questions, such as age, sex, educational attainment, income, employment status and weeks worked.

If all the labor force and income data are blank, all of these economic questions are assigned from a similar person who have provided all the necessary data.

During the editing process, we include consistency checks among the three I&O variables, as well as with other labor force, education and income data.

For example, if we record a person who is older than age 15, and is employed, and their occupation code is 2100, which is lawyers, then we check the education -- the educational level.

If that is less than a Master's degree, and their income per week is less then $930, their occupation code is then changed or revised to 2140, para-legal and legal assistant.

After collecting, capturing, coding and editing, we provide several kinds of data products for users. These include detailed tables, subjects tables, maps, profiles and more.

Most of our products are found on the tables located in the American Fact Finder, on the Census Bureaus' website. We also have several papers, staff have authored, on the occupation webpage, as well as crosswalks and indexes that we have seen here today.

Here is the address of the occupation webpage, as well as the contact information for the Industry and Occupation Statistics Branch. Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. If you don't mind, I'll open it up to the Panel, see if there are any questions. Allan?

DR. HUNT: Census just gone by, can you say a little bit more about the assignment from donors? What is a similar person? How would you define that?

DR. DAY: It depends on the edit, but it's typically somebody who is similar age, sex, occupation -- we look at a number of variables that we have seen, that correlate closely to that variable.

So, in occupation, if we have their industry and we have their educational attainment, sometimes even region, so, it's somebody who is -- we build a matrix, basically, of certain variables, and we put donors in there, and then we pull from that donor, as we come along.

So, it's the characteristics, as I mentioned, the income, education, sex, age, are typically the main ones.

DR. HUNT: And forgive me, but why is that better than just saying it was a faulty response or a 'no' response?

DR. DAY: We put out 100 percent. So, we don't leave blank data in our data sets.

DR. SCHRETLIN: So, what percentage of missing data are imputed?

DR. DAY: I don't know, right off the top my head, for I&O, exactly. But usually, it's less than five percent, it's very small. It's on the quality measures website.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

MR. HARDY: You had said something about, I think it was in indexing, when you get a new title, you were putting those in?

DR. DAY: Yes.

MR. HARDY: Do you track those, and when -- do you do anything with that information, beyond just tracking it?

DR. DAY: I'm sorry, what do you mean by tracking?

MR. HARDY: If I were to say to you, "Could you go back in and give me all the new titles you've got in the past six months," is there a way for you to kind of go in there and pull that information out?

DR. DAY: We do -- when we put them in, we know that we're putting them in. So, it's easy enough for us to know --

MR. HARDY: To back-track and get them back on?

DR. DAY: Yes, but I don't think we've taken official, "Oh, let's go track, exactly what is going on."

MR. HARDY: Okay, thank you.

DR. DAY: But we put them in basically, every so many months. We'll update them, so, it's something we kind of know, but we don't really officially have a tracking system.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan and then David.

DR. GIBSON: Could you briefly speak to your response rate, at each of your three phases of data collection?

What is your response rate on the mailed survey? What response rate you then add t that with your CATI, and then at the CAPI level, you mentioned taking a sampling of those who did not respond to CATI.

So, how do you choose that sample and decide who to go out to?

MR. HEFTER: Hi, you gave briefly, sort of the -- what the un-weighted response rates essentially are.

I'm going to get into a little bit more about our personal interview sample selection in my presentation.

But about half of our responses come from mail, and Jennifer cited, about 10 percent of our responses come from the CATI mode.

The rest of our responses come from the personal interview mode, and we send about one-third of what is left over, after mail and CATI, to personal interview, and they do an excellent job, our field staff. They gather data for almost the entire personal interview sample.

Roughly, there is about two percent non-response that we wait -- do an awaiting adjustment for, in the end.

I'm going to throw out -- you've already asked at least two questions and this one, that can be answered.

The ACS has a very great internet page. On there is a page called 'The Quality Measures Website'. There is a slew of information about response rates, about amputation rates, about coverage rates.

So, I would encourage you all, if you're interested in the ACS, sort of what we call the operational data, or the quality measures data, to go there and take a look.

DR. SCHRETLIN: And that actually was precisely what my follow up question is, but let me just make sure I do understand.

So, then roughly 50 percent come in through the mail, another 10 percent through the telephone, and then of the remaining 40, you sample one-third of them, for an interview, and you get about 98 percent of that one-third, is that right?

MR. HEFTER: Yes, in general, that's right. On average, we send, or sample about one-third. But we use differential sampling rates, based on historical response rates.

I'll get into that a little bit more. The weighted response rates for the surveyor are what we typically cite for the public. The weighted overall survey response rate is about 98 percent, and we have weighted response rates by mode, and I'm not going to try to remember what those are.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions?

DR. SCHRETLIN: Yes, actually, I do have another question.

You mentioned -- you gave a couple of examples of uses of the ACS data, and also, is the ACS the survey that's done monthly?

DR. DAY: The ACS is -- essentially, it's all the time.

DR. SCHRETLIN: Okay, and you describe the NSF survey of college graduates, and if I heard correctly, they used the ACS data from some wave, as a basis from which to conduct a more detailed survey. Is that right?

DR. DAY: That's is correct.

DR. SCHRETLIN: So, you were able

to provide unique identifiers, so that they could follow up with people?

DR. DAY: The Censusers running the survey.

DR. SCHRETLIN: I see.

DR. DAY: Because we can't provide that, but they have been working closely with the Census Bureau, so, we developed a sample frame, and we're running the survey.

DR. SCHRETLIN: So, that is --

DR. DAY: But they wanted to come and use -- because they wanted to get through that small --

DR. SCHRETLIN: Right.

DR. DAY: -- unique group.

DR. SCHRETLIN: So, at least there is -- there is at least one instance of a case in which this Census will contract with another organization, to do a more detailed or an add-on?

DR. DAY: Yes.

DR. SCHRETLIN: Okay.

DR. DAY: But to follow up, you may -- depending on what your uses are, we contract with other agencies for doing supplements on CPS, also.

So, yes, depending on what the uses and what the real need is, sometimes, ACS may not be the best place to go to. It may be CPS or even putting questions -- follow onto SIPP, the longitudinal surveys.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions? Thank you, Jennifer. Steve?

MR. HEFTER: Hi.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: You need to get your Power Point on there? Okay, I think it's coming up, here.

MR. HEFTER: Is it up yet?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Just a couple of seconds, it should be up.

MR. HEFTER: Just let me know. As soon as I see it, we'll start.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

MR. HEFTER: Thanks for having us here. This a great opportunity for us to talk to other agencies about the American Community Survey. A lot of questions that we've been getting since the 2010 decennial Census, where everyone was saying, "Oh my God, where is our long-form data?"

Well, there is no long-form data anymore. We've been trying to be very public about that, for a lot of years, now, but some people don't pay attention until they're looking for their data.

So, this is a great opportunity to talk to you. We've talked before, to Silvia and to others who have come to the Bureau.

What I have for you is sort of a generic presentation on the ACS sample design, which I'm responsible for.

So, I'd like to be a little bit relaxed. I would encourage you to interrupt me with questions. I have one-half of my presentation that's on our Housing Unit Sample Design. The other half is on our GQ Sample Design, which I'm not sure that you're that interested in, but if you are, I can launch into that, too.

I don't have that many slides. I do have a lot of information in the slides that I do have.

I think I can still ask this. Has anyone got an ACS questionnaire in the mail, besides me? I actually sent myself one, okay.

Well, I can't do that, because you know, it's all random, so, if you're randomly selected --

MS. KARMEN: Send us one. That was the CPS one.

MR. HEFTER: Well, who cares about the CPS? I also sent myself a Census 2000 long-form. So, I'm not really sure what is going on with myself.

As Mary told you, my name is

Steven Hefter. I'm Chief of the ACS Sample Design Branch. I've been at the Bureau for a while. We're going to sort of back up to the very beginning of the survey, in terms of design.

We're going to talk about the sample design, itself, answer, maybe, some questions about our personal interview sampling, and give you some sort of statistical background, on how we select the sample, and what you can sort of infer from the estimates in the end.

I can also touch base a little bit on the weighting, if you have questions about how we weight the data in the end, although that is not my area, but I do know enough to answer maybe three questions about that.

So, sort of as an overview of my talk, I am going to touch on the Housing Unit Address Sampling, which covers the sampling frame, the sample design itself.

We made a relatively large design change for the 2011 sample selection, which I'll talk about, and we'll talk about the follow up sampling, which we've already had a question, and then as I said, the second half is on the -- our GQ sample design.

So, everything starts with our frame, as all scientific samples start with a good frame. Our frame is the Master Address File, and that is a file that's maintained by us, has been maintained since prior to the 2000 Census.

We used to go out every 10 years, and re-canvass the entire country, and build a brand new list, every 10 years.

Someone thought, and I'm not sure who, someone it would be a great idea if we maintain this list, and it is. It's a good idea, though it is a lot of work, to maintain a list of about 130-million or 140-million residential addresses.

That address list is updated

continually, and we get updates primarily through the Postal Service. They give us their delivery sequence file twice year, and that identifies all drop points in the nation.

It's a little bit different than what we would like, because it doesn't identify actual housing units. It delivers drop points on the ground, where they deliver mail.

So, we have a slew of what we call filter rules, to try to weed out the garbage, and the things that are not housing unit addresses, so, we're left with a good frame, in the end.

We also update the MAF with information from surveys that we have out in the field, including the current population survey and the American Community Survey.

So, we do pass information back to the MAF.

The design is relatively simple,

though it's intricate, if that makes sense.

We select the sample twice a year, and we call those phases. So, we have a main phase sample selection and a supplemental phase sample selection.

About 99 percent of our sample is selected in the summer preceding the sample year. In January, we get -- of the sample year, we get another delivery of the master address file addresses, and we select what we call a supplemental sample, which comprises of about one percent of our sample.

There is two reasons to do that. We want to get that new construction, essentially, it's new construction, into the sample, and we also update all the address components and the geography for the sample we selected in the summer.

So, we do this in two phases, and each phase is done in two stages. So, it is a multi-phase, multi-stage sample design.

The first stage is very simple.

The goal of the first stage sample selection is to partition our universe of addresses into five pieces.

We do this primarily because we have a requirement, currently, to un-duplicate our sample over five year periods. So, we partition the frame into five pieces and we rotate those pieces each year.

So, essentially, no address should be eligible for the ACS, more than once in any five year period, and so far, that has worked relatively well.

The way we identify addresses on the master address file, it leaves some room for some ambiguity, and we can't guarantee that no address will receive a questionnaire more than once in a five year period, but so far, it's worked very well.

We began this way back in 2004. We partitioned every county, all the addresses in each county were partitioned into bins, to five bins, and we have maintained those bins over time.

So, all the new addresses that we get on the master address file, we take a random sample, it's a systematic random sample, of 20 percent, and we just allocate those new addresses to those bins systematically.

So, we maintain that partition over time. That is the entire purpose of first-stage sampling.

An important point is that each of those five samples are a representative sample of the nation.

Our second stage sampling is where we select independent sub-samples of that first stage sample at the county level. We calculate our sampling rates anew each year.

Jennifer mentioned that the sample size, up until mid 2011, and I'll touch on that, has been about 2.9 million addresses a year.

We've said approximately 3-million, for a long time, but it's more like 2.9 million addresses every year.

Because we have a fixed sample size, and our universe of addresses on the frame grows, we need to recalculate those sampling rates each year.

So, essentially, the percent and sample shrinks a little bit each year.

Currently, we have 16 sampling rates that are assigned -- each block is assigned to a particular sampling rate, and we do that based on our estimate of occupied housing units, at the Governmental unit level, and at the tracked level, and I'm going to get a little bit more into some detail about how we do that.

DR. SCHRETLIN: Do those sampling rates, even though they vary, kind of hover around two percent of households?

MR. HEFTER: Yes, yes, I mean, I think in 2010, we had two -- approximately

2.2 percent of the addresses in sample, for the year, and I believe in 2011, it was 2.12 percent.

So, yes, it's hovered right around two percent for the last several years.

DR. SCHRETLIN: But across the 16 sampling rates, there are like 2.1 here, 2.3 there, 1.9, not two percent here, 12 percent there --

MR. HEFTER: No.

DR. SCHRETLIN: --- 40 percent --

MR. HEFTER: No, it is actually the latter. We have -- it is a differential sample design.

So, we specifically design the sample to have -- to sample some areas at higher rates, and the way we do that is -- I'm going to discuss, right now.

So, we have this -- on this slide, I'm showing what our previous sample design was. There essentially were five sampling stratum.

You'll see this term GUMOs and TRACTMOS. All that is, is our estimated occupied housing unit estimate, at the Governmental unit level, and then at the tracked level.

So, once we determine the distribution of addresses on our frame, by sampling strata, which we can do before we assign the sampling rates, because we have these thresholds, then we can calculate our base rate, which is here in stratum-1, on this slide, and then the other rates, except for stratum-5 were functions of that base rate.

So, what that allows us to do is, sort of maintain the relationship between those sampling rates over time, even though they change, proportionally, they stay the same.

We do have a fixed sampling rate for that stratum-5 at 10 percent, and that mimics sort of what long-form did, in their one and two sampling strata for Census 2000 and 1990 Census.

The ACS sample design is built directly from the ACS -- or from the Census long-form sample design. It was extracted directly from that, since ACS is a replacement for the long-form data.

So, up until this current sample year, that was how we set our sampling rates.

What we did was, last year, we took at look at how those sampling rates were performing, and the goal of the ACS is to provide equitable or estimates of equal or similar reliability across all areas.

We're a nation-wide survey. We don't target any one particular area for better estimates than another area. So, we took a look at how we were performing under those sampling rates.

What we did was look at tracked, because tracked is essentially, our unit, our geographic unit of analysis. That is sort of the -- the five year data is built around tracked estimates. The tabulation block group data that we put out every five years, while we do produce it, we caution data users, how they're going to use it and that maybe they should it as building blocks to aggregate.

So, tracked sort of becomes our geographic unit of analysis.

We looked at tracks of -- typical tracks, so, we looked at sort of average track sizes by class, and we took a look at what our hypothetical or theoretical co-efficience of variation were, giving the samples that we were seeing, and as you can see, the CV's are drastically different and as you might expect if you had a flat sampling rate, the CV's get much better, the bigger the area. The smaller the area, the CV's were very large, and that is not a good thing.

So, what we did was we increased the number of sampling strata. Smaller intervals between those strata allow sort of smoother transitions between the rates, and should, in theory, provide more equitable measures of reliability across areas of all sizes.

So, we did that and we also increased the sampling rates. We created two new fixed rate sampling strata, because those smallest Governmental units are the ones that are hurt the most, when they don't get enough sample. They are also the ones that we tend to hear from, a lot, about, "Hey, why are estimates so high, are the reliability of the CV's so high for our area?"

It is really the five year data is sort of the premier data product for the ACS.

We do put out one year data, and we do put out three year data, but it's the five year estimates that are essentially, the replacement for the long-form data.

So, what we did was, we created these strata, based on the Governmental unit measure of size, the estimated occupied housing unit count at the Governmental unit, and when I say Governmental unit, I mean sort of like incorporated place, cities that are incorporated.

We added a 15 percent sampling strata for the very smallest areas. We also added -- well, we moved the 10 percent rate to the smaller area, and then we added a seven percent rate for the in between area.

So, I think that is going to help, overall.

DR. SCHRETLIN: You keep referring to it as a small area. Do you mean low density, or actually small area?

MR. HEFTER: I mean small, in terms of the number, our estimated number of occupied housing units.

So, you can think of that as

density, in terms of occupied housing units. It also translates to density in population, when you think about it.

So, we added these fixed rate strata, beginning with the 2011 sample selection, and then we have these other 13 sampling strata that are based on our tracked -- our estimated number of housing units at the tracked level.

So, you can see, maybe you can see, although the calculations for the sampling rates are not straight forward, but they're all functions of that base rate, which we recalculate each year, because we have to target our sample size, whatever that fixed sample size is.

You'll see in strata-6, 8, 10, etcetera, there is an HR after that. That indicates the sampling rate for blocks in tracks with high response rates.

So, before we went to full implementation in 2005, we had a flat one and three CAPI sampling rate, and we decided at that time, to develop a differential CAPI sampling rate. But we had this constraint to stay cost neutral, because no one was giving us extra money.

So, the way we paid for the additional sampling for the personal interview mode of data collection was to reduce the initial sample in the highest responding areas.

So, we've carried that theory ahead, and we are able to reduce the initial sample size, in the highest responding tracks, and when I say highest responding, I mean in terms of their mail CATI cooperation rates.

We have lots of definitions for response rates, cooperation rates, return rates, and what we're looking at here is the combined mail and CATI cooperation or return rate.

So, we're able to tweak the

sample allocation, based on historical response rates, which is a good thing, and what that leads to is what we see on the right, is our new stratification and how that affects tracks of typical size.

And clearly, we've made big gains in equatability between tracks of differing sizes. Clearly, in the smallest track size category from zero to 400, they're going to have higher CV's, unless we have a sample of, oh, I don't know, 8-million per year or so.

But for the other track categories, we see, they're all in line, and they're all 30 percent or less, which in the design world, for us anyway, 30 percent CV becomes sort of a key metric. We would like all of our CV's to be 30 percent or under.

So, we feel as if this design worked very well. In fact, so well that we implemented it for the 2011 sample selection.

DR. HUNT: I know you've got it by class, but just overall, what is the average track? I have no idea.

MR. HEFTER: The average track is about 2,000 -- about 2,500 occupied housing units, about 4,000 people.

DR. HUNT: So, the --

MR. HEFTER: Somewhere around there.

DR. HUNT: So, the fixed sampling rates are really for pretty tiny areas?

MR. HEFTER: The very, very tiniest tracks, and there are very few of them, actually, but if we don't give them additional sample, their estimates are terrible. So, that answers your question.

I am skipping over one data collection mode, because it really is not statistical, at all.

So, we do have mail. Jennifer mentioned, we have computer assisted telephone interviews.

So, sort of the flow is, and there was a question already, the ACS is a monthly sample, because when we select a sample, we allocate all the addresses for the year, randomly, to each of the 12 months of the year.

So, each month really is an independent sample of itself. We mail in month one, and about 95 percent of the sample is mail-able. About five percent of the sample has addresses that we deem un-mailable, that the post office can't deliver.

In month two, we -- everything that we can get a phone number for, that's mail-non-respondent, goes to telephone interviewing, and in month three, we select a sample for personal interview, and that's just for one panel.

So, in any given month, there are three data collection modes happening, for three separate panels, and we're always in the field, as Jennifer mentioned. We're always mailing. We're always in the telephone center, and it really is a continuous survey.

Now, for personal interviewing, we do select a sample, and that's primarily to increase sampling efficiency. It's really expensive to knock on people's doors, and you don't really get the benefit, if you go to all the non-respondents.

The cost variance trade-off is skewed towards to cost side, if you go to all the respondents.

So, we sample for non-response, and that had always been the plan, with the ACS. We also sample all non-mailable or un-mailable addresses, that five percent of the sample that we can't mail to. They also go to CAPI, and we sample those, but we sample those at a rate of about two and three.

So, they get a higher sampling rate than the rest of the universe, which let me tell you, what those sampling rates are.

The way we determine that is at the tracked level. So, we look back a historic ACS mail CATI response rates or return rates, and we assign every track to a CAPI sampling stratum, or rate, and those rates are one and two, one and three, two and five and that two and three rate for the un-mailable addresses.

So, there was a lot of research done in 2004, about what sort of the optimal CAPI sampling rates are, or would be, what we could afford to do, and what makes sense.

We don't want to make the ACS so complicated that it's hard to explain, and that sometimes, we found that over-complication doesn't really increase -- we don't really get a lot of benefits.

So, this has been the design, since 2005, and we have gone back and revisited, and re-assigned tracks to CAPI sampling strata, based on the ACS response rates that were seen.

So, we've done that once in 2008, re-assigned tracks, and we'll do that again, too, after Census 2010, actually, for our 2012 sample selection, which happens in a few months, we will re-allocate tracks to sampling strata.

Actually, that concludes the housing unit sample design, at least the 20,000 foot view.

I can stop here and take questions. I can launch into the group quarter sample design, whichever the group prefers.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any questions, at this point?

Okay, I think you can just proceed.

MR. HEFTER: Okay, sure.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: David, did you want to ask a questions? Go ahead, okay.

DR. SCHRETLIN: All right, all right, are households private residences? What if someone is like in an assisted living facility or jail, or something like that?

MR. HEFTER: What a great segue to group quarters. Those are group quarters.

DR. SCHRETLIN: You can thank me for that.

MR. HEFTER: Yes, you would think we met beforehand, right? But thank you very much. You're like my Ed McMahon, today.

GQ's, what are GQ's? We do select a sample of GQ's and interview persons in group quarters.

Here is the first part of the definition of what a GQ is. I'm not going to read it all.

But essentially, it's a place where people live together that's not a private housing unit, and they share some common living arrangement.

I gave the definition -- or the link at the bottom of the page, if you want to click through, or I guess, you would have to type it in, to find the full definition of what a group quarter is.

But essentially, those are correction institutions. We actually have major group quarters types. We have detailed types within these major groups, but we have these major groups here, correctional institutions, juvenile facilities, nursing homes, other long-term care facilities, college dorms, Military and other non-institutional GQ's, sort of a catch-all category.

Why do we include these in the ACS? Well, we're a replacement for the Census 2000 long-form.

We also have committed to providing estimates for the total population, not just of the household population.

So, the group quarters population is not insignificant. In Census 2000, there were about 7.8 million people in GQ's. I don't know what the 2010 estimate, or the 2010 count is, from the Census, but you can find it later, if you'd like.

The ACS estimate from 2007 was about 8.2 million people in GQ's. So, it's important that we include those.

The other important thing to remember about people in GQ's is by nature, they're clustered. So, we have a prison, and geographically, those prisoners are clustered, and it's very important for that local area, to have a good estimate of their total pop. That means we have to include those GQ people.

As I said there on the slide, it can be a very large component for total pop for some small areas, and in fact, we have some areas where it's by far, the majority of the population.

So, the current design is to produce these robust state level estimates of characteristic -- of the characteristics of the GQ resident population, at the state level.

Our design currently can support

state by major GQ type group characteristic estimates, those seven groups that I showed on the previous slide, and there are some similarities to the housing unit sample.

It's a two-phase sample. We identify GQ's where we will conduct interviews. We select the small GQ's. We actually have a concept of small and large GQ's. Large GQ is anything that we believe has 16 or more people, and small GQ's, 15 or less.

We sample them differently. We sample large GQ's proportional to size, and we sample small GQ's just -- we sample the GQ themselves, just based on the unit.

The way we do GQ sampling is, we select independent samples by state. The small GQ's, we do a similar first-stage sampling, as we do on the housing unit side, to only allow small GQ's to be in sample once every five years.

That primarily was a respondent

burden issue. We really didn't want to go back to these very tiny GQ's, year after year after year, and although we let large GQ's be eligible for sample every year, we still hear about the respondent burden issues from the large GQ's.

There are some large GQ's where we go every month of the year. They want to know why and we explain to them, why. I mean, the ACS is designed to capture the seasonality.

Now, as we move through time, we're finding that there are some GQ populations that aren't that seasonal. Federal prisoners, doesn't really matter what month you go.

So, we're learning, as we go, and we may make modifications to the sample design in terms of when we go to a particular GQ.

We do a systematic sample selection, just like on the housing unit side, and up until 2008, we used a flat sampling rate of 2.5 percent. In 2008, we modified those sampling rates, so that we could provide robust state level estimates.

There are some very small states, in terms of their GQ population, Wyoming, Vermont, well, the small states in general have small GQ populations.

So, we assigned specific GQ sampling rates to each state, and they range from about two percent to about 7.8 percent, and I think I've already covered that slide.

We have lots of challenges with our GQ sample design. In the end, we end up selecting about 200,000 people that are interviewed every year, or where we attempt an interview every year, in GQ's. It's a relatively complex operation, to collect the data at group quarters, as maybe you might envision, and it's also a two step process, where we select a certain number of interviews to conduct at the GQ.

When they go, they get the current population size and input it into the laptop and the laptop spits out the line numbers, based on the current pop and the number of interviews that we've selected, and actually, the instrument does the sub-sampling for us.

So, that is the -- the instrument takes care of the sub-sampling at the GQ, itself, but there is a lot of issues around data collection, around contact, around security issues, finger printing, background checks, when they go to Federal prisons, or prisons that manage Federal prisoners.

One of my biggest challenges, responsible for the sample design is, you know, the sample design is just not working.

For the smaller areas, we're just not representative enough. What happens is that because the samples -- the percent -- sorry, because the sampling rate is so tiny, there are GQ's in particular areas, we skip over, but that is the only GQ in the county, and when the ACS puts out a zero GQ pop estimate, and the Mayor or the local official looks out their window and says, "I see the prison. I know it's not zero," we have to go tell them how the sample designs works.

But it's not working. We have a lot of constraints on the GQ sample design, itself. So, we want to produce those robust state level characteristic estimates, while we want to be representative at the track level, and we only have 'x' number of dollars, and it's very expensive to do the GQ interviewing, which all happens in the field.

Right now, the National Academy of Science, the Committee on National Statistics is looking at all things ACS/GQ statistical related.

So, they're under contract with the Census Bureau to review all of our statistical methodology having to do with GQ's. They've come out with their first report, which was just a very cursory -- do we understand the problem, type report.

Their second report is due out in October, and we hope that based on their recommendations, and the work that we're doing in-house, in 2013, the goal is to field a new GQ sample design. But that research is happening, as we speak, and I'm ahead of myself, again.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom, did you have a question?

MR. HARDY: Yes, I had a quick question. Did you have any sense of the cost per interview, what it costs you to get a person out there, do this, on one interview?

MR. HEFTER: I'll give you a range, and don't quote me, because I'll deny it. It's between about $150 and $200.

It's expensive to do GQ interviewing, especially as things like gas prices go up, and the field representatives have to drive to some of these very isolated prisons, for an example.

Travel costs become a big concern. It doesn't take them that long to do the interviews, once they're there, but the leg-work to get there and to conduct -- there is sort of a front half of the interview, where they call the GQ and they try to set up the appointments, and that can be time consuming, as well.

DR. SCHRETLIN: How long does the actual interview, typically take?

MR. HEFTER: I think we say it takes about the same time as the housing unit side of 35 to 40 minutes. Again, yes, I don't know, off the top of my head, but that's relatively good guess, yes.

MR. HARDY: One more follow up question.

MR. HEFTER: Yes, sure.

MR. HARDY: The interviewers, do you have any standards or requirements for a person doing the interview and what kind of training do they have to have?

MR. HEFTER: Yes, I believe they have to be U.S. citizens.

We try to recruit, like on the housing unit side, we try to recruit FR's, field representatives from the local area, that know the area. We have a permanent workforce.

So, that's one of the things that we try to get across to data users and stakeholders a lot, is that -- and I'm just going to segue or digress for one second, and I'll get back to your -- the second part of your question.

Although we have higher sampling variance than the Census 2000 long-form, we think that we have a lower non-sampling error component, a lot of that driven by our permanent work force.

So, in Census 2000, we mailed, just like we do in the ACS, but the non-respondents were followed up by a temporary workforce, just like the Census is.

They come in for six or eight weeks, and they do their job and they leave.

So, the ACS has about 3,000 or so permanent field reps in the field, and that is their full-time job, and that is what they do every day, all day. I mean, they might have a night job, that I'm not aware of, but we like to think, and it's been proven in some studies, that the non-response error due to that permanent workforce is a lot lower than what we saw in Census 2000.

Yes, they do have special training. All field representatives have several days of training. They work test cases. Their work is Q-Ced. They have to report back to their supervisor for the first 'x' weeks. I don't know how long that is. So, there is training and there is oversight, and not just of the GQ FR's. In fact, the FR's work both group quarters and housing unit cases.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I have kind of a follow up question on that.

When Jennifer was speaking earlier, there was a question about whether you do special runs for other agencies, that type of thing. I don't remember what the question was, and the answer was 'yes'.

Do the --- have you ever used FR's to do any special request like that, for any agency?

MR. HEFTER: Well, the FR's that we have in the field do lots of different surveys. They work on CPS. They work on American Housing Survey, I believe. They work on ACS. Some of them -- well, I don't think they worked on Census, but I'm not sure. So, the answer is yes.

DR. DAY: We do surveys for other agencies, and so, yes, the FR's will work on those, too, if that is what you're getting at, because we have this field staff that's all over the United States, and they're very well trained, and so, we do contract with other agencies, to do surveys.

MR. HEFTER: We also do special censuses, communities and cities and -- have -- they pay us, to do special censuses, not special ACS surveys, but censuses, and I believe it's that same workforce that does that special -- those special censuses.

They may have to hire a few more FR's, as they go, but --

DR. SCHRETLIN: But the folks that are hired temporarily are for the Census, not for the ACS --

MR. HEFTER: Correct.

DR. SCHRETLIN: -- or these -- are all the CAPI interviews done by the permanent field reps, for these surveys?

MR. HEFTER: Yes.

DR. SCHRETLIN: Okay.

MR. HEFTER: Yes.

DR. DAY: We have three CAPI centers, for the most part, Jeffersonville, Indiana, one in Hagerstown, Maryland and one in Tucson, Arizona.

MR. HEFTER: That's CATI.

DR. DAY: Excuse me, CATI. I keep saying the wrong word, CATI centers. So, those are also permanent staff.

MR. HEFTER: We have 12 regional offices, and there is a permanent workforce assigned to each one of those regional offices, and they do all our CAPI interviews.

One thing that I did not put in my presentation, because I wasn't aware of it at the time that I wrote the presentation, I was aware that in the President's FY11 budget, there was a request for additional monies for the ACS to increase our sample size.

We had requested an increase to $3.54 million a year. Personally, I had no hope that we were getting that money. We got it.

In June of this year, we

increased our sample to the $3.54 million level. So, we begin mailing at that level in June, and then in August, we start the field work for that corresponding June panel.

So, that's a big deal. We worked for a long time, to get our sample size increased, to do all the leg-work and the research showing what the increase in reliability would be, given different levels of sample size, and so, that begins June of this year. It's exciting, if you do what I do, and that's actually the end of my presentation.

I have a question slide up, but I don't think we need that, because we're all comfortable asking questions. Did you have one?

DR. GIBSON: I did. I find myself continually interested in the basis for the sampling frames, and you use United States Postal Service, which I thought was very intriguing.

MR. HEFTER: Well, we use that in conjunction with other things. I mean, the math was built --

DR. GIBSON: Right.

MR. HEFTER: -- first, on an independent listing from the Census address canvassing, and Census 2010 address canvassing updated that list, also.

It's those updates in between censuses that we get primarily from the Postal Service, and they're really good at giving us new construction, because they identify new addresses that have new drop points. So, I don't think you're done, I'm sorry.

DR. GIBSON: No, that's okay. That actually was more clarifying part of my question.

My question was going to be, how does compare, or do you know, can they let -- will they let you compare, you know, how does that address listing or that individual listing match up with, for example, maybe what the IRS would have, or some other group that has an interest in tracking every person in their location, or every family location?

MR. HEFTER: There is an administrative records area at the Census Bureau. I don't know if they've done that match. I believe they have, and I don't know what those results are.

I'd like to think that the master address file is pretty darn complete. What we find is that over time, what we found is, as we moved away from the 2000 Census, we had more and more, what I call garbage. It's probably not the PC term.

But we had more and more bad addresses, non-residential addresses, duplicates in our sampling frame, for a couple of reasons.

One big reason is that we, when we -- I mentioned that we have a set of filter rules. So, we don't just take everything in the master address file, because it contains residential, non-residential, group quarters, businesses, they're all in the master address file.

So, we have to come up with a set of rules that identify what we think are the good residential housing units.

We, the ACS, and other surveys that I've worked on, always err on the side of duplication, or over-coverage as opposed to under-coverage.

So, if I have a choice, and I mean, I'd rather have a perfect frame, but if I have a choice, I'd rather have a duplicate on the frame than have it missing, all together.

I'd rather have it have two probabilities of selection and not account for it in the weighting, than have it not be eligible at all, for sample selection, and what we found is as we moved away from the 2000 Census, we had about five percent over-coverage in our frame, in, I think that was 2009.

But what we saw, after the 2010 Census, is what we were hoping to see, was a big clean up of our master address file and of our sampling frame.

So, it was a pretty big deal for the ACS, too. So, we get pushed aside a little bit during Census time, because they're a pretty big animal and they have one job, and they only have one time to do it.

We can make continual improvements in the ACS, but we also reap the benefits of all of that work, too.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: David?

DR. SCHRETLIN: This was a fantastic presentation. Thank you so much. I really appreciate it. This has been incredibly illuminating, and one of the questions that I have, when you have worked with other organizations who have contracted with you to do some particular study, like the NSF, can you -- I assume you have the flexibility of working with the group, so that you might take bin number one, instead of all five bins of a survey sample.

In other words, you said that at a county level, that the population is divided into five bins, and that each of those is representative. They're fully representative --

MR. HEFTER: Right.

DR. SCHRETLIN: -- of that county. MR. HEFTER: Right.

DR. SCHRETLIN: So, would it be possible, for an external organization to contract with you, to do a sub-sample of the ACS survey, tack on questions or a follow up survey, or something like that? Is that a possibility?

MR. HEFTER: It is a possibility, and the survey and the Census Bureau has developed sort of a set of criteria that we would consider.

Maybe Jennifer knows more, but I know that NSF worked with us for quite a while. In fact, we did a content test, to test the field of degree question, and then it was added to the ACS questionnaire, beginning in 2010?

DR. DAY: Two-thousand-nine.

MR. HEFTER: Two-thousand-nine. So, I'm not the right person to talk to about that, but I can put you in touch with the management of the survey. But it's certainly a possibility.

DR. DAY: Our Demographic Surveys Division is the group that does surveys for other areas, and they also run the CSP. In fact, ACS used to be there, when we considered it a survey, but then once it became more of an ACS -- a decennial product, it moved to another area in the Bureau.

So, they do all the surveys and they would be the ones that I'll put you in touch with. ACS, as I mentioned, has many criteria, as to whether or not you can use ACS.

There are other surveys, which piggy-back on, too. It depends on what your needs are and what you're looking for, remembering that data that we collect are under Title 13.

So, as -- you know, we had a few people from SSA come visit us a few weeks ago, to kind of look at, you know, what do the occupation data look like? We had to square them in, where we take this very seriously, they're sworn for life, never to reveal what they saw.

But we do take that very seriously. So, we can run surveys for you, but we can't always tell you, you know, who we talked to or identify -- we want to protect who we talk to, because we have -- everybody has a best interest. We want to collect the data, and we want to make sure that people know that their data is confidential.

MR. HEFTER: Yes, and we also want to minimize respondent burden, too. We don't want to go back to the same people, you know, for the ACS, and then for multiple surveys after that.

I think we also have a vested interest, to not shine a bad light on the ACS. So, we want to be able to go back, you know, and be in the community and collect ACS data, without people saying, "Well, if I fill out the ACS, I might be in another survey, too. I'm not going to do it." So, these are all considerations.

DR. HUNT: Can I ask you a speculative question? I think it's, well, for both of you, I guess.

But so, if is SSA had an interest in locating specific work content, out in the U.S. economy, and I mean, I understand you can't tell us who said it or where they're employed, but how could you use the ACS to guide us, either -- well, I guess it would have to be geographically, where to look for or how to find particular occupation that we're looking for, assuming we need to send field staff out to examine those actual work activities?

DR. DAY: One possible option is special tabulation. We'd have to see if we can get it. We have a Disclosure Review Board that makes sure that we don't do tabs that you can pinpoint people.

But we do collect, as you know, information on occupation, and we ask people where they work.

So, we can run tabulations on workplace geography by occupation, and I don't know how far -- what small geography we can publish that at, and give you a -- so, we could give you a tabulation, which you could then pinpoint well, the people who have this kind of occupation seem to be in this kind of geography.

So, then if you wanted a sample from that, that would be one possibility, of not having to go back through, running a survey through us.

MR. HEFTER: The other possibility is to -- is to run a survey through us --

DR. DAY: Yes.

MR. HEFTER: -- as a reimbursable survey, with all the constraints and bells and whistles that go with that.

Maybe, what I'm hoping is -- because we've talked a few times now, and to be honest with you, I'm still fuzzy on what it is, you're trying to accomplish sometimes and how you think -- I understand, because I run into the same issue, where I know that like, there is all this juicy information and how can I use that? I mean, I run into that at work, myself, in my job.

But maybe after this discussion, you can formalize your thoughts, and maybe even provide sort of levels of options, you know, "This is really what we would like, but we would be okay with this," and then, you know, "If we only could get this, we would be," -- and if you could write that, and maybe then, we could respond to it in that form.

Because it's very hard to -- verbally, we keep having these sort of conversations, and I don't always know how to answer you, and I'm not always the person to answer those questions, either.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

DR. SANCHEZ: This is more of -- it's not really a question about your presentation, but more asking for your insights or suggestions.

We know that most of the disability cases seem to be associated with the under-privileged, and I wonder if you have any suggestions, in terms of how do you sample that population, the population of the under-privileged, that go from job to job, who do useful jobs?

Do you have any insights on what is the best way to reach those folks?

MR. HEFTER: Create a really good frame. I don't. I don't. I'm not aware of, you know, other information that might be out there, for you to use, although, you know, as I start thinking maybe -- maybe there are other Federal agencies out there, that have that information, that they can share that with you, I don't really know, off the top of my head.

DR. SANCHEZ: Because as you're aware, we're talking about, you know, addresses that are no longer valid, duplicated addresses. I was thinking there's probably lots of those folks that fall in that category --

MR. HEFTER: Yes.

DR. SANCHEZ: -- that move from apartment to apartment, who get evicted, who

--

MR. HEFTER: You know something? Usually, surveys in the past have used phone screeners to try to identify those populations, and then go for a personal visit.

But I mean, as we know, I know, telephone is not working as it used to, because of the advent of cell phones, and no one has a land line and you can never be sure who you're getting or who it's linked to, which is really interesting.

A lot of surveys are moving back to address based sampling, which we've always done, you know. So, it's really interesting that they're coming back, you know. Everyone went to phone surveys for a while, but --

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Other questions? I have a couple of questions.

You both have talked quite a bit about respondent burden, for GQ and CATI and all, what not, and it's impressive, your

3,000 people out in the field collecting data, and you also use the multi-modal data collection.

I was wondering if -- I'm assuming it goes from probably the most efficient to the most expensive.

Do you keep information, in terms of costs that are available to the public, in terms of each mode of data collection, and also, I'm interested in the data quality, from each mode of data collection, particularly the fact that you do have so many people out in the field, and that it is the most expensive, and the data quality of that, compared to the other modes.

MR. HEFTER: Yes, we have a -- in my area, I have a rough idea of what it costs for each mode. So, I mean, again, don't quote me because it's always hard for even me, to get accurate cost data that is recent.

So, it's about $12 to $15 to mail. I'm trying to remember what it is for

CATI. I don't remember that number, so, I'm not even going to try to quote it. It's about -- it had been about $130 to $140 for CAPI, and then there was -- it's like $160, if someone goes through all three data collection modes.

But again, I know those numbers are relatively old, and if you really want that, I would get it for you, from the management of the survey.

So, in terms of data quality, what -- because there is lots of definitions for what quality is. I would have to know what you meant.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Well, when you compare the data across the different modes?

MR. HEFTER: You're assuming we've done a mode study, a mode study, yes. We haven't really conducted a lot of analysis into the differences between modes.

That is something that is coming.

It's moving up on the priority list, in terms of research. There have been a lot of things that the ACS has had to accomplish, since we fought for funding to replace the long-form through 2005/2006, we're so new.

I mean, in terms of Federal, statistical system, we are the baby on the block. We really are new.

So, a lot of research that has gone into the last couple of years, just to get the survey up and running, and you know, off the ground and working, doing assessments of what is -- what we think is the most important.

But that is something that a lot of people at the Census Bureau, in the ACS in particular, have championed that case, that we need to start doing that, and it's going to become really interesting, because we're just finishing up our internet test, and that goal is soon, to hopefully go into production with an internet instrument.

So, there will be four data collection modes. So, that is an important piece of research.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you for your time. I know we're over, so, I appreciate that you came and stayed a little bit over.

This was incredibly valuable to the Panel. Lot of heads nodding, very, very good information.

We appreciate your time. We know that you've met with us before, in terms of the Panel, one of our Panel members and also, SSA, and with a lot of heads nodding, I am sure there will be more communication in the future.

So, at this point, we'll take a break and come back at 10:30 a.m.

MR. HEFTER: Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at approximately

10:10 a.m. and resumed at approximately 10:30 a.m.)

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: If the Panel would please take their seats.

Okay, the meeting is back on the record, and at this point, I would like to have the different subcommittee reports. Allan, if you would maybe just indicate who is on the Research Subcommittee and just provide a copy of your report, or a review of your report.

DR. HUNT: Okay, the Research Subcommittee was reorganized, so to speak, in December, when it reconstituted after Mark Wilson's departure, and the current plan is, we basically -- members are Shanan, myself, Abigail and David.

And we decided that the way we could make ourselves most useful to SSA, was by essentially, making ourselves available for one-on-one consultations in our areas of expertise.

So, rather than, you know, set series of meetings or other activities, we simply, you know, wait for a phone call or an email that says, "I've got an issue I'd like to explore with you."

And as of Tuesday's meeting, we had sort of a qualitative evaluation meeting, to talk about this from SSA's staff point of view and our point of view, and as far as I can tell, everyone was delighted with this arrangement. It seems to be meeting the needs of SSA, not burdening members of the Research Subcommittee with unnecessary meetings or involvement in issues that they don't necessarily want to know more about, but yet, can provide the expertise needed on demand.

So, at least for the interim period, I think it's functioning very well.

We can cite some examples, if you want more detail, but I don't know that that's -- as Shanan says, it's not like it's a secret. You know, we're not doing anything that's not part of the general activities of the SSA staff.

So, we're supporting them, as best we can.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, are there any members who would like further detail or any information, that would provide that greater detail? Any other questions of Allan?

Okay, thank you, and Janine, if you would give us the User Needs and Relation Subcommittee report.

MS. HOLLOMAN: Thank you. Our committee is made up of our two Co-Chairs, myself and Shanan Gibson and Members Deborah Lechner, Tom Hardy and Robert Fraser.

The User Needs and Relations Subcommittee has held one teleconference call this quarter, on March 10, 2011. At that time, it was agreed to table further meeting until the project team completed their work on the OIS research and development plan.

However, at that meeting, we reviewed the draft of a newsletter article with updated information on the OIS project, that included answers to frequently asked questions.

The approval has just been given for the publication of that newsletter.

Presentations have also continued to stakeholder organizations, including the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals and the National Association of Disability representatives.

At a subcommittee meeting held on Wednesday, May 3rd, the group discussed assisting the project team in completing the next newsletter and addressing the needs to keep stakeholder organizations informed of the progress of the project, in light of the current budget constraints and travel restrictions.

We will be exploring the

possibility of webinars and other methods, other than face-to-face presentations.

The subcommittee remains committed to assisting SSA in ensuring that all stakeholders remain informed and that accurate information on the project be disseminated in a timely manner.

We also remain committed to assisting and addressing all appropriate concerns in a timely and professional manner.

To that end, we invite and welcome feedback from participants in the audience today, some of whom we've already heard from and thank them for their input, also, feedback from those listening telephonically or those reading the transcript at a later date, or any other interested person to share questions, concerns and ideas, as we move forward, we will address them as they come in and we remain dedicated to that end. Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

Are there any comments or questions? Anything else by the Co-Chair, any members of the Panel?

Okay, thank you, Janine, and Deb, if you would give us the report on the Subcommittee for Job Analysts.

MS. LECHNER: Thanks, Mary. We have met, had two telephonic meetings, one on March 23rd and one on April 27th, and just to remind and update everyone about the mission of the subcommittee is basically to provide advice and feedback to Social Security Administration, as it develops its process for job analysis, as well as for developing the process for training and certification of job analysts.

What we've done, primarily, at this point, is to provide feedback on Call Order 001 and 002, that is being carried out by ICF.

Call Order 001 is the -- the purpose of Call Order 001 is just to develop, or do a review of the methodologies and provide feedback and recommendations to SSA, on the methodology that would be used for job analysis.

And we provided initial feedback to ICF's responses to Call Order 001, and on the call on March 23rd, we were able to receive responses from ICF, to our feedback.

And what we've seen from ICF, in terms of work product, at this point, we've seen sort of an outline of what will be their final report, sort of a table of contents outline.

We've seen a sample of the type of information that they will provide to us and we have seen their criteria, by which they will evaluate each of the job analysis methodologies.

So, and I think the report for Call Order 001, I believe it's due at the end of June.

Then Call Order 002 addresses the

certification of the job analyst, and we've seen a preliminary report from Call Order 002. They identified different approaches to certifications, so, they pointed out that you could have a certification just of attendance or you could have a certification, sort of an assessment based certification, and then there are personnel type or professional certifications, and they're recommending that SSA provide, or look at the assessment based certifications, which obviously make most sense, because it addresses both the training and the certification process.

They're also recommending that SSA's certification process for analysts be approved by an objective third party, and they mentioned a couple of the -- couple of different certification bodies, one is the American Society of Testing and Materials, ASTM, and the other one is the Institute for Credentialing Experts -- Excellence, ICE.

They laid out about nine different areas that both of these certification bodies addressed, and they showed -- they provided tables that compares the certification criteria that have been laid out by each of these organizations.

In reviewing that information, it's pretty clear that both of these organizations are very consistent and -- in terms of their qualifications, requirements to be certified, to certify analysts.

So, each of them addressed structure, management, policies and procedures, QA, record document management, provision of training, assessing outcomes and how certificates are issued.

So, it's just kind of, the certifying body's address all of the operational procedures that are relative to certification.

So, that's -- we've reviewed that information. I think the committee felt very

-- the subcommittee felt very positive about what's being produced from Call Order 002 and that is, it's good feedback for SSA. That's all I have.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Are there any questions of Deb?

Okay, thank you, and the members of that subcommittee are you and Shanan and Bob, okay.

So, we are running early. That is kind of nice, to be able to say that.

So, at this point, we are ready for the OVRD presentation on the content model and the disability evaluation construct inventory, and the -- Sylvia KARMEN and Mark Trapani are going to be providing that information.

So, as we all know, I don't think I need to read Sylvia's biography, here, but she is the Project Director and then, we have Mark Trapani, who is the Senior Analyst. So, the PowerPoint is up, great. Thank you, Sylvia.

MS. KARMEN: All right, thank you. So, one of the things that I think is going to be really helpful for us, in making this presentation, when we realized, putting together the slides, that this is actually the first activity that we're going to report on, that ran through -- that was put through the business process.

So, it gives us an opportunity to kind of go through that, especially for some of the Panel members who -- to whom this is going to be completely new, not only the activity itself, but the business process that we use to get there, and for those people who are either in the room listening or listening on the phone.

So, let me move to the next slide. So, one of the first things that we took note of was once again, having to get back at looking at what -- how do we want to define a content model, and you know, the fact that we did that, actually flows from the fact that we had a business process.

It's not that we didn't think of that before, but the manner in which we were able to come at this with a bit more clarity, I think, assisted us, because of the business process.

So, you know, when I'm saying that the presentation is going to give us an opportunity to do two things, one, you know, not just to describe the work that has been completed toward the development of content model, you know, to the Panel and those attending the Panel meeting, it also gives us an opportunity to show people how the business process has assisted us in that.

And given the concerns that were raised in September, I think the business process really has been a pretty key factor, in helping us reorient our approach, not only in terms of the process by which we conduct the work and do the work, but also, it assisted us, not just in process, but also in methodology, and you know, honestly, that is the purpose, really, for the business process.

So, I promise you that the next few presentations that we make, we won't need to go through the business process, but I just thought, you know, we might take this opportunity to do that.

So, let me just, I guess, stay with the definition, here.

So, one of the things that we first came to in developing the initial documentation for this under the business process for phase one, which is pretty much, a high level -- or a conceptual model of what the activity is suppose to entail, and the first thing you want to be asking yourself, is, you know, what exactly are you trying to do, and that often leads to questions having to do with, well, let -- you know, definitions.

I mean, we've all done that, yes, I know, Tom is certainly acknowledging that.

So, what we came to was that the content model will be, you know, a totality of constructs, that will form the basis of the new OIS.

So, really, you know, we looked high and low for a number of definitions, you know, all over the place, but for our purposes, this is how we're going to define it.

It is then, really, a blue print of the items and scales and measures that SSA will need to be reflected, ultimately in the work analysis instrument, and then job analysts, or you know, through some process and right -- obviously, we certainly think that we're going to need to be using job analysts to go out to sites, to either interview or observe, or both, would use that instrument then, to conduct the work analysis.

All these things seem very self-evident, but they have quite a bit of meaning, once you start looking at, well, how are you going to develop the thing?

Then, of course, the data from those work analyses would then populate the OIS.

The point being here that we had to very clear in our documentation, in our development for the methodology then, that the object of analysis here, the thing that we're actually going to be looking at, is work and then that led us to make the conclusion that while there were -- it's very important for us to consider what SSA's needs are, SSA's needs frequently, with regard to evaluating a claimant, involves medical evidence, functional evidence and occupational evidence of what they've done, so, the work they've done, as well as, you know, other work in the economy.

And so, we needed to make that

distinction and make it very clear in the development for the content model, work taxonomy. The work taxonomy tends to be sort of the generic language that we were finding in literature. So, we find ourselves using that language a lot.

Oh, and I guess another point here, that -- that last bullet, that the content model itself really cannot be finished until you have gathered data.

So, there is this, I think, a need for all of us to understand that while we put forward theoretically, what the taxonomy will -- what we intend for the taxonomy to contain, until we've gathered the data, you really can't finalize it, because it is through the data collection, the instrument testing, the testing of, you know, how that works in our process, what will finally remain in the taxonomy, and then, what SSA will continue to include in its instruments.

So, no matter what we're putting out, you know, in terms of what we lay out into the public or before the Panel, or both, with regard to content model, before we've actually gathered data, it will always be theoretical.

I mean, to a large degree, there won't be a way around that, until we get data back. So, those things will always be subject to the iterative process.

All right, so, the actual project activities involved here, so, again, I'm going to take this opportunity to sort of use the DEC inventory development, which is a piece of content model development, to explain the process that we went through.

You know, so, for phase one, which I mentioned, is a conceptual outline of what we intend to do, it required -- you know, it would require a team, or a sub-group of folks in OVRD, or an analyst, to identify the basic elements of what he or she would need to consider in developing the phase two, or the study design.

And so, you know, what types of things would you need to be considering, to get you to even to study design, and you know, obviously first, what's the purpose? What's the objective of the whole activity? What are some of the key research questions? What are the assumptions, and we're going to talk about the assumptions that we had.

You know, what background work might we need to conduct, just so that we know how to develop the study design, you know, because there is work that has to be done, for the activity itself, but in this case, at this phase, we're talking about what work do we need to do, what reading do we need to do, who do we need to talk with? What questions do we need to be asking, before we can even get to study design?

You know, just to switch gears here for a minute, a really good example of that are the presentations that the Panel has had now, for the past two days.

Hearing from Census. Hearing from BLS. Hearing from ETA and O*NET, are examples of background work that Social Security needs to do, either with the Panel or without the Panel. In this case, it's with the Panel, to build on -- do that phase one work, in essence, that would then lead to phase two, for perhaps, sampling design. You know, so, whatever study design we may need to have in place for that.

So, just to give you a sense of what work may be involved in a phase one document, while it may be a piece of paper, there could be a whole lot work that goes on behind what you need to get there.

Other things that we -- so far, when we have developed our phase one documents, lots of things that have been very important to me to see, as a project manager, I want to know, you know, what is the estimated time line, you know, so that we can kind of synch that up with other activities that we have because, of course, everyone has limited resources, so, it's good for you to know, you know, who is going to need to be doing what, at what point?

What kind of expertise do we think this will, you know, require? Do we think we're going to need a statistician? Do we think we're going to need, you know, program expertise? You know, what is it?

So, we have the individuals on our team, who have that kind of background available to us, or if we need to go obtain that kind of expertise or assistance elsewhere in Richard's office, or perhaps, elsewhere in the agency, or you know, if need be, given the type of activity it is, perhaps hire someone or whatever.

And then, in terms of outcomes, that's also something that I think we have to be really clear about is, what would the final product look like? You know, what is it that you're trying to build or do or what's the end result needing to be?

In many cases, it's probably going to be a report, but report of what, and what does it -- what are the -- what are we anticipating doing with it? You know, that really, in many ways, drives what the method needs to be, because you need to be able to plug it into something else, going down the road.

So, the other feature of this is, in terms of developmental activity, is the consultative piece, which I think is another portion of the business process that's been very helpful to us, in the sense that that has, I think, enabled the other project components, the Panel, the OIS development work group, and you know, other entities within Social Security, fore example, that we may need to consult with, or at least to obtain their approval, for example, if it requires approval by our General Counsel, you know, we need to have consultation with those individuals, as we're moving along.

And you know, in the case of phase one, we did that. We've done phase one documents and things within -- a number of times with, you know, individual Panel members and discussions with you all.

So, to the extent that you have participated in that, that's sort of the two parts -- there are two parts to the business process.

One is the developmental work that the staff does, and then also, the consultation that informs that work is a very critical part of it, and I think the benefit of us has been that I think it's a lot more clear, when we go to a person or a group, like work group or the Panel, that they know when they get a phase one, what it's about, you know, and what it's not.

That it is not a study design.

You know, that you don't open up the document and you're thinking, "Why is this not here? Why is that not here," you know, or that if you do get a phase two and it's a study design, you know exactly what we're intending there, and so, if something is missing, that's going to be a really important part of the conversation.

So, I think that for us, that's been a helpful thing and again, while we're in the proto-type phase of it, you know, we'll be looking and welcoming comments, both from the Panel and from work group, as to how well they perceive that that's been working.

So, moving quickly onto phase two, again, that's typically where the study design -- something that, you know, would map out what the research questions are, what the methodology, what we're intending to do, you know, again, time line, you know, possible outcome, and of course, what the main objective is, any of the other critical issues that may be involved and of course, you know, what types of background material have we already consulted.

So, you may end up with a -- you know, a bibliography, for example, in there. So, it's like any other study design or activity design, since not everything we do is literally a study.

Then phase three is where you simply go and do the work, and there is consultation, you know, available throughout, you know, any of these phases.

You know, I would like to see consultation, especially between phase one and phase two, especially for more difficult and complex activities, and then again, you know, with phase two, before we head into phase three, we want to go back to our -- the project components with whom we work, such as yourselves and the work group, and again, you know, double check.

Are we all clear that this is

truly the method we're going to go with? You know, we have a sticking point here. Are we all clear on that? That has, I think, been very helpful to us.

Then with phase four, and we are completing a couple -- two or three phase four products at this point, and they are going to be in the form of either, you know, a summary, a report. Some of them are going to be more extensive than others, depending on the type of activity that it is, but that initially -- or essentially, involves sort of the description or window on the outcome of the work.

I mean, especially if it's data. You know, the actual product probably would be data, but you need a report to make that accessible to people, so, they can kind of see what the -- the take-away was for us, and what we intend to do with it.

So, that, again, is, you know, something where we bring that to our project components, the Panel, work group, let them have an opportunity to review it and, you know, ask questions about it, and then when, you know, staff has made the changes and revisions and I review that, if I'm okay with it, then I would send that onto my management and -- for a review, questions, and then eventually, final approval.

There is also a publication process within the agency, that is, you know, something that also happens there, that's necessary, or advisable.

So, for this particular activity, for content model, and phase one, I think the business process here really helped us, in terms of, we established, of course, a conceptual plan for what the agency needs to undertake, to develop a content model, and we, in fact, did consult with the Panel and the work group, and we operated under these assumptions, and again, the assumptions grew out of our attempt at trying to draft a phase one document, which truly, for this activity, took us a while, and I think it's -- it is the sign of, you know, how difficult this was and complex it was, and how useful, again, parsing out the steps, so that we don't rush to a study design or the -- phase three, where the activities are, before we've really laid these things out and people are clear about them.

So, our assumptions going into this, we've determined, would be that the OIS content model and subsequent development will be driven by the focus on work site constructs, and that is those things that -- and this is my description of that. Both Elizabeth and Mark may have an even finer or more refined description of that.

But in my mind, those things would be elements which can be measured and captured by -- in the world of work, because they are, in fact, attributes of work, which again, sounds really pretty simplistic, but when we start looking at all of the functional requirements for work that we are interested in, because they map onto things that people do, that can become -- you know, can quickly become blurred.

So, we had to be very clear about that. Then also, the development of the content model does, in fact, require specific expertise.

And so, that kind of told us that when we had completed a certain portion of this, which is the whole subject of this particular presentation, the disability evaluation constructs, that the next stage of that, we'll be wanting to work with individuals who have experience in work analysis, to build out the content model, or work taxonomy.

Then SSA would either hire or contract with individuals who have that expertise, and there are a number of ways we can do that, as you well know, through inter-

Governmental personnel agreements, you know, straight contracting. So, there are a number of ways that that can be accomplished.

Then the content model, of course, will not -- must address the disability evaluation needs for Social Security, and so, the general method by which we will go about doing that is, we're going to, of course, use the work taxonomy that the Panel recommended in 2009, and essentially, build out that taxonomy.

And because the phase one led us to differentiate between the DEC from the content model work taxonomy, we can see that in general, you know, we will be inventorying, or we have inventoried, the disability constructs, and those will then inform the types of domains and constructs, and then later, the items that we'll be needing, to capture what's possible in the world of work.

Also, I think a point that I need

to make here is that the process enabled us to see that we then will need two study designs. You know, so, under phase one addresses, in general, the development of the content model, or the work taxonomy that would then lead to instrument development.

But then once we got to -- finished phase one, we saw that really, essentially we have two activities, and so, then we realized we needed two study designs. We needed two phase two documents.

And so, what we have developed and shared with you, and you've seen that, was a document that laid out our methodology, for how we were going to inventory the disability evaluation constructs.

The next piece that we have to work with will be the development of the work taxonomy that, of course, leads to the instrument development and at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Mark and Elizabeth.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And Elizabeth's name was not on my list, so, if you would introduce yourself, and welcome.

MS. KENNEDY: Hi, I'm Elizabeth Kennedy and I'm a Social Insurance Specialist with OVRD.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

MS. KENNEDY: Okay, I'm going to be walking you through some snapshots of the various inventories that we developed.

Our process for developing these inventories was that one analyst developed the initial inventories, and two policy experts reviewed the inventories.

Then we came together and had a discussion and came to consensus regarding any changes that needed to occur.

We determined that we were looking for functional and vocational constructs. Our definition for functional construct was a construct pertaining to work related, physical, psychological and sensory motor capabilities of a person or environmental conditions a person may not be able to tolerate due to an impairment.

Our definition for vocational construct was the construct pertaining to age, education and work experience.

So, the next slide has a snapshot of what our inventory of core disability constructs looks like.

This inventory actually had four different tabs within Excel. What you're looking at now is actually a snapshot of the RFC form tab.

So, we identified constructs from the residual functional capacity form. That is what you're looking at here.

The other tab was constructs from the mental, residual, functional capacity form, and the third tab had constructs from the regulations that most directly pertained to RFC and vocational considerations.

So, the types of constructs that

you will see on that inventory are things like age, education and work experience.

The last tab has definitions of the various constructs in this inventory. We identified those from regulations and other policy sources when the definition was not in the regulations.

MR. TRAPANI: Yes, just to emphasize that, what Elizabeth is walking you through are the -- essentially, five different inventories that we established here. Actually, four separate ones, and then a consolidated one, and that she is describing, this is the -- this one here, is, as described, a core disability construct, and we basically identified those as arising from the residual functional capacity, or mental, residual, function capacity forms, the items on those forms, and as is -- they are listed in the left column, there.

And as Elizabeth described, the regulations that pertain to those assessments, so, that -- this is the policy constructs, and then we'll describe what we got from other sources.

But again, just to emphasize there, we just put -- we didn't want to combine and -- combine things or merge anything to make those decisions. It's very -- it's a very difficult process.

So, we laid it out, as explicitly as possible, from, as Elizabeth said, the largest on the left hand, to the smallest. So, it includes everything. We tried to be as transparent as possible, there.

MS. KENNEDY: Right, with this particular inventory, we wanted to show the relationship between constructs, which is why we did lay it out, to show the largest on the left, and then the smallest related construct, over to the right-hand side. You won't see that same relationship on the other inventories.

Okay, so, these should look

familiar. This is the inventory of the panel constructs. These came from your 2009 report, and we did look to the subcommittee reports, for some information, such a definitions of constructs.

With this inventory and the next couple that will follow, you'll see that we did a review for whether or not the construct was a functional or vocational construct. If not, we would place a check mark next to that construct.

We also did a review for whether or not the construct directly conflicted with our SSA regulations. If so, we would put a check mark in that box.

Anything with a check mark in either of the last two columns, we did not include in our inventory of all of the constructs, which we'll be getting to here, in a minute.

Okay, this is an example of our inventory of NIH and BU constructs. NIH and

BU have done a presentation to the Panel. Currently, there is exploratory work with us to say -- to develop computer adaptive testing instruments.

So, we took the constructs that they're currently testing and included them in the inventory.

MR. TRAPANI: And again, we're applying the same standards to it, in terms of whether it's a functional vocational construct or it conflicts with regulations.

MS. KENNEDY: Okay, here, you see an example of our inventory of constructs from public comments. We did receive a lot of public comments.

Last year, OVRD staff developed a synthesis of all of the comments, all of the letters that we received. So, staff, last year, had read through everything that we received and developed a synthesis, and our team, when we did this activity, we went back to that synthesis, to identify the constructs.

Okay, so, finally, you see here, an example of what the inventory of all of the constructs looks like.

So, we listed the constructs on the left-hand side, and then we show the source of the construct. So, you can see which sources recommended what construct.

So, for example for lifting, all of the various sources recommended lifting. We also show any definitions that were associated with that construct. Not all sources gave a definition, but we did include the definitions that we had.

I want to let you know that for this particular inventory, we made no -- for all of the inventories, we made no attempt to use judgment to combine constructs.

So, in order to get a check mark next to lifting, the source had to recommend lifting. They could not recommend something like lifting, or something that we thought might be the same as lifting. They literally recommended lifting.

MR. TRAPANI: And let me just quickly say, what you did to arrive at all of those inventories was to -- Elizabeth, as the analyst leading this effort, worked with two program policy experts, Debbie Harkin and Mike O'Connor, and essentially, for each of the construct lists you saw, Elizabeth put together the initial list and then, had the two policy experts review those, and identify any missing constructs or anything they thought was inaccurate, make sure that -- ensure that the list was complete and accurate and in effect.

And then, to the extent there were disagreements, they got together and discussed the issues and then reached consensus on those. So, that's how those forms were developed.

MS. KENNEDY: Right, so, the types of issues that might have come up would be that I had not identified a construct, I skipped over it.

We also had some discussion, as to what was a functional or vocational construct, especially when looking at the synthesis of the public comments, because many of those comments were, in fact, work side comments, which was appropriate.

And so, they wouldn't be included in this inventory, although we still are looking at those public comments.

We want to let you know what we are sharing this. We're going to be sharing this with you, the Panel, and also, with the OIS development work group, for comments.

OIS development work group has seen part of -- one of the inventories, but has not yet seen the next -- the other ones.

MS. KARMEN: Actually, I think one of the things I want to just mention there, with regard to, you know, what -- next steps, in terms of phase four, just so people have a sense of what is coming next, both Panel and work group.

That Elizabeth is preparing a phase four document, which is basically a report, you know, that summarizes what we had encountered and found in assembling the inventories, and what the next steps we're anticipating will be. What possible issues we may have encountered, you know, doing that, and that you know, we'll be reviewing that. Richard will review that, and then we will be sharing the phase four document with you and the work group, for your comments and thoughts about that, before we completely seal, sign and deliver it, and just have it finished, so, and move onto the next piece.

So, just so you have a sense of what that looks like.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: You're done? Okay, I just wanted to double-check, because the last one says 'questions and feedback' and you weren't there yet, so, I didn't know if you had any other input, sorry.

I know we have one Panel member who is chomping at the bit, to ask a question. So, I will let her ask the question. Shanan?

DR. GIBSON: I'm going to run these all into one question, since I can only talk once, I think, or twice.

First, let me say I think I speak for the whole Panel, when I say we're excited at the prospect of getting the consolidated inventory of all items that are identified by source. We've been looking forward to that.

Two, I want to say that I have a little bit of concern, when we talk about the nature of bringing in the items from policy, not because I don't think it's important, but because we know your policy was derived directly in many cases, from the DOT, and therefore, has many items that are actually composite or non-observable or of a nature that aren't necessarily going to be beneficial going forward.

So, I worry about seeing those, and I'm interesting in how they fall out.

For example, on the slide you showed, one showed lift and carry. So, how did you handle it? Did you separate lift and carry?

I'd also like, if you could identify some examples. So, I told you I was going to run them all together -- can identify any examples of potential constructs that might have been contra-indicated by regulations, and therefore, were removed from the list.

I understand, not functional, not vocational, but will we also be given a list, I guess, of everything that was removed and the rationale for its removal?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: How many items are on the list?

MS. KENNEDY: There is about 500

on the list of all constructs.

14 But to emphasize, a lot of those are quite similar. It's the way we separated them out, and made that multiply, made that list multiply.

So, if somebody were to go through and try to group, in terms of some standard of similarity, it would probably be reduced substantially, I think.

But of course, we did not do that for this exercise.

MS. KENNEDY: Right, I'd like to address Shanan's question about lifting and carrying, and how she saw those combined.

I believe they were combined on the list of policy constructs. So, if we could go back.

MR. TRAPANI: I'm sorry.

MS. KENNEDY: Right, so, when you're looking at the list of the core disability policy constructs, you'll see that lift and/or carry is combined on this list.

Our process, when we went through and developed the inventory of all of the constructs, is that we separated constructs such as this, to show them independently.

That allowed us to really show which sources made the same recommendation for a construct.

However, one caveat to that is that if there was a definition for lifting and carrying together, we did not break that apart.

There would not be definition for lifting carrying, but some of the mental constructs were definitely meant to be combined, and there was a definition for that phrase. Does that answer your question related to that?

DR. GIBSON: It certainly helps, and when we see them, it will certainly probably better illuminated.

How about the removal of items, due to contra-indications with policy? They say one rationale for removing items would be if there were checks in either of those two boxes, where they not functional or vocational, or was it contra-indicated by policy.

MR. TRAPANI: Just first, let me say that it was a strict standard we applied. We were very conservative, in terms of what we did, and it was -- if it was, again, direct contradiction of policy.

So, if we saw construct, we had to see that in the policy, saying, "This will not be allowed. This consideration of this construct would not be allowed," so, it was quite restrictive, in that sense.

MS. KENNEDY: Or there had to be a definition in policy that was different or opposite from the construct.

DR. GIBSON: Can we get an example, because I'm still not clear.

The only thing I could think of is, I know that in public comment, for example, many people recommended that you add in, "Is there an accommodation available for the job," and that would be, to me, contra -- it couldn't be part of the content model, because you can't look at the combinations.

So, that's the only thing I can come up with --

MS. KENNEDY: Right.

DR. GIBSON: -- and I'm not sure if that's what you're referring to.

MS. KENNEDY: Yes, the example that's coming to mind is, there was a recommendation for something related to skills, that was using a different definition for skills than is allowable under our policy, under our regulations.

MS. KARMEN: You know, also, I think it bears -- worth noting that, you know, again, you all don't have the full versions of all five inventories. So, it's, you know, hard for you to see this.

But just because something was

found to be not permissible or found to be prohibited by our regulations, which by the way, was very small number, because, you know, our regs really don't come right and say, "You cannot do this," in a lot of cases.

But they're still in the inventory. They're in the inventory for -- so, if it was a Boston University recommendation -- or item that was in something that they're testing, it just simply -- it's on the list for them, and there is a check mark in the box that says, "It's prohibited."

So, that's how it's retained. So, really, what we're doing is showing the disposition of it. So, I don't know if that is clear.

MR. TRAPANI: In those two right columns -- the columns to the right, there, if it was functional or vocational construct, check. If not, one of those, and then conflicts with regulation, there would be a check mark there, but you'd see that. Obviously, you'd still see the construct.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom?

MR. HARDY: I just want to make sure I'm understanding something you said, Sylvia, so, I'm clear on process.

You said that this is going to be an iterative process and we're going to go back and forth, and I'm looking -- since I haven't seen this before, persistence and pace, I was looking at that, and in there, the words that caught me were 'excessive' and 'acceptable', as part of the definition of persistence and pace.

So, as you're going through, gathering information, is it your plan to come back and fill out excessive and acceptable with a banding, or rating, or is it more -- I was just curious, if that's what that meant, when you said that.

MS. KARMEN: Okay, so, I think this is where we were drawing a line between what needs to into work taxonomy, to develop an instrument versus what the Social Security Administration or NIH and BU, or members of the public, if they're vocational experts, for example, use or consider in their work, within Social Security's case, claimants and in the case of members of the public who wrote in, you know, maybe their -- in their world, they may be dealing with clients.

So, what maybe appropriate to define, in terms of excessive or whatever this language is that you're mentioning, that's on the person side, or on the DEC -- that's a disability evaluation construct.

That's the way in which the human function is evaluated with regard to what the person, the claimant, can do. But that isn't necessarily going to translate one for one, into the work taxonomy and then into the instrument.

So, Shanan, perhaps, you know, what you were raising in your first question about, you know, seeing things that may, you know, end up as items, and blah, blah, blah, in the work taxonomy, or in the instrument, I think that that's why we were very clear in our assumptions, or trying to be clear in our assumptions, that the work for DEC is really, you know, in a program side.

You know, this is what the users tend to look for, when they're evaluating human function, when they're actually evaluating a person's ability to do something.

Then when we set about evaluating work, what is required to do work, we will need to have some way to have those two things -- two sides talk to each other, but they will not map on, exactly.

And so, that's why we had to draw that line and say, "Okay, well, there may be measures over here," on the DEC side, that are completely appropriate and are going to be there, no matter what, you know, that's how people want to do that, but in the world of work, it will be different.

That's where we will need the work analyst expertise to help us make that, to navigate that.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: David?

DR. SCHRETLIN: Yes, I really appreciate that question, Tom.

I think, if I'm understanding it correctly, the point if this is to sort of map out all of the constructs that could be -- it doesn't mean that everything listed will remain in there, but it's the universe of potential constructs, and it may well be when we get to the point of developing items or field testing things, that constructs will drop out, simply because they can't be assessed reliably or -- that's my assumption.

My working assumption is that, at the end of the day, we're going to learn a lot from all the pilots and eventually, the field studies, and we may -- one of the things we may learn is that it's impossible to reliably measure some constructs, whether those are constructs on the work side, or the person side, and we'll just have to say, "Cut our losses," and say, "We can't do it."

MS. KARMEN: I think we're certainly, at this phase -- at this stage, it's clear to us that the constructs that are represented in the DEC are truly constructs for disability evaluation, that people use to evaluate claimant function, at least in our world, it's claimant function.

Those constructs, in essence, are independent of constructs and the work taxonomy.

However, because Social Security has a need to have an OIS that meets its needs, it's important for us to map out on the DEC side, what all the -- the whole universe of things that we are able to discern, that we tend to look at on the person side, and would want to see, how can we get that kind of information on the work site and the constructs that might be needed there, might actually be different, because they're work related?

You know, so, but none the less, your point is still well taken that, yes, and in doing iterative process of developing the work taxonomy and then testing the instrument, as things -- as information comes back and we find that certain things didn't work well in the instrument and, you know, ghee, you really aren't going to get good information here, we may want to drop a construct or drop items, or add new items, whatever, and that may or may not inform the DEC side of things.

I mean, the agency, certainly, may want to continue, for example, to determine to what extent and individual with a certain impairment has a deficit as a result of that impairment, in concentration.

Even though, on the work side, it

may turn out that, well, you know, we got limited information that tells us about activities for which concentration is a requirement, and we're not too confident, maybe we need to just focus on, you know, some of the other mental cognitive requirements.

But that wouldn't stop the agency from continuing to assess concentration, but it might involve our making a change on the work constructs, that, well, okay, maybe we don't have that one. I don't know if I've made --

MR. TRAPANI: Yes, just to, I guess, bring that all to a head, because it seems like it's a very difficult thing to convey.

But I mean, I think the bottom line of this all is that this is not the content model. I think that's, in effect, what the facility has been saying.

This is meant to inform the

development of the content model, which is a work side product. So, the thinking is that when we bring the experts on, as Sylvia has indicated, we need to do -- to develop the actual content model.

We presume that one of the first questions to ask us is, "What are your needs? What are you looking to do," and this would be our presentation of those needs, in the most transparent explicit form we could think of, and if there is something additionally that they need from us, then they could advise us on what that is, but at this point, we thought this was the most basic straight forward product we could provide for that purpose.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Abigail?

DR. PANTER: I was just wondering, are there any other sources of information that should be brought to bear, at this point?

So, so far, there is -- the first

major tab is about existing SSA forms. So, those are sort of existing constructs, with respect to SSA.

The second one is the Panel's work, and that third one is the BU project, and the fourth is the public, and I wondered if -- are there other sources of information that should be brought forth, and have you considered -- do you anticipate that there might be some additional sources that come forth, or do you think this is it, or -- I mean, I think about examination of the claims, for example.

Is there information that's in there, that could be brought forth or other sources? So, I just wondered how you viewed that.

MS. KARMEN: So, yes, we did consider that. There was some -- certainly, fair amount of discussion about, where do you draw the line, because that could really go on for quite some time.

So, what we came to was, and I guess this is also something that, in terms of context, I think that there is a -- with the report, the phase four will cover, and we will certainly be presenting on that, or at least offer the report and have an opportunity for the Panel to discuss it.

We did look at, you know, what would the benefit possibly be, you know, in doing that? What kinds of things are we already doing?

So, for example, yesterday you heard from Debbie Harkin and Mark, with regard to the, you know, initial data analyses coming from the Med-Voc study. Certainly, that is confirming that, you know, a lot of the limitations that we tend to see from people, based on the types of impairments that they have, it's not surprising they're going to have, you know, lower back problems, if they have low back injuries and things like that. So, they have, you know, functional issues that result from that.

I mean, granted, a lot of those things are DOT driven, you know, because so many people look at that and that's -- both in the private sector and in the public sector.

So, a lot of that is going -- no matter where you go, a lot of the functional view of things comes from that paradigm. So, that is one thing.

We do know, for example, we're going to get information from those claims. So, when you mention, what information can we get from our claims, there is one source.

The other thing that's confirmatory, the other thing that we thought about was the fact that the Panel itself, in making its recommendations for physical and mental, did quite an extensive review of that, literature that was, you know, most recent and most relevant, certainly wasn't like the full universe of literature on all of those topics.

One could certainly, probably do an extensive search on one construct, alone, much less, you know, all of them.

So, we believe that given that the Panel had made these recommendations, that that could provide us with a -- kind of like an imprimatur, with that regard, and then, given that -- that both the public comments also spanned a really wide range of comments, with regard to a whole host of functions.

Now, again, they're public comments. That doesn't necessarily mean every individual who wrote in, you know, had expertise in a particular area.

However, they were commenting on the 2009 Panel recommendations, and so, in that regard, that kind of helped provide -- would provide context for us, and then, finally, NIH and Boston University are certainly two entities that have done a lot of work in the functional area.

Now, again, the specific work that they're doing is developmental. The agency isn't even, you know, saying it's necessarily going to go in that direction.

But for us, when we were looking at that, we thought, "Well, you know, here is, you know, a group that has actually done a lot of work, to just identify these elements, based on what they have found," you know, through a variety of studies and literature in those areas, with regard to mobility and mental cognitive. They may have called it something else, but I'm calling it that.

So, we felt that that covered the water front. So, that is -- and Mark, I think you had something else.

MR. TRAPANI: Yes, if I could just add that -- I mean, again, it's the way -- it depends on -- it all comes down to the way we conceive this activity, as sort of a basic fundamental activity.

Obviously, if we were trying to reconfigure our person side, in effect, then there is so much that we would have to do, to do that right.

So, many people would have to consult, in addition to the sources that we consulted, but understanding that that's not what this is about, and that this is not the content model.

We really fundamentally come down to wanting to make clear, again, communicate clearly, what our policy needs are, in terms of person side assessments, or disability evaluation constructs, and then as Sylvia mentioned, then the next C- the other sources came in as sources that have directly weighed in on those policy constructs, one way or another, whether it was the Panel -- because we requested, or NIH, because another part has requested that for other purposes, and then the public comments that relate to the Panel recommendations, and thinking that that does -- that is essentially, what we needed, and what we were aiming to do here.

And for our purposes, it seemed going beyond, it wasn't clear, why and for what purpose we would go beyond that, in terms of other sources.

DR. PANTER: Thank you. So, but in the next stage, when experts are being brought in, if it turns out that there is some kind of idea that there should be some more information that's brought forth, is there flexibility, to be able to incorporate that into another tab?

I'm just thinking that it could be that the group of experts that you have, have an opinion about another source that should be included. Thank you.

MR. TRAPANI: Yes, I think if I -- again, when we bring the IO experts on and they say, "Well, we need something more to work with, from your -- the standpoint of articulating our needs," and we would -- that would lead us to identify, what would the -- what would we need to do, to satisfy that need for them, to identify that?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

DR. SANCHEZ: I was going to say, you know, I really like this study, because I think -- I don't see -- I guess, I'm a little bit different, in the sense that I do not really see a distinction between the person and job site, because we like to find out what the job requirements are, so the people, right persons could -- you know, we can determine whether or not they can work.

So, I think the right way to do it is to look at, well, this is one way to do it, is to look at what are the nature of people's disabilities, and that gives you an idea of what it is that you need to look for in jobs.

So, I guess in this particular

case, I'm not offended by the fact that this is a people or person site study, because you know, like we said yesterday, it's -- jobs don't really walk and talk. It's people that do, right?

The one part that discouraged me a little bit is the list of items, because I'm thinking of the item inventory, or if I had a question or interview -- but like you said, you know, there is a lot of redundancy.

So, I think lots of the pilot testing is going to have to focus on that redundancy. So, I could see a lot of factor analysis going on.

I also -- I think there is term for this, it's co-morbidity, meaning that some of these requirements probably go together, right?

So, perhaps that will give us break, in terms of the number of items, or the number of questions that we need to ask, and I guess, the final point is -- and of course, this is not question, these are just my thoughts.

Tom's point about scaling, or the -- my reading is that deals with scaling, and I think that's going to be an issue that is going to be somewhat complicated to deal with, and I was going to ask you if you know of any -- perhaps, this is a policy or a regulation question.

But when we think about the level of the construct that is required for the job, if you use acceptable, right, an acceptable level, then the judgment is quite different than if we say average, or superior, or even satisfactory.

And I think if we ask employers, they will probably say, "No, we want the item to say superior, or at least average," but not minimum, because I don't want to hire somebody who could do the job minimally well, right?

So, I think the scaling issue and

how the questions are worded is going to be a concern and perhaps, there are some policy factors that I'm not aware of, that dictate that the individual has only -- you know, should only be able to do the job minimally well.

In job analysis, we have a long tradition of establishing minimum qualifications, but we do know that minimum performance is different from maximum performance, right? So, yes.

MS. KARMEN: To get to your first point, well, I don't know if it's your first. Maybe it was actually your second, the 500+ constructs.

So, the list that we have at this moment, and again, we haven't finished the phase four report. I think that through review, both with Panel and within our agency, with the work group and also, with our staff, I think there may be some work, first of all, that we may be doing and of course, it would be documented, how those things would be -- what their disposition would be.

We may want to go through the list again, and see, you know, all right, we applied the most broad and as strict as possible, the criteria that we had, so that we were not making a lot of inference and decisions, okay, and that was the whole purpose of it.

And so, we ended up with this, of course, long list, and as Mark pointed out, or Elizabeth pointed out, there is a lot of duplication.

We were not about to try to collapse things into each other and, you know, then you don't really know how things worked.

So, that's one aspect, is that no matter what the list looks like on the DEC side, does not necessarily mean that the taxonomy has to have 500, you know. It's just okay, we're identifying here, 524 things that came from all these five sources, and some of them can be combined.

So, at the end of the day, maybe we've got 321, you know, but even then, that doesn't mean you have to have the corresponding 321 constructs on this side, that may not even be possible, given what's possible to measure in the world of work, or what's appropriate.

So, and then, so, that's one thing. So, whatever list you end up seeing, you know, there is not -- don't draw incredible meaning from the length of that list, with regards to the taxonomy, because it may or may not necessarily be the same, since they are truly independent.

Then the other thing is, again, about the scaling, and you know, and perhaps I'm just misunderstanding, but any information, in terms of the definitions that one would see in the DEC are all unique to how one evaluates the persons ability to do something.

So, from our policy, for example, in terms of to what extent something is a policy construct, our policy lays out, you know, how we will try to characterize, if you would, the extent to which a person can walk, the extent to which they can sit.

And so, we have scales and measures and things for that, so, that the adjudicator and doctors can apply that, you know, in our process.

That does not necessarily mean that the corresponding scales for work will be the same, or scales that would help the agency to get information about work that can be associated with medical evidence, are necessarily going to be exactly the same.

So, for example, if there is a policy requirement right now, for adjudicators to make a determination as to whether something is -- you know, I forget what the word was you used, acceptable or excessive, or something like that, that doesn't necessarily mean that we would have those kinds of scaling, you know, like a Likert scale, with you know, it is acceptable? Is it excessive? Is it, you know, less than adequate, you know?

We don't necessarily have to have those same things on that side, but we do need things that we will then be able to correspond with.

So, I don't know if I made that worse, or better, but --

DR. SANCHEZ: Yes, actually, you know, I agree with you. It's just that I guess my point on the scaling had to do with, when you make this determination, is the individual capable of working, right, and then you look at the work requirements, and then you switch sides and look at the job site.

Even on the job site, right, you

could make a determination, as to well, this job to be done minimally well, requires this level, right. But to be done really well, to be a superior performance, it requires --

MS. KARMEN: Right, so, some of the things we've talked about, and again, this is theoretical, you know, for example, one could image that, you know, yes, we may want minimum requirements, perhaps we want a range, you know, so that there is the minimum and -- I don't know, I mean, maybe that's not helpful to us.

But if I'm understanding you correctly, currently, because classifications are used by HR and individuals and employers, to help assess, you know, who might be best fit for the job, or you know, one's performance -- and you're always looking at the higher end of the best of it, we're really, right, wanting to know in many cases, you know, what are the requirements, just to do the job, not, you know -- and blow the doors off of everybody, and it's incredible, their performance just is outstanding --

DR. SANCHEZ: It's going to have to be a policy decision. Are we looking for a determination of what the job requires to be minimally --

MS. KARMEN: So, by policy, you mean, for our protocol?

DR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

MS. KARMEN: Okay, because --

DR. SANCHEZ: I was wondering --

MS. KARMEN: Folks listening might hear policy, and right away, they go to program policy.

But what you mean is, the protocol that we would be wanting to establish for our data collection?

DR. SANCHEZ: Well, I was wondering if there was something in SSA policy, in general, about what does it mean to be capable of doing the job?

Are we talking about being

minimally capable, like, you know, first of all, I could play basketball, but if Lebron James is coming my way, I'm getting out of there, right?

MS. KARMEN: Yes.

DR. SANCHEZ: So, you know, that's what I was wondering.

MS. KARMEN: Go ahead

MS. HOLLOMAN: I can appreciate what you're saying, about the fact that the way the person is evaluated and the way the job is evaluated, or the occupation work is evaluated, may have different constructs and different scales.

But would like to suggest that the extent to which the constructs and the scaling can be the same, on both sides, the more easily and more objective the comparison can be.

MS. KARMEN: Yes, I mean, we're not going to go out of our way to make them different.

MS. HOLLOMAN: No, no, but I --

MS. KARMEN: I mean, it's just that we -- we want them to be what they need to be, to get to those things. So, we're --

MS. HOLLOMAN: I'm just trying to suggest, though, is that we -- that SSA go out of its way to make them as similar as possible.

MR. TRAPANI: I think in part, that will be driven by the -- in part, the work side data might indicate the better -- another way or a better way to do that, for us, when that's collected.

And just in terms of the number of items, too, I think our conception at this point, and of course, this is where Panel input is very valuable, is that it's better to have more at the start -- at the beginning and not try to narrow it down prematurely.

So, with the thought that ultimately, yes, we'd want something less than 500.

DR. SCHRETLIN: And I just -- Deb, I couldn't agree with you more. I just think that that's -- you're out front of where we are with this particular discussion.

I think that this is just looking at the universe of constructs.

MS. KARMEN: But we do have -- we share the same opinion. I mean, absolutely, we completely agree. I mean, you know, we would want it to be -- because that would be the easiest thing to do, really.

So, you're going to want to do that first, try to do that first, work with the work analyst, to say, "How can we make that happen," and when not, okay, if we can't have it that way, how can we make it so that it is -- you know, still readily -- you know, that adjudicators can readily associate those measures and the scaling and measures and outcomes, with medical evidence?

That's going to have to be the bottom line, and Juan, back to your question.

You know, we determine whether or not somebody can do the work or not. It is binary. We don't get into, well, they could do it a little bit.

You know, we do have a transfer really of skills analysis that we do, but again, that is so to determine, would their abilities, based on their skill set, overcome or help an individual overcome the transition to another -- to other work.

And so, again, that's more binary, so, that -- I don't know if that's answering your question.

DR. SANCHEZ: Yes, I think it does, because that probably dictates the way the questions are going to be phrased. It's going to be quite different.

But you know, quickly going back to the point of the number of questions, right, we need to keep in mind -- and I know that you -- you indicated a lot of redundancy and this is probably going to be reviewed a lot, but keep in mind that we also are going to have to deal with the issue of reliability, and the fact that if you want to know about my ability, then you give me one shot, it's really unreliable, right?

If you give me 10, it's more reliable, meaning we're probably going to have to have several items, or questions, for each construct, right, which you know, if we have 500, it can be --

MS. KARMEN: Yes, no, we understand that, because that is one of the issues that we have with other classifications that have been developed, where they did this, you know, global construct and then there is a single item test, in effect for it.

So, we understand that. So, we're not putting forward this DEC list, like you know, there is 500 and now, we're going to have 10 under each, and frankly, those would be constructs, you know, theoretically, you know.

So, no, we get that, and there is -- you know, the whole issue of, how would you even administer an instrument that is that long? I mean, that could be very --

DR. SANCHEZ: Exactly.

MS. KARMEN: That is a problem, too. So, I mean, even if you had all the money and the time in the world, people get tired, you know what I mean? So, anyway.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think I have three people stacked up to say something. Deb, do you still have a comment to make, and then Tom and then Shanan. You're okay? You're okay, okay, Shanan?

DR. GIBSON: I just want to perhaps, reiterate something that Juan said.

I do think it's important that as we look at the universe and consider, should it be smaller and how to whittle it down, that we should not rely on clinical judgment to combine.

I like the approach you've taken, which is very stringent, and that we'd rather consider the necessity of pilot testing, in fact, or analysis, and letting the data speak. I would like to see that, the methods used, instead of going through and deciding ourselves, which ones look close enough to be combined, because we're not always real good at those types of clinical judgments.

Also, as many people realize that most of the work analysis instruments that are out there, commercially available, have many, many items on them, which are never answered, because they are, in fact, do not apply.

And so, since we've always conceived of this as some sort of computer process, where people -- the analysts fill in the information, even if there were 500 items, measuring 200 constructs, however we want to look at it, the amount of time taken would not be 1,000 items answered 'yes', 'no', 'yes', 'no', because they would be adaptive in the release, in how they were presented.

So, that does make a difference, when we look at this, just for people out there listening.

MS. KARMEN: You know, I think another way -- something occurred to me, and I don't know if this is also helpful or not, but you know, if, in fact, we were to -- another reason why we did not whittle the list down at this stage, certainly, not at the first go-around.

You know, we applied the criteria. We ended up with the list that we ended up with. We may want to go through it one more time, from our program side of things and think through, you know, what we want to put forward, as a final DEC list, and that's still probably going to be long, because we're probably not going to combine things that are similar, for the point that you're making.

If we were, if SSA were, or at least our staff, at this point, if we were going to be revising the MRFC, or revising the RFC, then yes, we would probably want to whittle that list down by a series of, you know, asking a question and then going through it and using and applying that criteria.

But because we're not doing that, at least Social Security is not doing that, at this phase, and we certainly aren't, then the whittling down into what goes into an instrument, really, from my perspective, and again, I am looking for input on that, but the way we've conceived of it as, the most -- most of that whittling down or combining or, you know, collapsing would need to be done when developing the work taxonomy and developing the instrument.

So, there is the -- that piece there. That doesn't mean that we can't go back through the DEC list, and apply yet another criterion and then say, "Okay, well," then we can dispose of, you know, I don't know, laughing or something, you know, whatever, if that was on the list.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan?

DR. GIBSON: That actually brings up another comment I had that was related to what Deb said.

The simple fact of the matter is, we need an occupational information system that's able to evolve, not just because the world of work evolves, but rather, because Social Security Administration's forms evolve, and when there are RFC changes, or there are MRFC changes, or they change the scales they put on their MRFC, we cannot have our occupational information system tied directly to using the measures they've got on those forms this year, because four years from now, they may have evolved and changed.

So, we need good, psychometrically sound stable information on work that relates to the constructs you need information on, but for example.

We saw earlier in the year, your MRFC is under review and renewal and they're changing stuff on it right now.

And so, I don't want to see us tie it too tightly, for the fear that when those forms change, we undermine our OIS long term.

MS. HOLLOMAN: Ultimately, I'd like to see the work on the word side drive changes to the RFC's.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions or comments? Thank you, and congratulations. This was a tremendous amount of work.

I think something Sylvia said at the very beginning is that even when the content model is developed, and I understand the DEC or whatever comes out, is just the starting point.

A lot of people, I think, are listening in or wanting a list of things, because they want to change their own things that they do and practice, or what not, and I think that's really dangerous, to look at any of these lists and consider them to be final lists.

We won people when we were presenting at conferences, in terms of our own report at the Panel, and I think this is indicative of it.

The fact that there are over 500 items shows how the criteria was applied to be as inclusive as possible. I really appreciate the methodology that was used and the incredibly hard work of the staff, to bring this about. So, congratulations. Thank you.

We are at the point now, of public comment. So, we have one public comment that we will receive, and then we will go into a break.

And so, welcome, Lynn Tracy and Angie Heitzman. They are familiar to the Panel, because we received public comment from them at every face-to-face meeting. So, welcome.

As you know, you will have 10 minutes and then the Panel will have an opportunity to ask questions. Thank you.

MS. TRACY: Thank you very much. We're honored to be here again, and speaking before you.

As you know, we're representing the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals, or what we refer to as IARP, and Angie and I are both on the Board of IARP and I am the Chair of the Committee that is the liaison to the OIDAP. So, just as a little.

We are very happy to say that we finally got all those data points on the past relevant work put together, and Angie is going to talk about that a little bit.

MS. TRACY: Yes, we conducted a survey with all of SSBE's, who agreed to participate, with the data on past relevant work from steps four and five.

We asked them to collect data on all of the cases that they were doing over a period of four months, where they would write down every job and DOT title and such, and then we are now going through and analyzing that data, and looking -- one of the things that we looked at is whether or not there is enough information in the claimant's record, to actually describe or identify the jobs.

What we found out, that in relation to that, was that in about 30 percent of the time, there was not enough information given by the claimant, in order to identify the jobs very well.

So, that is something to consider in the information that we're getting back from them.

The preliminary results show that

we got 5,193 job entries from this data collection. One thing that we're doing right now is comparing the results of this survey to the work that Deb Harkin and Trapani did, and our top 10 jobs are in line, almost exactly with the top 10 jobs they had.

There are some changes in the order of the jobs. There were only two changes. They had material handlers as one of the top 10 jobs, and we had kitchen workers, instead.

So, but otherwise, you know, we're looking at cashier two, laborer, stores, cleaner, housekeeping, fast food worker, cashier/checker, home attendant, nurse assistant, kitchen helper stock clerk and packager/handler.

One of the interesting things, when we look at our data, is that those top 10 jobs only represent, let's see 19.85 percent of all the jobs. Whereas, for their study, I think it was more like close to 28 percent.

So, our's was very well spread out. Even the top job only represented 2.3 percent of the entries.

So, from our perspective, that shows the need to go well beyond looking at the top jobs, as we go on here.

We did, however, find one instance of a job called the grinder pump operator. That one is for Mary, and I would like to go on now, to Lynn.

MS. TRACY: Thank you, Angie. Well, we would just like to reiterate some points we've made before to you all, based on what we've heard for the last two days.

In terms of data collection, we still encourage SSA to use field data collection for the OIS, due to the consistency -- the consistent theme of problems we keep hearing about consistency of data, for self-reports.

So, we really feel that the field

analysis needs to be done.

Also, when the data is rolled up into the occupational definition, that information, we really would like to see it released into the public domain, and have -- allow us, the public access.

In terms of sources of data, just some thoughts and ideas of us brain-storming, there can be a lot of data gained from sources, such as the insurance companies, the vocational counselors out there, who have done job analyses in the past, not saying to use that data, necessarily to build the OIS, but just for informational purposes of sources of what jobs and where are they?

It's a great source that could be tapped and anything that's been done before, there is no reason why that can't be done. So, that would be one suggestion.

Also, SSA is a great source of its own data. There is a lot of data that SSA has in other areas of the organization, you know, who did what, where?

So, I think, you know, we think that that's something that should also be looked at.

In terms of field analysts, we really would like to see SSA even think about using their contracted vocational experts.

There are 1,250 vocational experts that do VE work for ODAR, SSA ODAR, and those are people that are already coming in with qualifications and skills, as a base line that could be used.

The other benefit of possibly using those 1,250 people is that it would help with defensibility, because they've actually gone into the field.

It also makes sure that they have some field experience. There are a number of VE's in the country doing Social Security work, that are fundamentally retired. They don't continue to have a hands-on case load.

And so, this would also, you

know, be another added bonus to possibly using those, and then of course, you've got all of the vocational experts through IRP, that are available, as well.

We also would encourage that SSA will need to develop a field analyst -- for the field analyst, a training manual that is extensive, more extensive than the hand book for analyzing jobs, and that that will be also, a reference point, and those are our comments. Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, you still have three minutes.

MS. HEITZMAN: Okay, you were talking about the NIH BU data study, and the recommended items, and we talked about a concern we had in December, about some of those items being very hard to measure, and utilizing self-report data.

So, we just wanted to reiterate that concern, of using those items.

Also, on a non-IRP item is that

we've established now, and academy of forensic rehabilitation research that is separate from IRP. We will be promoting and actively looking at developing research in the forensic rehab area.

This a vehicle that SSA can use, as an arm for conducting research. So, something to keep in mind for the future.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, thank you. Any questions from the Panel? David and Allan?

DR. SCHRETLIN: Yes, thank you very much. Are you going to be reducing the findings of the research to a document that sort of outlines the findings?

MS. HEITZMAN: Yes, we will.

DR. SCHRETLIN: Could you -- would you mind including a sort of cumulative frequency distribution, to give us an idea of how many different -- how many unique job titles capture, you know, 50 percent, 75, 90, 95, maybe, you know, some -- either just a very lengthy cumulative frequency distribution, or many points, so, we have an idea of how it -- because it sounds like it compares.

There is a little bit more spread in your data, than in the Med-Voc study.

MS. HEITZMAN: Right, yes.

MS. TRACY: But there is also a lot of similarity, as well, but yes, yes, we'll be glad to do that.

DR. HUNT: Sorry, I have a related question. I wanted to ask about the front of the screen.

What was the qualification for the claims that you looked at? Was it similar to step four or step five in that --

MS. HEITZMAN: They were all step four, step five at the hearing level.

MS. TRACY: Right, so, it was all done -- what we had the VE's do, as they were at a hearing and they reviewed the work history, they would fill out a form that listed what the claimant wrote down as the job and their exertional level as described, and then the VE classified the job, with either the same job title or the correct job title, from their assessment, what the DOT gave as the exertional level, and what the VE felt, based on their experience was the exertional level.

So, everything would be at step four -- be at step four or five, had to do more with whether the ALJ asked a particular question. We were doing a straight analysis and testifying, basically, at the step four level.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

DR. SANCHEZ: Well, I'd like to thank you for making the grind pump operator part of the record. But that's more of a comment.

I wonder if you have any suggestions for how to deal with potential conflict of interest, when -- if the decision to employ vocational experts in the field, as job analysts, is made, if you have any suggestions as to should there be any rules regarding conflict of interest, and how will you do that?

MS. TRACY: I think that that is a good point, and I considered that. I have not considered the answer to the question, but I do think it would need to be considered.

We, as -- because I am on contract. Angie is, as well, now. Under that contract, it's broad enough, I believe, that we can be utilized as a vocational expert in a variety of situations for Social Security.

So, I don't think there is anything that locks us down to having to be used at a hearing per say. I could be wrong. I'd have to look at the brand new contract that came out.

I think that there would have to

be -- there would be considerations of that, and there would have to be discussion of that, and making sure that the vocational experts were doing clean analysis.

But as you're running many people through the process of training and certification, they would still have to go through that.

I'm just saying that this is already a group that has base line. But I'm sure there are many considerations that that -- that if that were to occur, that that would have to be considered, no question.

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

DR. SCHRETLIN: Maybe just one, and that is, you've been immersed in this. What do you think? What are your thoughts about it?

I appreciate that there is tremendous overlap in the top 10, it's almost -- you know, it's 90 percent overlap, by the sounds of it.

But what is your take on why there might be a great spread, or a greater number of titles in your sample, than the Med-Voc sample?

MS. HEITZMAN: I really don't know, at this point. But that is something that I think we'll take a look at and consider, as we -- but I did find it very interesting, that it was such a great difference in the spread.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I think Richard has a comment.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER BALKUS: I just wanted to remind people that we're working on different samples.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Right.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER BALKUS: Okay, what you were presented the other day were initial level cases, both allowances and denials, steps four and five, okay.

What they are presenting today,

are only cases that came up from the initial process, were denied at the initial level, were denied at the reconsideration level, and were before an Administrative Law Judge for a hearing.

So, if we're looking to make some comparisons down the road here, it would be more likely to occur, with the part of the study that we haven't done yet, and that is the hearing level cases, and those cases, we are going to -- you know, it's a sample of 1,300 cases, which includes both ALJ allowances and decisions.

So, I think, you know, I wouldn't look too closely here, in terms of trying to make comparisons at this point.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for that input. Allan, did you have a -- okay.

I think we are at the point now of going into a break. We had on the agenda, the break from MS. LECHNER: 15 to MS.

LECHNER: 30 p.m. I think I'm only going to hold it for 15 minutes, because we only have half-hour of deliberation on the agenda, and this has been a very full meeting, and I have a sense that the Panel will take at least that half-hour.

So, let's go ahead and take 15 minutes and come back at 12:20 p.m. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at approximately 12:05 p.m. and resumed at approximately 12:20 p.m.)

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I'm going to ask the Panel to please take their seats.

We are now back on the record, and at this time, we have the opportunity to have further deliberation.

Just to kind of orient our deliberation a bit, on Wednesday, yesterday, it's amazing, it was just yesterday, David Russ spoke to us. He gave us three areas where SSA indicates they need some help.

One is finding employers, job, basically, sampling options. The next is the field job analyst needs and the third was the OIS instrument or work taxonomy.

We've heard presentations by staff, by Federal agencies, and have had discussions, deliberations yesterday, as well, in each of these areas.

So, I would like to open up any areas for discussion. One of the things that you have, had -- disseminated to you during the break, was from POMS.

This is a break-out of information displayed that SSA collects. I don't remember who it was, during the last presentation, indicated that SSA has a lot of their own data.

If you will look at the first three page item, you'll see that the DEQY, I forget what that stands for, detailed earnings quarterly -- I don't know what the

'Y' is, but anyway, it has a variety of information on there, in terms of detailed earnings, adjusted records, agricultural and non-covered earning, which I know that we heard yesterday, that OIS does not cover, W2 data, employment type, that kind of thing, trying to get more information about the coding on the employment type, because that wasn't clear. I couldn't Google it, dog-pile it or find it on the SSA website.

Then there is a more detailed information of qualified quarters of earnings and how they -- basically, more technical information that is the second hand-out.

So, I wanted to pass that out. It might also be helpful if we have questions, at least on this, to maybe bring Sylvia back and if there are any questions that she can answer, specific to this, or that we have, to be part of this discussion. Go ahead.

MS. HOLLOMAN: I don't seem to

have that.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: You don't have it?

MS. HOLLOMAN: I got missed.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, here, you could have mine. There is probably more. I know that they were handing some out, okay. Thank you.

So, at this point, let me go ahead and open up the discussion around the major theme for this meeting, which was sampling, and thoughts? Abigail, you look like you want to say something.

DR. PANTER: I just want to say how important and helpful this discussion was and this meeting.

So, the back presentations has been extremely helpful, and really inspires thought on what we might think about and advise for the future.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Other thoughts? I know one of the things that came up during one of the sessions that I was talking to Steve about, from Census, was one of their products that they put out, called the County Business Patterns, that when you go to their website and you look it up, you can go and look up data, from the U.S. Census, by county, metro or zip code.

So, if I put in my zip code into that County Business Patterns, which is, you know, Boise is not that big, 83714 is not a hugely dense population area, but it tells me that there are 875 establishments.

In those establishments, there are paid employees totaling, as of March 12, 2008, totaling 13,493 paid workers.

It gives you what the first quarter payroll is, but it also breaks it down by industry.

So, when I inquired about that, to Steve, Steve and the SES, is from the demographic side of the Census. This information comes from the economic side of the Census, and he said he just joined a committee that is looking at the two working together, because they have different sampling frames.

So, it might be helpful to maybe talk to more people at the Census, and really get a sense, because if we are going to be providing some advice and recommendations to SSA, in terms of finding employers and jobs, sounds like there is more than one area within the Census and this one is very specific by zip code, where they're identifying establishments, and also, the number of paid employees in those establishments, and at least have some level of break-down, in terms of industry. Allan?

DR. HUNT: Well, you can go farther than that, because you know, these occupational staffing ratios by industry are, you know, fairly well established, and they seem to change fairly slowly.

The fly in the ointment there is

that you have to be careful because the NAICS codes, or any industry codes, can be broad, broader than you want.

So, you may be mixing up, you know, two things that you think are the same, and they really aren't, and so, they don't have the same occupational staffing pattern.

But yes, I'm looking back at your list of challenges from David, and I guess, I mean, it seems to me, we are already kind of, I don't know, pointed at these, in terms of our contributions and our specialities. My problem is that it seems to me like, you know, the taxonomy is the priority, because if we don't have that and the instrument connected to it, derived from it, however you think of it, you know, this other stuff is fluff.

So, how do we accelerate progress on that dimension?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: That's a great question. Thank you for orienting that, in terms of the priority areas, I agree. Thoughts on that? Shanan?

DR. GIBSON: At this point, I get the sense that internally, SSA staff is working on this as fast and as hard as they can.

I do believe that the model we've taken of providing targeted feedback when they request it from us, has been beneficial for them. So, I hope that's one way we can continue to help them to move along as quickly as there possible.

To me, I actually see that as a co-requisite for staffing, though. I don't see it as -- it is pre-eminent, but it is dependent upon that other issue, and I don't know that we can help them with that right now, either, except that as we give more feedback and advice.

So, I guess my long answer is, we don't have a good answer, but I think they're making very good progress, given what they've got, and they've come a long way in the few months we've been quiet.

So, I think as we look forward and perhaps, once we see the consolidated 500+ construct document, we might have a little more direction at that point.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other thoughts, in terms of that aspect of it, the instrument?

DR. SANCHEZ: The Federal Register on April 20th, has a solicitation for consulting services, right, for this project.

So, people are emailing me about that. I guess, my comments yesterday, probably -- so, I would think that's going to speed up the process.

I read the description on the Federal Register and it species that this individual is going to come to Baltimore on a regular basis, once a month, spend a few days, he's going to go back and forth.

I gather, this is not the lead scientist that you guys -- he's not the -- there is something in between, just on a temporary basis, until -- so, you know, that seems hopeful, that things might speed up.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia, did you want to make a comment on that, in terms of what is going on with that?

That's great, that you're getting inquiries about it.

MS. KARMEN: Yes, and actually, two issues. One, with regard to -- this, I guess, brings up something that maybe the DFO will need to, you know, just provide some -- if you have, you know, questions along those lines, I think Deborah can provide you some guidance, with regard to how one may -- you know, need to respond to inquiries, with regard to things such as this.

So, and she can certainly help you with that, later.

But more specifically, you know,

I realized yesterday after I looked at my notes for what I was presenting and the project director's report, that I neglected to include the RFQ.

I had it in my notes, but it wasn't on the screen. So, it just didn't happen.

So, yes, we put out a request for quote for one or more consultants to provide, of course, consultant services, to us, and the idea is that the way that we've written the statement of work, the requirements are really to have that individual or individuals, provide us with some, you know, consultation, guidance, work with us a bit.

I mean, we're looking at, you know, being able to roll our sleeves up a little bit and help us do some of the work that we may need to be doing, to prepare for the study design, first -- you know, just developing the study design, or phase two document, for example, for the content model of work taxonomy.

I think that we would be greatly aided by having somebody who is meeting with us on a somewhat regular basis and working with us, to help us pull that together.

Then from there, we have some other activities that we will need to do, that will help us, you know, work toward getting an instrument together.

So, it's not as if we're looking for those individuals to literally build the taxonomy or literally build the instrument, but I think we will need their assistance in, how do we go about doing that, and you know, to the extent that we are doing any of that work, yes, we may want their assistance with that.

But also, help us, in terms of perhaps reviewing an RFI, request for information, or -- and then a subsequent RFQ perhaps, that may go out, so that, you know, if in fact, we determine that -- the agency determines that it may need to have contracted help to develop the taxonomy and instrument, we would want these individuals to assist us with the requirements, to that we can make sure that we're speaking the same language, as the people who we're looking to engage to work with us on that.

So, that is pretty much what that is about. So, my apologies for not mentioning that, earlier.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other thoughts or comments, in terms of the OIS instrument work taxonomy end of that?

Okay, how about with sampling? Allan?

DR. HUNT: Well, I mean, I think we're getting to the point where we need to get serious about a decision of which way we're going, through the employer or through some random sample of -- well, it may not be random, but some sample of individuals, directly.

I think there is enough on the table now, that we can start to talk intelligently about it. I don't know how others feel.

I've been kind of playing with this, or agitating for this since last summer, but I mean, that's kind of behind what I just said, is that I feel inadequate in the sense, okay, we can start getting serious about that.

But until we have an instrument or can see an instrument in the distance, so, what? Of course, I would say, there are mutual implications.

The instrument has implications for the sampling design and vice versa, but you know, that's sort of in the fine print, I think, ultimately.

So, moving towards decisions on sampling, may almost be premature, except to keep gathering this kind of information, and as our Chair has suggested, looking into other things, like county business patterns or other possible sources of data, and the sorts of things that the Bureau of Economic Analysis does, which it hadn't occurred to me, that would be relevant, until this morning.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: David and then Shanan.

DR. SCHRETLIN: Yes, Allan, what I'm wondering, to me, it seems like the various components of this project are all so complex that they all need -- that we need to be working on them all.

I'm just wondering, so, I'm thinking that while we're working towards sort of the job analysis taxonomy instrument development, that we're also laying the foundation for really, how are we going to sample and what will this Panel's recommendations to Social Security be, and I'm wondering, do you think there is some danger, in working on these things simultaneously, rather than sort of prioritizing them and approaching them more sequentially?

DR. HUNT: No, I don't think there is any danger, except the possible redundancy, if you take the wrong turn at some point, and need to go back and retrace your steps.

But I guess this just came out of my own frustration, at not being able to contribute on the other side, and feeling like, well, so what?

I mean, I can keep working, but it isn't going to help, because the other side is, in my conception of it, is lagging behind because not that it's more complex, maybe, but it's certainly more unknown.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Shanan?

DR. GIBSON: One thing that occurs to me, as I think about this is that we're going to need, or SSA is going to need, several points in this research and development and roll out process, to sample.

For example, at some point, we're going to say, "Okay, we have what we think is a decent taxonomy and a decent instrument," and we're going to take the top five jobs and go out and collect data, to test these in the pilot test.

The methodology we use for choosing the sampling frame for our initial pilot test may be very different from the methodology that they choose long term, for populating an OIS.

One may need to be more expeditious, efficient, and it may not be the ideal for the other.

So, when we look at these, I don't just think it's a matter of better and worse. It's pros and cons, given the circumstances of what we need the data for, and that actually adds to the complexity of the decision, here, but I think it's a factor we sometimes overlook, when we talk about the sampling.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Juan?

DR. SANCHEZ: Yes, I guess the good thing about it, Allan, is that because we are an Advisory Panel, we could only make recommendations and it's them, fortunately, for them that need to make the decisions.

But it seems to me that perhaps, we could, at this point, I see that the strengths and weaknesses of all approaches are more clear to me.

So, perhaps that is something that we could work on, develop a list of strengths and weaknesses of survey, the strengths and weaknesses of relying on incumbents, as opposed to analysts, you know, speculation as to what type of person will make the best analyst. Is it the vocational expert, and under what conditions?

I don't know if we are at that level or point, where we could actually start to formulate those lists, but that may be what benefits them the most, I would think.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: David?

DR. SCHRETLIN: So, first, I want to second what Shanan said. I think that's a very important reminder, that we might have multiple sampling frames for different components of what we're -- or Social Security might have multiple sampling frames for ultimately, the work they need to do, to bring this to fruition.

But I guess because this meeting is focused on sampling, that's where my thinking has been over the last couple of days, and I just really appreciated getting the diversity of presentations.

I know that at times, I've probably been a very vocal proponent of the bottom up approach, but I don't want to make it sound like I'm totally wedded to that.

I see a value in a variety of approaches, but I just think that before we get to the point where we can make recommendations, we need to explore further, what our possibilities are.

And so, for instance, talking with -- I was talking with Sylvia during the break, and Dr. Day, from the Census Bureau, and it just seem to me like there may be a variety of ways that Social Security could partner with the Census, that, you know, we, as a Panel, we might want to talk with Social Security about, just sort of brain-storming ways.

Whether it is to rely on them for help with just purely sampling, or actually try and sort of inter-digitate some efforts with an ongoing survey. I mean, there are so many different ways that I could imagine that Social Security might be able to benefit from their expertise, because they clearly have a remarkable infrastructure in place, for getting a broadly representative sample, if at some point, we want to commit to a bottom up sort of approach, for some component of this research.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Deb?

MS. LECHNER: It occurs to me, that there will be a pilot study phase for the instrument itself, and you know, you wonder if that could be coupled with a pilot study of sampling approaches.

So, that if, you know, perhaps, one of our jobs, as an Advisory Panel or a subcommittee of the Advisory Panel could put together a list of pros and cons of different approaches, pros and cons of working with different agencies, and coupling, you know, their -- or capitalizing on their data.

And so, here are the pros and cons of each, and then as the pilot study is designed, we take the instrument, we're piloting it, but we're also piloting two or three different sampling approaches, and can sort of get some real hands-on practical experience that tells us, this is going to work better because it worked better in the pilot.

DR. SCHRETLIN: I could imagine ways of doing that, that could provide information about feasibility, but also, representative, so, you know, I could see that as a real possibility.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I'm going to call on people who have been kind of quiet, because I want to make sure everybody gets a chance to express an opinion. Tim?

MR. KEY: I really don't have that much to add.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, okay. Tom?

MR. HARDY: Well, like all attorneys, I like to just hear myself talk.

But I've really tried to bring myself back in on that one, during this, because this is not my area, and the one message that I want to give back to the work group is how impressed I am with the quality of the work that has been coming out in the past couple of months, how impressed I am with everything that I've seen coming out of the work group, and it's been really a pleasure to see that development and growth within there.

When it comes to sampling and validity and reliability, I don't know. I defer to those who know best. I know our Panel is kind moving heavily now, into being more research oriented and our work is research oriented, so, I kind of am stepping back and listening and with my other ear, I'm trying to listen to legal issues, and I'm trying to listen to the disability people issues.

I'm listening to some other things, and I'm sort of holding that within right now, because I don't think it's appropriate to share, because we're not at that point.

But I am also trying to keep in

mind that now that we've got a roadmap and there are other pieces, I'd like to see us work on multiple areas, because I think we can now take information and go, "Okay, well, this is not part of what we're doing now, but it can plug in over here and let's save it."

So, as far as the message of doing this quickly, I got that message and I think we need to be not just tied to, this is what we're doing, which is this one piece, phase two, blank, blank, blank. We need to be planning as much ahead as we can and thinking of other implications, ramifications down the line, and prepping for those pieces, too, so, we can move this down the track quickly.

But overall, I'm really impressed with everything that is going on, and I've appreciated this meeting, because I've learned a lot.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you for those comments. I think that will also help, as we're kind of restructuring the Panel and subcommittees, to also think that it's sometimes a little bit beyond just the immediate function, that there are other outside issues that we need to maybe capture a little bit. So, thank you.

Abigail, you haven't spoken during this deliberation, so, I want to make sure that --

DR. PANTER: I think that we can assume that there will be an instrument, and it will not be very long, but it will show up pretty soon, and I think we should be outlining various scenarios for sampling, what would it look like if we went in this direction? What would it look like if we went in this direction, and what the costs would be.

I think we advise SSA in this, but I think that this is a very fruitful direction for us, because we can't see the pitfalls unless we walk through what it could be.

So, that's -- and we have now, data to say, what are some of the major options for us, and we need to proceed, I think, in that way.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Janine?

MS. HOLLOMAN: Well, likewise, I am not a scientist by trade. So, I want to say how much I appreciate the expertise, both of the Panel and of the work group.

You're doing amazing work. I know just enough about this part of the process to be dangerous.

Having said that, I really do appreciate also, the presentations over the last two days, because I was not aware of the various programs or the various infrastructure that BLS has, Census has, and really feeling like if we can tap into, you know, why reinvent the wheel and if we can tap into these sources for what we need, so, much the better, and I think so much - we'll get more done in less time.

So, I am very appreciative of the discussions and the presentations this week.

You know, the bottom line for people who are out in the field, representing claimants is making sure that this OIS does reflect the work that is being done out in the workforce and that it not be so generalized, because that's one of the problems we have right now, is that some of it is so generalized it doesn't pertain to our people that are actually out there working and applying for benefits.

So, again, I want to thank both the people on the Panel and on the work group that have that expertise, to be able to move this forward, and do a good job.

I said in my presentation to NADR, that I am just gratified to work with a group that has this area of expertise on both the Panel and the work group side, and their commitment, overall, to do it and get it done and do it right.

So, it's a privilege to serve and I am assuming that I'll have more input as we move forward and start to develop the instrument that will eventually be used out in the field. So, thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, thank you. Anybody else, before we move into the administrative end of our agenda, have anything else for deliberation?

Okay, so, now, we go onto Tom's favorite part of the agenda, the minutes, okay.

You have received the minutes. We got them earlier than just our folders. Are there any corrections to the minutes? Go ahead, Allan.

DR. HUNT: Entertain a motion to approve?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Well, it's a consent agenda.

DR. HUNT: Okay.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, if there are no amended -- if there are no changes to the minutes, we don't have to go to a vote on it. If there are any changes, we have to go ahead and go to a vote.

So, I'm looking at Tom. Okay, anybody else? Okay, hearing none, if there are no objections, the minutes are approved as printed, okay.

We also have a copy of our operating procedures. They are the stapled piece of paper that say 'draft', I think.

Oh, I think they are backwards. Are there some pages missing on this? Right after the minutes?

Okay, it looks like there is some pages missing on my copy. My copy starts at page five. Are we missing some pages, here? This is pretty important. If we're missing some pages, we need to make sure everybody -- we got a copy of it earlier this week. I don't know if anybody had reviewed it, before we got what's in our folders.

(OTR comments)

DR. HUNT: Mary, I don't know about others, but I did not --

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I want to make sure everybody has a copy, a full copy.

DR. HUNT: Right, but we didn't get it earlier.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: There should be seven pages, yes. I'm sorry?

DR. HUNT: We did not get it earlier. I did not get it earlier, at least.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, it went on email, but if this is something -- because this is our operating procedures, what we operate under, and I can go verbally, over what the changes were, but until everybody has had a chance to read it, I really would rather hold off the voting on this, until our teleconference in July.

And so, I can tell you what the changes were. I went through it, to look at dates, basic information, such as how long we are chartered for.

Obviously, that changed. So, updating those basic things, you know, some just editing kinds of things, in terms of the DFO being all the way through.

In terms of substantial changes, there was an addition that I had, and let's see if I could find it. It's under voting, I'm looking for the sub-section here.

No, it's under minutes and records. I'm looking for it.

Basically, I was trying to preserve the descent opinion and reflect that in the operating procedures, that the minutes will reflect, in terms of votes, any descent, so that people who want to have that reflected, should have the opportunity to have it reflected. It is something that is part of Robert's Rules, to be able to respect that, and I wanted to make sure it was reflected in our operating procedures.

Then there was one other section that was not very clear. Okay, it's under section -- back to the voting, under Section 6A, if you look at the very end, the last couple of sentences, "The Panel may adopt any action after recording the votes of the majority of the membership present and voting in favor. The DFO will ensure that meeting minutes reflect the number of members voting for, against and abstaining for a vote -- from a vote."

And we already went over the other day, the different kinds of votes and that in terms of ballot votes, if anybody wishes to have any vote reflected as an silent vote, that could be reflected.

The other area of C- bit of a change was under the public comment, and that was not really changed, as it was a clarification, and so, under public comment, it is Section 5C, on page four.

And it says, "Members of the

public may provide comment on issues that relate to the development of the OIS. Commenters may submit written testimony, no longer than five pages in length," and then it gives the address to access the Panel.

"SSA will publish opportunities for public comment during Panel meetings in the Federal Register, including the length and time allotted for such comment. The DFO will post agenda to the Panel's website, prior to each meeting."

There was some wording in the way that that was reflected before. It was kind of inter-mixed, with 'B', that talked about the agenda, and if you look at the second paragraph of the agenda, it says, "Non-members," so, people outside the Panel, "May suggest issues for the Panel meeting agenda, by participating in the public comment process, in person or by telephone at public meetings or in writing."

"Commenters must include detailed

information on how the specific topic relates to the mission of the Panel."

So, I wanted to make sure that that was reflected accurately, so that we could have the public understand that point, as well.

So, let's go ahead and not vote on this. I'll read it, very thoroughly, this is how we operate, and let's move this to the agenda, in July, the telephone meeting, and address it then.

The very last sheet, I'm sorry, go ahead, Allan.

DR. HUNT: I'm not sure if this is on purpose or inadvertent, but under voting, it seems to me there is a contradiction between A and B.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

DR. HUNT: In the sense that you say, the majority -- well, "Panel may adopt any action after recording the votes of the majority of the membership present and voting in favor."

Then of course, we have provided for an absentee vote, which wouldn't count, under A, because there is not present --

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Right.

DR. HUNT: Am I right?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And there is, under Robert's Rules, a way to account for absentee vote, voting, and let me take a look at that, again.

DR. HUNT: Okay.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And when we discuss it in July, I'll make sure that that is consistent.

Any other comments or questions? Go ahead, David.

DR. SCHRETLIN: I was just curious, the initial period was for two years, and now, it's for one. Is that because it's thought that this Panel is only going to go for another year?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: That is a

good question, and I think that's a question for SSA.

I know that we were chartered for a year. When I spoke with Richard about it earlier this week, I don't think there is any anticipation that we will end at a year.

So, I don't know, you know, why that decision was made, particularly, or if we'll be -- I know we cannot be chartered for longer than two years, under FACA. That is the maximum amount of time.

Okay, let's go ahead and then move now, toward the last item of our agenda, and that is the agenda.

So, but before we do that, the very last piece of paper in your folders is the teleconference date on July 27th and then, the last quarterly public meeting on September 20th through the 22nd.

That will be somewhere in this area, Baltimore, D.C., probably. That will be worked out, so, I don't want to commit any specific place, because as we know, that might change.

The only reason that we have the dates reflected here, through the fiscal year, is because we have to get beyond this year, or get closer.

So, hopefully, toward maybe July, we will get some further indication of dates into the future.

So, the last thing on the agenda is to look at items on the agenda for July and September.

I know for July, we have talked about having that agenda reflect, obviously, the operating procedures, also, the plan, the OIS development plan will probably be just finishing their run on the website. So, I know that will be on that agenda.

Project Director's Report, we usually don't go more than two hours on that phone. So, any other specific thing that you would like to see included in the July agenda?

DR. SANCHEZ: I'm not sure if this is an agenda item, but I think this consultant that is going to be -- or consultants, well, number one, they could have benefit from being here quite a bit, because there are going to be people with my background, but without having gone through this process, and I could tell you that it makes a huge difference.

Most people don't have basic knowledge about all the Federal products, or are in engaged in surveys, and I do feel like now, I have much more knowledge than somebody who could --

But I guess what I'm thinking is, is there a way to somehow, transfer this knowledge that we have acquired here, to this individual, that perhaps -- reading the minutes is not going to do it.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Probably, I mean, all of the materials that we were given are available, and we could provide.

When the Panel first started, I could not be here for the first two days, and there is a transcript that I spent a long time reading, going back and forth.

So, the fact that this is recorded and it's in the public, the individual will have access to the information that was on the record, and that was disseminated, and that's probably the closest we can get to that.

But I think that would be helpful. Abigail?

DR. PANTER: On the 27^{th}, it says it's a four hour meeting, but is it really just a two hour meeting?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes, we haven't set the time. So, I think hold that block open, but usually, we don't go more than two hours. I think we run into fatigue issues, longer than that.

Okay, then for the September

meeting, that is our face-to-face, back in this area.

Besides, the staff reports, obviously, the Project Director's Reports, earlier, we were talking about maybe having Census come back, and listening to the -- it is Bureau of Economic Analysis? Is that it?

I know ICF international is going to be having their report done by them.

(OTR comments)

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Is the report plural or singular, call one and call two? Deborah?

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: The call two report will be delivered on August 31st and the call one, the job analysis bench-marking will be delivered on June 30th. So, you should have both of those before the September meeting.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, so, it sounds like all of their work. We should have that way ahead, to be able to review and have them present on that.

So, because it's both calls, it will probably be a long presentation. Deb, did you want to say something? Okay.

So, ICF International Census, from Census, I was hearing a couple of different things. We talked about the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

They also have the field analysts, FA's, is that what they call them? They call them field analysts, and they have a whole program associated with that, in terms of what they do for training, what they do for recruiting, what they do for ensuring standardization and that kind of thing, access, those kinds of issues.

I was talking to Steve about it, after they presented on it. Since we are going to be hearing from ICF, would it be also helpful to hear from the Census and that particular program?

What they do with the field --

the -- field analysts, SIPR or -- CITA, I forget what they call it --

MS. LECHNER: I think it would be helpful because they're of the three groups that presented, they were the only ones with true field analysts out there.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Other areas? If we think about three areas that David talked about, which was sampling, data collection, field job analysts, and taxonomy, instrumentation. So, Allan and then Deb.

DR. HUNT: I'm hesitating to volunteer for the group, but how soon would you -- I mean, I think it is possible, at this point, to do a pluses and minuses analysis, at least at individual versus firm, and maybe even easier to do the two databases that are at hand.

Would the research subcommittee be willing to undertake that, before --

DR. PANTER: Yes.

DR. HUNT: Well, fill in the

date. Would it be -- it might be difficult to handle that over the phone, but for the September meeting?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: For September?

DR. PANTER: Yes.

DR. SCHRETLIN: I wonder if, for the September meeting, rather than try and set a target that we have some kind of finished product that we use -- take some of the time during that meeting, to have a sit-down and really come into that meeting with notes, but use that as a time to really discuss the strengths and weaknesses of alternate approaches to sampling, and I wonder if there might even be an opportunity between now and then, because that is several months away, to have some further discussion with SSA about what they might think of as possible ways of collaborating with some of these other agencies.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I would

like to know about SSA's own data, this kind of information, I think a presentation from SSA about their own data would be very advantageous.

MS. LECHNER: One of the other things that peaked my interest in the Census presentation is their quality assurance pieces, and we got to hear a little bit about that today.

But I'm wondering if there is more to it, because I think that is going to be an important piece of what has to go on long term, to maintain the quality of data that is coming in.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Maybe one of the things that we can do, like we did for this session is, we had questions that we developed for each group.

Maybe we could include that as part of the question for both of, what do you do to ensure data quality for your end of what you're doing?

We had -- going back to what Tom was saying earlier, and trying to think about not just what's on the table, but how it all kind of fits together, we had a presentation during fact finding on inferences.

You know, basically, that kind of thing, how things fit together. Do we want to do further presentations like that in September, or do we want to hold off and really focus the agenda on these areas?

DR. SCHRETLIN: Well, one of the things that I was wondering about is sort of responding to Allan's concern about moving forward on the instrument development.

I wonder if the job analysis people here might be willing to -- or be able to talk about some of the scaling issues that arise in characterizing various kinds of job demands, physical versus, you know, sort of more inter-personal or cognitive?

I don't know if that's premature, as well, but I think it could be very interesting and sort of edifying for us to learn about, what are some of the ways that you can scale those job demands, and what are the strengths and weaknesses?

DR. SANCHEZ: I guess job analysis people could say that.

Yes, I'll be happy to help you in any way you guys think I could, I guess.

MS. LECHNER: Yes, I'm happy to contribute to that, as well.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, then we could probably end up having something like that. That would be great.

DR. SCHRETLIN: But you guys, that is what you do. I mean, is that -- do you think that would be useful for us, or is that going to be sort of -- I mean, I just don't know sort of concretely, how we scale different things and whether that is going to have a big impact on the precision or quality or reliability or validity of data that is contained in the OIS.

MS. LECHNER: I definitely think it will have an impact on both reliability, validity, as well as the ability to aggregate data.

So, you know, I think it could put something together that would address those concerns.

DR. GIBSON: At a minimum, we could start off with a conversation of the importance of having cross-job relative metrics that versus with end-job relative metrics versus within organizational and then look at the importance of subjective versus objective measures and the outcomes there.

So, I mean, even if we didn't go into a psychometric properties of scales, which would probably put people to sleep, we could at least talk about the importance of the different types of scales that can be used and why they're valid or not valid in this setting.

DR. SCHRETLIN: But even what you

just said right there, just makes so much sense to me. That kind of orienting would be helpful.

DR. SANCHEZ: Something that I could do, if I had some time, you know, basic routes of job analysis, basic types of data, basic sources of data, what are the different methodologies?

Discussion on the level of detail, you know, I could do that.

DR. SCHRETLIN: I mean, I found myself wondering on day one of this meeting, if the original DOT instrument was somewhere available, or if it was lost in the dust bin of history.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: The original from 1939? Well, I know the data for the current version is gone. I heard that, anecdotally, and then I got it directly from the Department of Labor, all of that raw data is gone.

DR. SANCHEZ: You could probably

bring Sydney Fine, I think still alive, right?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: No, he's passed on.

DR. SANCHEZ: Passed on?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Yes. So, it sounds like we have something around job analysis that Juan, Deb and Shanan will be working on. It sounds like it might be at two different levels, we might have something for maybe fact finding, or might be something, fact finding and the regular meeting. We'll work around that, okay.

So, I have a variety of things here, it sounds like we're going to have a very full meeting in September.

Is there anything else that you think is critical? Go ahead, Allan.

DR. HUNT: So, you have the sampling options discussion or pluses or minuses, whatever?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I do, but

is that -- yes, I have it on there and then we could figure out where it fits the best, yes.

DR. HUNT: And that doesn't necessarily mean we wouldn't want someone like BEA to come, although I'd like to reserve the right to say, that's probably not going to help us, but because they don't collect the right kind of data for us. They just process other people's data, but --

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, we could look at that further, and it might be that we would find that they are not who we want to have here, but okay.

Any other areas? Okay, so, sounds like we have covered every item on the agenda, and it is right on time here, so, Deborah, I will turn the meeting over to our Designated Federal Officer, for adjournment.

MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: If there are no objections, the meeting will adjourn.

Hearing no objections, we are

adjourned until the next teleconference meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel in July 2011. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter concluded at approximately 1:15 p.m.)