SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT

ADVISORY PANEL TELECONFERENCE MEETING

AUGUST 31, 2009

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WOODLAWN, MARYLAND

*   *   *   *   *

DR. MARY BARROS-BAILEY

INTERIM CHAIR

S R C   REPORTERS
(301)645-2677

1   M E M B E R S

2 MARY BARROS-BAILEY, Ph.D., INTERIM CHAIR

3 GUNNAR ANDERSSON, M.D.

4 ROBERT T. FRASER, M.D.

5 SHANAN GWALTNEY GIBSON, Ph.D.

6 THOMAS A. HARDY, J.D.

7 SYLVIA E. KARMAN

8 DEBORAH E. LECHNER

9 LYNNAE M. RUTTLEDGE

10 DAVID J. SCHRETLEN, M.D.

11 NANCY G. SHOR, J.D.

12 MARK A. WILSON, Ph.D.

13

14   C O N T E N T S

15 ITEM:

16 ---

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

2   OPERATOR: Good day, ladies and gentlemen,

3   and welcome to your Occupational Information

4   Development Advisory Panel conference call. At this

5   time all participants are in a listen only mode. If

6   you should require operator assistance at any time

7   during today's program, please press "star, zero" on

8   your touch tone telephone. I would now like to

9   introduce your host for today's conference call,

10 Ms. Debra Tidwell-Peters.

11   You may begin, ma'am.

12   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Thank you.

13   Good afternoon everyone. My name is Debra

14 Tidwell-Peters. I'm the Designated Federal Officer

15 for the Occupational Information Development Advisory

16 Panel. I will begin by doing a scan of our members

17 to ensure that we have a quorum present.

18   Gunnar Andersson.

19   DR. ANDERSSON: Present.

20   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Mary Barros-Bailey.

21   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Present.

22   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Robert Fraser.

1   DR. FRASER: Present.

2   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Shanan Gwaltney

3   Gibson.

4   DR. GIBSON: Present.

5   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Thomas Hardy.

6   MR. HARDY: Present.

7   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Sylvia Karman.

8   MS. KARMAN: Present.

9   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Deborah Lechner.

10   We expect to have Deborah on the line

11   shortly.

12   Lynnae Ruttledge.

13   MS. RUTTLEDGE: Present.

14   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: David Schretlen.

15   DR. SCHRETLEN: Present.

16   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Nancy Shor.

17   MS. SHOR: Present.

18   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: And Mark Wilson.

19   DR. WILSON: Present.

20   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Thank you. We do

21   have a quorum of members.

22   For our members, since this meeting is

1 being transcribed, I will ask that each time you

2 speak that you say your name so that it can be

3 captured by our transcriptionist. And also, if at

4 any time during the meeting you need to mute your

5 line, please press "star, six;" and to unmute it

6 press "star, six" again.

7   Having a quorum, I'm now going to turn the

8 meeting over to the interim Panel Chair, Mary

9 Barros-Bailey.

10   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Good day, everybody.

11 Just to do a little bit of an introduction before we

12 review the addenda and procedures.

13   The purpose of today's meeting is based on

14 a continuum of activity that we have had. This is to

15 review and deliberate on the subcommittee's work

16 arising out of our Panel meetings, and the

17 recommendations of the subcommittee to the Panel in

18 terms of the Content Model and Classification.

19   There will not be any voting at today's

20 meeting. That will be held in September in terms of

21 the recommendations for the Content Model and

22 Classifications. We will be discussing the drafts of

1 those recommendations today as well as -- that arose

2 out of the subcommittee reports.

3   Just to put this in to a continuum for you

4 a little bit in terms of what will be happening after

5 today, the subcommittee reports will be finaled close

6 of business tomorrow. Then, we will have the overall

7 report, the OIDAP report of Content Model and

8 Classification to the Commissioner. That will be

9 drafted by the end of the week. That will be sent

10 out to the executive subcommittee with their

11 responses coming back to me by the 7th of September,

12 to final the report by the 8th of September, and then

13 that out to the whole Panel by the 9th of September

14 for review and approval at the Los Angeles meetings.

15   In terms of what we're going to be doing

16 today in terms of the review of the agenda we're

17 going to be going through each of the subcommittees

18 recommendations for the content model and areas of

19 future study. We're going to be taking the

20 recommendation section by section and discussing

21 those and deliberating on those by subcommittee

22 before we move on to the next subcommittee.

 1   It's my understanding that the physical

 2   demands report may need to be pushed up because there

 3   is some time constraints that Deborah Lechner is

 4   under. So we might need to move that up either

 5   before transferable skills or taxonomy, depending on

 6   how we're dealing with the time. Then at the end of

 7   the deliberations for the subcommittee, we're going

 8   to have overall deliberations for the Panel. Then

 9   any outstanding issues or questions we're going to be

10   talking about the Panel vote in September. Okay.

11   So I'm going to ask our subcommittee chair,

12   Sylvia Karman, to address the recommendations for

13   Users Needs and Relations.

14   MS. KARMAN: Thank you, Mary. Good

15   afternoon, everyone.

16   We -- our subcommittee has made

17   recommendations in three main areas. One is

18   communication information coming in and going out of

19   the Panel and SSA about the project, recommendations

20   for applying research, and then recommendations for

21   other content model data elements; those which are in

22   addition to physical and mental cognitive demands of

1   work and worker traits.

2   I will begin with public comment process

3   recommendations under communication. And what we

4   submit as recommendations for the Panel's

5   consideration are that SSA should explore more

6   extensive use of Federal Register notices to solicit

7   public comment. We offer two possible options for

8   considerations. SSA should investigate whether or

9   not it's able to publish the Panel's final

10 recommendation report in the Federal Register,

11 inviting the public to comment for a designated

12 period of time.

13   And then SSA as well should consider

14 publishing in the Federal Register notices of -- that

15 are independent of the Panel meeting announcements.

16 These notices could request public comment regarding

17 specific topics of timely interest to the Panel or

18 SSA that may inform Panel deliberations, meeting

19 agendas that are in the future, as well as SSA's

20 project work.

21   Also, SSA should notify the public

22 periodically as determined by the Panel of the nature

1   of public comments received between and during Panel

2   meetings. SSA should summarize these comments and

3   make the summaries available to the public. They may

4   be posted to the OIDAP web site, disseminated at

5   face-to-face public Panel meetings, and broadcast to

6   the subscribers of the OIDAP e-mail. Comments

7   received in response to a Federal Register notice may

8   be summarized and published through the Federal

9   Register process.

10   Are there any comments or concerns before I

11 move on to the next area?

12   Okay. The second area under communication

13 is communication methods and venues. We have

14 examined a number of different methods and our

15 subcommittee discussed them. These were the

16 outcomes. So number one, SSA should consider

17 publishing notices in relevant professional

18 publications advertising the OIDAP web site and

19 e-mail addresses.

20   And also SSA should explore social media.

21 Of all the social media that are currently available,

22 our subcommittee felt that a closed authored blog may

1 be the best contemporary method to reach a variety of

2 audiences. This would be a blog that is moderated

3 with a designated blogger, one individual or set of

4 individuals were designated to post information on a

5 regular basis and make that available to the public.

6   Then, thirdly, 2c, maintain our basic

7 static and receptive media, which would be the OIDAP

8 e-mail and our web site as a Panel's virtual

9 billboard. However, obviously, that's not

10 interactive.

11   2d would be for us to recommend that SSA

12 also push media -- or use push media, such as e-mail

13 distribution lists, public service announcements

14 through Social Security's web site, and other e-mail

15 distribution lists that SSA may have.

16   Under 2e, we suggest that the Panel

17 consider having Social Security develop consistent

18 structure for any online social media use. That

19 includes developing a branding style, developing a

20 style sheet for all print media, and develop

21 presentation materials and Power Point slides

22 regarding the project and Panel activities that can

1 be modified to suit audience needs. Develop criteria

2 for moderators of social media sources that may be

3 selected regarding the content, the clearance of any

4 information that gets on to that medium, the style,

5 and any online behavior that we have for expectations

6 and guidelines for that.

7   Also, help set expectations and boundaries

8 with disclosure statements notifying participants of

9 any of these media regarding the authoring,

10 anonymity, and expected response.

11   2f, we should ask that SSA continue to

12 monitor developments in the new and emerging public

13 media through ongoing SSA and other federal

14 government itself. We have cited two that we know of

15 right now and currently another federal advisory

16 committee within Social Security called Future

17 Systems Technology Advisory Panel, and the federal

18 knowledge management initiative.

19   And then, finally, the last item under this

20 section is for Social Security to develop fact sheets

21 for the public to address frequently asked questions

22 regarding the project and Panel activities. Are

1 there any comments or concerns?

2   DR. SCHRETLEN: Sylvia, this is David

3 Schretlen.

4   MS. KARMAN: Yes.

5   DR. SCHRETLEN: You have, obviously, spent

6 a great deal of time thinking about this. Certainly

7 more than I have. I am wondering, all these under

8 these general recommendations for communication,

9 were there other methods or venues that you

10 considered and rejected; and if so, why?

11   MS. KARMAN: We did, in fact, consider a

12 number of them. A lot of the things that we looked

13 at included the open blogs, open wikis, which if, in

14 fact, Social Security were to be responsible for

15 these things, we felt that there were concerns

16 about -- you know, the degree to which that

17 information could remain unaltered and secure and

18 that we knew what was -- that the information was

19 reliable.

20   Mary, did you have some other points that

21 you wanted to make here?

22   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yes, I think in terms

1 of other social medias, is that what you are

2 referring to or are you referring to any media?

3   DR. SCHRETLEN: Just any media. You know,

4 I don't even know what a closed authored blogged is,

5 what that means. How that differs from others.

6   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I will explain the

7 difference. A closed author would be kind of when

8 you go to the White House web site, you see they

9 have a blog. They don't allow comments and that

10 kind of thing. It's an active participation in

11 terms of information, but there isn't a lot of

12 dialogue back and forth. So it is the way that the

13 information is collected and processed.

14   Some of the research that we did was among

15 other -- what's happening in other areas within

16 government, not just federal, but other levels of

17 government as well in terms of the integration of

18 social media. And it's a fairly new concept in and

19 of itself. So it's a matter of looking at it and

20 kind of treading lightly and making sure that

21 information that is available is information that is

22 accurate.

1   DR. SCHRETLEN: But people who read the

2   blog can comment, so communication goes both ways?

3   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I mean, they can

4   comment through our e-mail address.

5   DR. SCHRETLEN: I see, but not on the

6   blog?

7   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Right. There is a

8   concern in terms of being able to make sure that the

9   information that is on there is as accurate as

10 possible.

11   MS. KARMAN: David, this is Sylvia, we

12 have also heard from a number of other Panel members

13 about the prospect of using wikis to -- sort of open

14 discussion about a variety of topics relevant to our

15 project. For example, you know, issues having to do

16 with, perhaps, experts in the field who are aware of

17 any changes that are going on with work activities

18 or occupations in general; but I think that we would

19 need to take a look at how we would be able to

20 operationalize that, if that was something that

21 Social Security was responsible for.

22   Now, if wikis get established and these

1   kind of things are out there being used, Social

2   Security could certainly use that information and

3   then go back and verify what people are posting. So

4   we're not saying we shouldn't be doing something

5   that's open. It's just how would we manage it in

6   Social Security. I think that's --

7   DR. SCHRETLEN: I guess the underlying

8   question for me is, is the purpose of this just to

9   promulgate information to the public, or to also

10 receive information?

11   MS. KARMAN: Both. Our recommendations

12 overall have to do with both. So in terms of the

13 Federal Register process that we have outlined and

14 other ways of communicating with the public, we have

15 an interest in getting information to the public and

16 to a variety of other users or stakeholders in the

17 process, as well as getting information from them.

18 So it is both.

19   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: And I think it's also

20 identifying the best platform for the best audience.

21 When we researched it, we, for example, talked to

22 NASA. Are they -- they have different platforms for

1 different audiences. So for researchers and

2 scientists it's more of a traditional online media.

3 And for the general public it's more the social

4 media that deals with blogging and social

5 networking, that sort of thing. So it's identifying

6 the best resource for the public -- the target

7 audience.

8   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. Thank you.

9   MR. HARDY: This is Tom Hardy. I have a

10 very quick question, Sylvia.

11   MS. KARMAN: Okay.

12   MR. HARDY: Under 2d, for push media and

13 e-mail distribution list; I'm assuming there will be

14 a way for the general public to write in and get on

15 that list?

16   MS. KARMAN: That's correct. They do this

17 now.

18   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: That's available now.

19   MR. HARDY: Okay. Thank you.

20   MS. KARMAN: Is that all? Okay.

21   The next section, there are recommendations

22 for Applied Research; and number three is User Needs

1   Analyses and Studies of Programs and Process Effects.

2   We submit the recommendations for the full Panel's

3   consideration that SSA should develop a formal plan

4   to conduct users needs analyses throughout the

5   research and development phase of the project.

6   The UNA plans and study designs should

7   address various stages of the Occupational

8   Information System development. For example, right

9   now we just -- Social Security just completed a user

10 needs analysis of -- involving it's user with regard

11 to the content model. The next stage may involve

12 issues having to do with content model as it's being

13 developed and instrument development. In this way we

14 can capture user reactions and concerns, including

15 any operational or programmatic information that

16 might be valuable to Social Security.

17   Also, these user needs analyses should

18 target as many SSA users as possible, as well as

19 external users of occupational information who are

20 directly involved in SSA's disability process. For

21 example, claimant representatives and vocational

22 experts. We understand that the Office of Management

1 and Budget Paperwork Reduction Act guidelines would

2 apply for any studies or surveys that SSA conducts

3 with external users, those who are not working

4 directly for Social Security Administration.

5   SSA on the third element, or 3b, actually,

6 is SSA should study the effects of using the OIS

7 content model data elements. Under that suggesting

8 the first one is that SSA should conduct a study of

9 the effects of the OIS content model data elements in

10 SSA's disability process by comparing the use of

11 prototype person-side instruments, which would

12 include the newly identified content model

13 person-side constructs and measures with the use of

14 current -- our current physical and mental residual

15 functional assessments. Social Security could do

16 this using a sample of disability claims that have

17 already been adjudicated. The results could inform

18 SSA's RFC development claims intake process. Other

19 assessments models, for example, computer assistive

20 technology, as well as the content model itself, and

21 prototype work-side job analysis instruments. The

22 study should involve SSA adjudicators and its medical

1 staff in applying the new content model's physical

2 and mental data elements.

3   Do we have any comments or concerns about

4 that before I move to the next suggestion? Okay.

5   Another study -- or another area of study

6 that we would want the Panel to consider to recommend

7 to Social Security is that when the results of field

8 tests of the work-side instruments are available, SSA

9 should also conduct studies of the application of

10 these data in SSA's disability process to assess the

11 validity and effects of the data on both its

12 disability process and programs.

13   These studies would include effects of

14 using physical and mental work demands data, as well

15 as work activity and other occupational data that are

16 critical to the assessment of work history and

17 transferable skills assessment.

18   Are there any comments on either of these

19 before I move on?

20   All right. Our final area, are

21 recommendations for other Content Model Data

22 Elements. We recognize that there are data that SSA

1   may need, that go beyond the physical and mental

2   cognitive demands of work and worker traits. And we

3   recognize that among those types of data we note that

4   there are some that are for adjudicative use, and

5   others that we are recommending that are only for

6   program evaluation and research; and would not be

7   recommend for adjudicative use.

8   First, I will cover a few of the elements

9   that we have recommended for adjudicative use. First

10   one is literacy. Does the occupation require the

11   worker to be able to read or write? If so, in what

12   language or languages?

13   Communication in English or other

14   languages. Does the occupation require the worker to

15   be able to communicate in English or other languages?

16   Are there options for how the work is

17   performed -- or how the work may be performed that

18   the worker may select, such as a sit-stand option?

19   This would be -- this would include options for use

20   of a variety of tools or technology to perform a

21   given work activity.

22   And core tasks. What are the core tasks or

1   work activities of the occupation, as opposed to

2   those tasks which may be not necessarily required?

3   Are there any comments on those or things

4   that you feel that we should add?

5   MR. GUNNAR: This is Gunnar. I guess it's

6   a political issue, but the question arises whether

7   or not you should require anybody to speak other

8   languages other than English?

9   MS. KARMAN: We are collecting the

10   information really with an eye toward whether or not

11   the job requires somebody to communicate in English,

12   which is -- as our current policy is, we look toward

13   that. We do not have a requirement that they need

14   to be able to speak a particular other language, but

15   that's always been information that -- that users

16   have told us that they frequently would want to

17   know.

18   That's an excellent question, though,

19   Gunnar, because in a way that isn't information that

20   is currently used in the adjudicative process, nor

21   are we suggesting that it should be. So, perhaps, we

22   should make a distinction about the extent -- if we

1 do include that kind of information, collecting that

2 type of information, perhaps, we would want to put

3 that in the program evaluation category.

4   Any other comments?

5   DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes, just one, Sylvia;

6 this is David.

7   I don't know whether it belongs here or not

8 or even whether it's appropriate; but I wonder, since

9 more and more people are working from home or

10 telecommunicating, is that something that is

11 important to consider?

12   MS. KARMAN: Currently, we don't have a

13 programmatic need for that literally. But it

14 certainly is important to consider, and we have a

15 list of items for program evaluation and research;

16 and perhaps, we should consider seeing where that

17 might fit there.

18   DR. SCHRETLEN: I just wonder if in the

19 adjudication of cases there might be people who

20 could do jobs at home, but not -- more easily than

21 going to work.

22   MS. KARMAN: Right. Right. But we would

1 need to take a look at that in terms of how we would

2 want to handle it in our policies. It seems like we

3 would want to cover that, though, under program

4 evaluation and research, at least for starters; and

5 then, that would inform SSA's process.

6   We do have some elements under there that

7 have to do with, you know, the shift of the job and

8 transportation; but I think that's a good point.

9   DR. SCHRETLEN: It just seems like it's

10 happening more and more.

11   MS. KARMAN: Yes. Okay.

12   DR. ANDERSSON: There is actually quite a

13 few patients who claim that transportation to work

14 is their main problem.

15   DR. WILSON: Yes, talking about the

16 ultimate sit/stand option.

17   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Just a reminder that

18 Stella is working really hard here to get down every

19 word. If you can say your name before you make a

20 comment, that would be great.

21   MS. KARMAN: Okay. Before I go to the

22 next set of data elements, are we finished with that

1 set -- at least for now?

2   Okay. All right. So here are a few

3 content model data elements that we're submitting for

4 Panel's consideration. These would be for program

5 evaluation and research at this stage of the game

6 only. None of these elements are we recommending for

7 adjudicative use. However, their analysis by the

8 Agency might lead the Agency to -- you know, it might

9 inform policy development.

10   For example, the issue of telecommunicating

11 that was just raised by David Schretlen and Gunnar

12 Andersson certainly might be an element that would

13 fit there that might in the long run inform policy

14 development.

15   So what we have, for starters anyway, are

16 the worker's year of birth; the worker's educational

17 attainment -- or level of educational attainment;

18 worker's chronological work experience. For example,

19 the last occupation or up to the last three

20 occupations. That's just a number that we're using.

21 It doesn't have to be that; including the duration of

22 work activities performed, and work activities

1 performed.

2   Worker's mode of transportation to and from

3 the occupation; zip code of employment entity.

4 Suspecting that we will probably have that or need

5 that anyway in order just to do our sampling. And

6 also zip code of the worker's residence. Kind of

7 gives us an idea of how far people are traveling.

8   Worker's primary language and secondary, if

9 any -- if there is a secondary. Occupations average

10 shifts, time of day and number of hours. And here we

11 can see where telecommunicating might fit in.

12 Worker's number of hours worked weekly or daily in

13 the occupation; and another item for worker's other

14 jobs or occupations -- this should say

15 concurrently -- that they -- that the worker is doing

16 concurrently. So in other words, is the worker

17 holding down more than one job at a time?

18   Does the employer offer health insurance?

19 And if yes, does the worker participate in that

20 program? What is the worker's gender, and worker's

21 race and ethnicity? Are there any comments or

22 concerns?

1   All right. Thank you very much, everyone.

2   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thanks. And Sylvia

3   went through each of her recommendations section by

4   section. I just wanted to ask overall if there are

5   any comments or concerns or questions for Sylvia

6   before we move on to taxonomy?

7   MS. RUTTLEDGE: This is Lynnae, it's not a

8   question or concern; but it might be helpful as we

9   start each one of the presentations if the person

10 who is giving the report can mention who are the

11 members on those committees.

12   MS. KARMAN: Oh, thank you.

13   MS. RUTTLEDGE: Sure.

14   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Sylvia, do you want to

15 maybe wind that up for your subcommittee?

16   MS. KARMAN: Yes. Absolutely. Thank you,

17 Lynnae. I'm sorry.

18   MS. RUTTLEDGE: That way it will be in the

19 record.

20   MS. KARMAN: Absolutely. Okay.

21   So for the User Needs and Relations

22 Subcommittee our members are Lynnae Ruttledge, Nancy

1   G. Shor, Mary Barros-Bailey, Sylvia Karman.

2   Okay. Thank you very much.

3   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Lynnae.

4   And I'm going to go ahead -- let me ask, is

5   there any other question or comment before I past on?

6   Okay. Mark Wilson is the Chair of the Work

7   Taxonomy and Classification Subcommittee, and I would

8   like to then turn the meeting over to him for his

9   recommendations.

10   DR. WILSON: Thank you, Mary.

11   And to deal with Lynnae's request, first.

12 In addition to me, Mark Wilson; Shanan Gwaltney

13 Gibson is the other member of our subcommittee.

14 Initially, James Woods, who was a Panel member,

15 previously was on our subcommittee, but choose to

16 resign. So Shanan and I have soldiered on by

17 ourselves.

18   The Work Taxonomy and Classification

19 Subcommittee has made 16 recommendations that are

20 organized into four categories for the Panel's

21 consideration.

22   The categories are Existing Systems, OIS

1 Design and Development; OIS Standing for Occupation

2 and Information System; OIS Data Collection and

3 Analysis, OIS Maintenance.

4   Our recommendations include suggestions on

5 work taxonomy and job classification, as well as our

6 views of the systems that are needed to bring these

7 about and maintain them.

8   So with regard to the first category,

9 Existing Systems, we have made two recommendations.

10 And essentially, our recommendation is that the

11 Social Security Administration should develop its own

12 Occupational Information System rather than try and

13 update or retask existing systems. And the two

14 systems are the Dictionary of Occupational Titles and

15 O*Net.

16   Any questions with regard to Existing

17 Systems?

18   Hearing none. I will move on.

19   MS. SHOR: Mark, this is Nancy Shor. I

20 will tell you that a question that is posed to me

21 more frequently than any other is why has the

22 Panel -- why is the Panel operating from the get go

1   that updating the DOT isn't the way to go?

2   DR. WILSON: I don't know if you -- we

3   went into some detail in the report about what the

4   issues were with the Dictionary of Occupational

5   Titles.

6   MS. SHOR: Right.

7   DR. WILSON: Discussed the National

8   Academy of Sciences review of the Dictionary of

9   Occupational Titles and scientific problems with

10 that. I think it's an important question, though,

11 Nancy, in that it very well could be the case -- in

12 fact, I suspect it will be, that the Occupational

13 Information System that we propose, if Social

14 Security chooses -- the Panel chooses to recommend,

15 Social Security chooses to follow, would more than

16 likely provide information on some of the same

17 constructs that the Dictionary of Occupational

18 Titles tries to provide information on, but with

19 greater scientific precision and more accuracy.

20   MS. SHOR: Okay. Thank you.

21   DR. WILSON: Any other questions about

22 prior systems?

1   All right. OIS Design and Development.

2   Here we made three recommendations. The first

3   recommendation is based on one of our activities

4   where we looked at all the previous empirical work

5   taxonomies that were out there and did a sorting and

6   consolidation process, which is now referred to as

7   Table 2 in our report to the Panel. And we suggest

8   that Social Security Administration use Table 2 as

9   the stimulus for the development of an occupational

10   analysis instrument that would have multiple item

11   scales to measure the dimensions that are listed in

12   Table 2.

13   The second recommendation -- and you have

14   heard some about this already -- is we recommend that

15   SSA host a web-based community where registered

16   experts from several disciplines could review the

17   dimensions in Table 2, make comments, make

18   suggestions. I suggest potential items, things of

19   that sort.

20   We were intentionally vague in terms of

21   some of the mechanics of exactly how the web based

22   community might work. You have already heard from

1 Sylvia some thoughts of other Panel members on that.

2 We're by no means experts in this area. Our goal

3 here is simply to involve, as Nancy asked, there is

4 very large, very active communities, people out there

5 that are very interested in this process. We need to

6 find a way to get them involved in and hopefully

7 understand that we're very interested in their views

8 on measurement of these important constructs on the

9 work side that we're trying to get after.

10   The most important things in terms of these

11 constructs, before I move on to the third

12 recommendation in this area, is that they be

13 behavioral and observable.

14   Okay. With regard to the third

15 recommendation, because there is so little expertise

16 in -- that is current in a lot of these areas, and

17 because we consider occupational information for the

18 purposes of disability determination to be a core

19 task of Social Security Administration, we are

20 suggesting that they should develop their own

21 internal unit to carry out recommendations with

22 regard to the design and development, data

1 collection, analysis, and maintenance of an

2 Occupational Information System.

3   We also think it's important that the

4 Agency should put in place procedures and policies

5 that are meant to help establish the independence and

6 scientific credibility of this unit. So those are

7 the three recommendations with regard to design and

8 development. Any questions in this area?

9   DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes, Mark, this is Dave

10 Schretlen.

11   DR. WILSON: Sure.

12   DR. SCHRETLEN: Under bullet point two,

13 there is the sentence, "two primary criteria for

14 items should be that they are both behavioral and

15 observable;" and I would suggest for consideration

16 substituting the word "measurable" for "observable."

17 Mainly because of my interest in the psychological

18 side of things. We can often measure things that we

19 can't necessarily observe directly.

20   DR. WILSON: I'm going to give you some

21 push back on that one, David, in the sense that we

22 think -- and some of it comes from my sense of what

1 the courts tend to look at in terms of job

2 relatedness of various personnel actions. You know,

3 maybe we will need to have a more extensive

4 discussion on this; but I definitely think

5 observable needs to be there. I think if we try and

6 get too far removed from things that can be verified

7 through direct observation, we're going to have

8 defensibility problems.

9   MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia, Mark and

10 David. Would it be possible for us to qualify

11 this -- that sentence a bit or the concept, the idea

12 a bit by saying -- by addressing what David is

13 concerned with, as well as what your point is, Mark?

14 So that both --

15   DR. WILSON: I think the issue is -- David

16 makes an important point. We're certainly not

17 arguing against measurability, but it was --

18   MS. KARMAN: Right. We do need observable

19 things.

20   DR. WILSON: The issue is, which I

21 completely agree, there are things that are

22 measurable that aren't observable. So we're

1 certainly not arguing, in fact, the reverse. We're

2 very much in favor of measurability. The issue is,

3 if we don't -- if we drop the -- the requirement

4 that things be observable, I think, we run into

5 other things. So I would have no problem adding the

6 word "measurable" to the list. My concern would be

7 dropping the word "observable."

8   DR. FRASER: Yes, let's just add the

9 "measurable."

10   DR. WILSON: Right. I have no problem

11 with that.

12   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Was that Bob?

13   DR. FRASER: Yes.

14   DR. GIBSON: This is Shanan. Can I take

15 you back a moment, please? Hello.

16   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Sure.

17   DR. GIBSON: I was going to say in

18 relation to what Dave just said, I think the issue

19 of observable versus measurable is very distinctive

20 on the person side. However, if we're talking about

21 measuring on the job side, I think observability is

22 a paramount issue for legal defensibility. So there

1 is a difference when we're talking about the job

2 side versus the person side here.

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

4 understanding you correctly, I agree; yes.

5   DR. GIBSON: On the job side we need to

6 maintain observable; and observable, therefore,

7 implies measurable. However, on the person side

8 there are things which are measurable, but not

9 observable. So there is a distinction depending on

10 which side we're referring to here.

11   DR. SCHRETLEN: I think my concern is that

12 for some characteristics of jobs like job complexity

13 it is difficult to --

14   DR. GIBSON: I don't think we can measure

15 complexity either, Dave.

16   DR. SCHRETLEN: You know, but it's an

17 important aspect of job demand. In fact, it's

18 probably one of the single most important

19 characteristics that distinguish among jobs. So

20 that's what I was saying, I think that you can

21 probably measure job complexity indirectly by

22 looking at it's reflection in incumbents; but it

1   would be very difficult to say what it is about what

2   a -- a judge does or a physicist that -- that --

3   that characterizes its complexity.

4   DR. GIBSON: But what you're referring to

5   there really is more, if you will, a statistical

6   computation of complexity based on -- estimate of

7   complexity based on things we do observe, actual

8   behaviors performed on the job, correct?

9   DR. SCHRETLEN: Well, I think that -- I

10 mean, the answer is at some level, absolutely, yes.

11 But I'm just not sure that it's very feasible to

12 characterize job complexity based on what is

13 observed.

14   DR. GIBSON: Even things which are

15 outcomes of work are observable, though. So if you

16 wanted to use the job of physicist for which, for

17 example, many of the tasks are cognitive in nature,

18 the outcomes are still observable, which would be an

19 indication of complexity. I just do not want to

20 move off saying that things can be measured on the

21 job side that don't have to be observable. That

22 runs counter to all the literature on verifiability,

1   and what we know about litigation and defensibility

2   and work analysis.

3   DR. WILSON: This is Mark Wilson. We --

4   in the report we actually discussed this issue at

5   some length. And the discussion that we're having

6   now, I think, is important in that it highlights the

7   issue of what is directly observed and measured

8   versus what one infers from that. Oftentimes -- and

9   it's what I was referring to earlier when I talked

10 about the DOT and some of the constructs that they

11 attempted to measure either directly in most cases,

12 or now we're talking about indirectly or through

13 multi-item scales.

14   I think that there are a number of

15 different ways that we can get at some of these more

16 complex constructs that David is talking about, like

17 complexity; but I think if the issue is -- and I

18 think as we make clear in our report, defensibility

19 attempts to directly measure highly complex

20 constructs -- on the work side anyway -- would be

21 difficult and hard to defend. It doesn't mean that

22 we can't do studies that, you know, we try and

1 capture expert judgment of some of these things, see

2 whether or not some of these larger inferential leaps

3 can be validated scientifically. But it's more

4 difficult, and I think the genesis of our discussion

5 here is referring to items, not constructs.

6 So if we think of it from that standpoint,

7 the items that we are going to use we're pretty

8 firmly in -- in the camp that they need to be

9 behavioral and observable; and we have no problem

10 with adding measurable as well. How we get to more

11 abstract issues is a little more complicated in terms

12 of measurement; but I think anything that the Panel

13 feels, regardless of how complex or abstract it is,

14 you know, we will certainly try and provide work side

15 information that could be used as a basis of making

16 those inferences.

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

18 other comments or suggestions on the second category

19 of recommendations?

20 MR. HARDY: This is Tom Hardy. I had just

21 a quick clarification I wanted to make sure on

22 bullet number one, referring to Table 2. Table 2 is

1 suggested stimulus areas, and the items in there may

2 and most likely will change over time, is that

3 correct?

4   DR. WILSON: Say that again, Tom. I'm not

5 sure --

6   MR. HARDY: Table 2 that we're

7 referencing. The way I'm reading this it indicates

8 that items in Table 2 may or may not remain or

9 change over time as we go forward with data

10 collection and analysis.

11   DR. WILSON: Right. This -- Table 2 is a

12 consolidation of existing and empirical taxonomies.

13 So as the report indicates, it is simply a starting

14 point. It's a place to provide stimulus for item

15 writing. Once we get into some of the other areas

16 and actually collect information and do factor

17 analytic studies, I don't think we're going to

18 recover all the dimensions that are listed in Table

19 2.

20   I also think that, you know, if our

21 recommendations regarding online communities, one or

22 more people out there might identify some major area

1 that -- through the -- the empirical literature has

2 missed. As unlikely as that may be, I think that

3 would be another source for additional information.

4 So yeah, I definitely think it's an iterative

5 process, and the actual number of dimensions that are

6 used in any sort of an operational system that is

7 developed will be smaller than what's listed in Table

8 2.

9   MR. HARDY: Okay. Thank you.

10   DR. WILSON: Other considerations,

11 questions about the second area, OIS Design and

12 Development? All right. Hearing none, we will go

13 to OIS Data Collection and Analysis; and here we

14 have eight recommendations. This is, obviously, an

15 area where we thought a number of recommendations

16 could be made.

17   The first one is recommendation that SSA

18 should conduct a pilot study involving the most

19 frequently seen jobs of claimants and the most

20 frequently recommended jobs for those with residual

21 functional capacity. The idea is to take the items

22 generated from the previous section and do a pilot

1 study to capture 95 percent of the work out there

2 that's most commonly seen by Social Security

3 Administration.

4   Toward that end, a second recommendation;

5 we are aware that there are large groups of experts

6 out there who already provide vocational information

7 to Social Security. There are also other kinds of

8 experts out there who are very knowledgeable in work

9 analysis. SSA has a large system to tap in to that

10 we think that they should use to develop job analysts

11 for the purposes of filling out these ten work

12 analysis surveys as they're created for a pilot

13 sample of jobs.

14   Once that pilot study is completed, a third

15 recommendation identifies the three evaluation

16 criteria that we think are most important utility,

17 reliability, validity, and make suggestions for how

18 you might operationalize each one of those.

19   The fourth recommendation is that SSA

20 should pilot a -- this is similar -- stated slightly

21 differently than some of Sylvia's recommendations;

22 but the pilot data on the Occupational Informational

1 system side should be used to prototype reports and

2 computerized systems and compare that, you know, in a

3 usability sense through existing systems.

4   The fifth recommendation, another web based

5 community, and this one is more purely scientifically

6 focused. The idea is as occupational information is

7 generated, it should be shared with the larger

8 scientific community so that they can conduct their

9 own research, conduct their own evaluations, things

10 of that sort.

11   The sixth recommendation is use of the

12 pilot study to -- and this gets back to one of Tom's

13 questions -- the pilot study data will be a

14 significant source of information for refining the

15 taxonomy using various psychonomic principles to

16 evaluate items, things of that sort.

17   The seventh recommendation is focused on

18 the issue of having to expand the Occupational

19 Information System to include all work, and we make a

20 suggestion of how one might go about doing that by

21 starting with the 12,000 plus titles that were listed

22 in the DOT, having an online community, suggest

1 additions and subtractions as a means of identifying

2 the most likely sampled job titles out there. This

3 is a difficult task that no one really knows the

4 answer too.

5   I don't think there is necessarily going to

6 be a conclusive methodology or procedure to identify

7 all known jobs in the U.S. economy, but we think this

8 is a good place to start; and we think this is a good

9 use of online communities to make suggestions as the

10 list of all jobs gets created.

11   Then, finally, our last and eighth

12 recommendation in this area is the -- once a larger

13 database of all jobs has been generated -- this is

14 the second part of our major area of concern in terms

15 of taxonomy and classification. The classification

16 aspect of it can be examined once we have a database

17 that we think includes most if not all work for

18 classification of jobs.

19   The idea is once we have a common metric,

20 we can use that common metric to determine job

21 similarity and have a better idea of how jobs in the

22 work force can be classified. So that's the eight

1   recommendations with regard to data collection and

2   analysis. Any comments, questions or concerns?

3   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. This is David

4   Schretlen.

5   I just want to say I really appreciate

6   recommendation number seven, that SSA should develop

7   a plan to sample work from all jobs in the economy.

8   I think that's a really smart

9   recommendation rather than trying -- as I understand

10 it, the difference -- what you are trying to

11 distinguish is to conduct or to develop an exhaustive

12 list, that you want to begin with a sampling of jobs

13 rather than an exhaustive list.

14   DR. WILSON: Well, I think for a number of

15 reasons. One, because -- as we pointed out, you

16 know, any time you make changes in systems there are

17 going to be concerns. People are going to have

18 worries that need to be addressed. So I think

19 starting out with a pilot study, using that as the

20 basis of prototyping, things of that sort, will

21 allow us to do a number of things.

22   People will be able to directly compare

1 information between old and new systems. And the

2 important thing here -- I want to make this

3 absolutely clear to everyone is that we could do a

4 pilot study. We could develop an instrument,

5 prototype in a relatively rapid fashion.

6   I mean, I think there is absolutely no

7 reason that this pilot study recommendation would

8 need to be something that would take a long time. I

9 think a lot of the concern -- as part of our taxonomy

10 subcommittee work, we have spent a lot of time doing

11 fact finding and talking to various end users and

12 things of that sort; and depending on who they are,

13 they have a number of concerns relevant to change.

14   And I think getting this information up,

15 collected, showing them what we are and aren't doing

16 relatively quickly will have a lot of positive

17 benefits. So it's an area where I hope we --

18 assuming these recommendations are accepted, that

19 it's an area that I think we can do relatively

20 quickly. I think we can begin. It's one thing to

21 talk about these things in the abstract. There is

22 nothing quite like having prototypes, and say, you

1 know, what do you think of this? Or compare this

2 type of information to this.

3   I get some of that in a verbal sense with

4 some of the end users, asking them questions like

5 well, what if you had this. Generally, the reactions

6 are positive; but it's all pretty abstract

7 information at this point.

8   DR. SCHRETLEN: Well, I appreciate that

9 the recommendation is that SSA develop a plan to

10 sample work, not that you are prescribing a certain

11 plan. However, in that -- in connection with that

12 it occurred to me, I wonder if it would be feasible

13 to work with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and

14 conduct some monthly current population survey.

15   You know, they survey 60,000 households

16 every month to get the unemployment rate statistics.

17 I wonder if it might be possible to have a question

18 or two added to the survey about a person who is

19 employed -- you know, their occupation, and thereby

20 get a really representative sample of occupations.

21   DR. WILSON: The problem with a lot of

22 the -- and I don't know specifically about this one,

1   David. The problem with a lot of Department of

2   Labor data is that it's at a much more abstract

3   level of analysis in terms of it oftentimes is

4   aggregated to such a level that it's difficult to

5   pull out information at the level at which people

6   actually do work.

7   The one thing that I didn't mention earlier

8   is a potential means to, perhaps, at least have

9   access to that information is that one of the things

10   that we made sure that we did is take the highest

11   level of Standard Occupational Classification, SOC,

12   which Department of Labor uses, and integrate that

13   into our Table 2 list of work dimensions. So we

14   should be able to recover the way they organize work;

15   and again, I'm not familiar with -- it's definitely

16   something we need to look at.

17   But in the past my -- when looking at the

18   Department of Labor databases, one of the issues is

19   that they oftentimes have words described at such a

20   high level of aggregation that it's not particularly

21   useful in figuring out what an individual actually

22   does.

1   DR. SCHRETLEN: That's why I was saying

2   maybe they could add a question or two, because they

3   probably capture information in an O*Net kind of

4   system, but it might be possible to work with

5   someone in labor and say, gee, in one of these

6   monthly surveys could we add a couple of questions

7   to try and capture more specific -- you know, more

8   homogenous occupational titles.

9   DR. WILSON: Well, the issue would be is

10   what would those questions be if there were only a

11   few? One of the issues, which we pointed out in our

12   report, is that -- what most people refer to as a

13   job title is actually not particularly useful in

14   figuring out what someone does. It can oftentimes

15   be misleading. So we might be able to ask them

16   that.

17   My view of Department of Labor data is that

18   it might be more helpful in terms of the issue of

19   numbers of jobs where aggregation might still be an

20   issue; but we -- once we have our own occupational

21   information system that has the kind of data we need

22   for disability determination, then we may be able to

1 first roll that out to look at employment trends from

2 DOL data; but then work with DOL to sort of bear it

3 out what -- which I think they have. I can't imagine

4 that when they generate these numbers for

5 occupational trends that that isn't done with

6 employers at the actual job title level. And so

7 that's where I'm optimistic that DOLs might be able

8 to help as opposed to on the sort of front end,

9 descriptive end.

10   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay.

11   MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia. Actually,

12 our subcommittee did discuss the prospect of working

13 with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and even the

14 Census Bureau to -- you know, on just that issue,

15 David.

16   You know, of course, our discussion of that

17 in our report is very general, because we're not yet

18 sure what those questions might be. But I think it's

19 certainly something that if we can identify the type

20 of information that we might be able to get, given

21 the audience that the Bureau of Labor and Statistics

22 or Census Bureau, you know, surveys; and the type of

1 information that they're getting in the first place.

2 You know, could we, perhaps, have a question or two

3 that get at work activities maybe, or something that

4 might help us even if it's not aggregated then at the

5 SOC level?

6   Is there something that we should be

7 considering in, you know, expanding on a bit in

8 our -- not in our recommendations there, but in terms

9 of how we describe that?

10   DR. SCHRETLEN: Not from my perspective.

11 I like the recommendation that you are going to

12 develop -- that SSA develop a plan to sample work

13 from all jobs in the economy; but it's funny that,

14 you know, the -- what we're -- the committee is

15 going to -- the subcommittee is going to recommend

16 using the DOT, which is what we were replacing.

17   And I'm just wondering if there might be --

18 while the DOT probably has lots and lots of

19 individual occupations that are, you know, valid --

20 occupational titles that are just as valid today as

21 they were in 1939 or '70, or whatever, that I am just

22 also wondering if there might be some empirical way

1 of getting -- of trying to identify a homogenous --

2 you know, occupational titles that are not

3 representative in DOT. You know, it may be going to

4 vocational experts is the best way to do it, and so

5 forth. I was almost -- kind of almost thinking out

6 loud.

7   MR. HARDY: This is Tom Hardy. Can I

8 interject something here?

9   I consider this a foundational topic that

10 we're talking about right now, these two

11 recommendations; because it really seems to me that

12 we're now moving into aggregation and classification,

13 which will be part of the next step, but it's here

14 that we need to be talking about kind of some cut

15 offs, and at least start to ponder the decision

16 making that we're going to do here.

17   What we're going to be doing is not only

18 looking at occupations that we know of, but we're

19 looking for occupations we don't know. So we've

20 always talked about emerging occupations, and the

21 phrase I like is extinguishing occupations,

22 occupations that are disappearing. And if we're

1   using a computer system. We're going to have to

2   establish some sort of anchor or cut off for

3   definitions of occupation, which, as some of you

4   know, it is something I have been talking about for

5   years, and years, and years. And it seems to me this

6   recommendation gets to that. And I would like to

7   hear a little bit more, either now or later,

8   conversation of how we are finally going to come down

9   to setting those -- those end points, because it's

10   the foundation of information gathering.

11   DR. WILSON: Well, this is Mark Wilson. I

12   think one of the issues, which goes back to our

13   recommendation to have Social Security develop a

14   unit that is focused on the kinds of issues and

15   topics that we're talking about in general there is

16   not good research. Once we begin pilot testing the

17   work that we're doing Social Security will know more

18   about a lot -- there is no one out there studying

19   all work. There is no one out there who is trying

20   to estimate how many jobs exist at the level at

21   which people actually do them.

22   The last attempt at that was the Dictionary

1 of Occupational Titles, which had a number of

2 scientific issues. So since that was the last,

3 that's where we start, but as has been pointed out,

4 it's by no means necessarily the only place we could

5 start, and hence the online web community has -- I

6 have spoke to a lot of occupational therapist and

7 vocational experts who know a lot about what's going

8 on in the economy, and what -- you know, there might

9 be some technical issues here. I think posting these

10 kind of communities where, again, it wouldn't be the

11 only source. It would be the internal unit's

12 responsibility to determine accuracy and validate a

13 lot of this; but there is no good methodology for

14 identifying exactly how many job titles there are out

15 there, and how many people hold them, because the

16 Department of Labor just simply hasn't done anything

17 at this level for over 20 years.

18   MR. HARDY: I guess this is Tom again. I

19 sit back and see the DOT at one end of the spectrum

20 and the O*Net -- maybe not at the other end of the

21 spectrum, but another point of evaluation. I just

22 am concerned that we talking about data collection

1   and analyzing work activity and trying to start

2   getting representative information for occupations

3   without defining occupations. And I see the

4   conundrum, and, you know, I hear exactly what you

5   are saying; but I'm thrilled to see what you guys

6   are doing in this section of the recommendations;

7   but I am asking to see if -- developing further and

8   see if you are absolutely heading in the right

9   direction.

10   DR. WILSON: Great. Love to hear that

11 kind of stuff, Tom.

12   Other comments on this section, which, you

13 know, it generates the most comments, because it is

14 the one where we had the most recommendations here.

15 This really is kind of the meat of our attempt to

16 create a system to bring about a taxonomy and

17 classification system. Concerns? Questions?

18   Okay. Then hearing none, I will go on to

19 the last three recommendations under OIS Maintenance,

20 which also is relevant to some of the discussions we

21 have had. One of the problems is we are trying to

22 hit a moving target here. Work doesn't hold still.

1 If you think the census is difficult and trying to

2 figure out how many people there are, figuring out

3 what they're doing at work is an order of magnitude

4 more complicated in terms of trying to get some sort

5 of cross sectional description at any one time that's

6 100 percent accurate. But we recognize that the work

7 world is changing, so we made three recommendations

8 with regard to maintenance.

9   The first one, which has been talked about

10 a lot is another web-based community that would

11 comment on the quality and accuracy of items and

12 information over time and make suggestions where they

13 think information is no longer accurate or needed,

14 because I can't remember the term Tom used, but I

15 like it for jobs that don't exist in any numbers

16 anymore.

17   The second recommendation in this area is

18 that -- and another way to get at the issue and

19 concern that Tom raised is that we should randomly

20 select jobs for audits from an operational standpoint

21 in terms of determining are they still valid. Are

22 they still useful, things of that sort, so that they

1 remain up to date.

2   Another issue that we have in this

3 recommendation, which, I think, at least tangentially

4 gets at Tom's concern, is the idea of identification

5 of an expiration date. Is this going to be the same

6 for all kinds of work? No, probably not. But no one

7 has longitudinally and systematically studied work

8 for a very long time. So we don't know how rapidly

9 work is changing. We certainly have no data. We

10 have a lot of experts opinions, and, you know, work

11 is changing at rapid rates in some areas; but we

12 don't have any data to prove that.

13   Our third and final recommendation is that

14 the occupational information system be reviewed from

15 time to time to keep it up to date and remove items

16 as work changes. And that concludes all the

17 recommendations.

18   Any comments or concerns with regard to

19 Maintenance?

20   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Mark, this is Mary.

21 I'm going through the recommendations, and I know

22 that in the draft of the report you make a

1 recommendation for classification. I somehow seem

2 to miss that recommendation in this set.

3   DR. WILSON: That would be recommendation

4 number eight.

5   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

6   DR. WILSON: In OIS Data Collection and

7 Analysis.

8   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So you talk

9 about common metric, but in terms of your report,

10 you are talking about it on the very broad scale

11 being SOC tied within --

12   DR. WILSON: I'm sorry, Mary the line --

13 there was some interference in the line. I didn't

14 get to hear your question.

15   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Within the report --

16 not articulated within this particular

17 recommendation, but within the report, you make

18 recommendations in terms of the classification being

19 broadly linked up to the SOC.

20   DR. WILSON: I said that, right. One of

21 the things that we did was provide the 23 level SOC

22 categorization. We integrated that into Table 2.

1 So we should be able to make some efforts to

2 crosswalk back to the SOC. I don't really know

3 enough about Bureau of Labor Statistics and how

4 Department of Labor is generating some of these

5 experts. We lost a member of our Panel who knew a

6 lot about that just as we were beginning to get into

7 our exercise. I certainly think it's an area that

8 needs to be explored in terms of greater

9 classification. I think the issue is classification

10 for what. And I think that Bureau of Labor

11 Statistics and Department of Labor are classifying

12 work from a very different standpoint, for a very

13 different need than what SSA is doing. They almost

14 seem to be going in opposite directions in terms of

15 what their interests are.

16   So it needs to be investigated, but I am

17 not optimistic that this is an area where we can rely

18 a lot on DOL efforts. I think it's another area

19 where the needs are unique and SSA is going to have

20 to take on this activity on -- once we have what we

21 consider to be a fairly heavily sample descriptor of

22 most work in the U.S. economy on a common metric, we

1　will be able to identify job classification scheme

2　with far more precision and much better accuracy than

3　anything that currently exist.

4　　　　　DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Mark.

5　　　　　MR. HARDY: This is Tom. I had one more

6　question for you, Mark.

7　　　　　DR. WILSON: Sure.

8　　　　　MR. HARDY: Excuse me. Like I said, I'm

9　really encouraged about what you are doing. When

10　you are looking at this, is your thought in the

11　future -- I am not talking about this recommendation

12　per se; but in the future will we be clustering work

13　activities, do you think, to get us to some sort of

14　way of defining discrete occupations?

15　　　　　DR. WILSON: This data would certainly --

16　you know, what we're getting into are some fairly

17　technical issues. We would certainly be using some

18　sort of profile analysis to look at various

19　descriptors for various job to see, you know, what's

20　similar and what's different.

21　　　　　I mean, if you look at the issue of job

22　classification, SSA actually has someone who -- some

1   of their very early work is -- was on this very

2   issue. Sort of technical details and how you go

3   about doing job classification. So they certainly

4   have some high powered expertise in this area. I

5   hesitate to get into a lot of the details.

6   The other thing I think I heard you say

7   Tom, which I think is slightly different, is out of

8   the behavioral, measurable, observable items that are

9   actually collected, coming to some sort of composite

10 or scale scores that might be referred to as higher

11 order. The famous ones being data people things.

12   You know, I'm sure that one of the things

13 that we will find when we factor analyze this

14 instrument, assuming we go down this road, is that

15 the second order analysis is likely to return a data

16 people thing, sort of structure. So if you want to

17 get at this issue of complexity, jobs that have high

18 data people things factor scores are likely to be

19 more complex.

20   So we will definitely be able to do that

21 kind of stuff as well. So one is on comparing one

22 profile and descriptors for one type of work to

1 another; that's the classification. Then within the

2 descriptors themselves, looking for scaled and

3 composites and things of that sort, gets at, I think,

4 the other part of our question.

5   MR. HARDY: Right. We're getting there.

6 I just wanted to check and kind of get a feel of

7 where you are heading, and I appreciate it; thank

8 you.

9   MS. SHOR: Mark, this is Nancy Shor. Can

10 you help me understand if there is anything in your

11 work on your subcommittee that ties into the legal

12 requirement of establishing that an ultimate job --

13 or ultimate jobs exist in significant numbers in the

14 national economy?

15   DR. WILSON: That, we didn't really --

16 it's an important question. We think that by some

17 of the methods and sampling procedures we might be

18 able to provide some insight on that. But again, as

19 I said earlier, when we were talking about some of

20 the other problems I think it's here. I think this

21 is the issue where the Department of Labor is going

22 to have to somehow help us step up and provide this

1 information. I think this is the one area, given

2 what they do with the SOC and things of that sort.

3 It is just something they still seem to be doing for

4 their own purposes is identifying what work exist

5 and what numbers, and things of that sort.

6   So I think it's there once we have

7 established what our descriptors are and how they

8 relate back to the classification scheme that

9 Department of Labor uses.

10   I probably shouldn't say this in public,

11 but I'm going to go ahead and say it, is I think at

12 some point our work taxonomy is something the

13 Department of Labor ought to consider. It goes back

14 to a point that David was making earlier in terms of

15 suggesting some items for them. I very quickly will

16 know more about work and the underlying

17 dimensionality than anyone else in the federal

18 government, certainly at the level of what people

19 actually do.

20   And so I'm hopeful that over time the work

21 that we're suggesting would maybe inform some of the

22 occupational classification schemes that they use to

1 go out and do their census. In the meantime, I think

2 it's going to have to be looking at their rather

3 aggregated blocks of data and trying to figure out

4 methods of disaggregating them. And again, this is

5 kind of more in the labor of top economics. It's

6 outside my area of expertise, but that was sort of

7 what I saw that linkage to be. I don't know if I

8 answered your question or not, Nancy.

9   MS. SHOR: Well, I think it's an issue

10 that ultimately can't be dodged. And that the --

11 the description of jobs without an ability to

12 identify how many of those jobs exist is really

13 going to be problematic.

14   DR. WILSON: Yeah, it's a good point.

15 It's kind of a circular issue, because until you

16 have an accurate description, if you go out asking

17 people about job titles, as we have raised a number

18 of times, that could be very misleading, especially

19 with some kinds of work. And so I think part of the

20 effort of this unit is going to have to be around

21 developing methodologies that are scientifically

22 defensible to enumerate work at the level at which

1 it actually exists. It would be impossible to do

2 that without a good common metrics.

3   So we think we're laying the foundation

4 there. But given our area of expertise, we didn't

5 want to get too direct about something that we felt

6 was not one of our core competencies.

7   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: This is Mary. I just

8 want to remind the Panel that when Jim Woods was on

9 the Panel he did mention during that April meeting

10 that NAICS might be an opportunity to look at that.

11 So there might be a variety of ways we might come at

12 a particular issue when we need to address it.

13   We have been on the line now for about a

14 hour and 25 minutes. We still have three reports to

15 go through. We had indicated that we would be on

16 until about 2:00 o'clock, but the Panel knows that we

17 might need to go beyond 2:00 o'clock eastern time.

18   I'm going to ask for any final thoughts or

19 concerns regarding the Work Taxonomy Classification

20 Subcommittee, and ask people to maybe keep their --

21 the questions and answers short so we could go on to

22 the other subcommittees. So I will ask that question

1 first. Are there any thoughts, concerns, questions

2 for Mark?

3   Okay. Because we will probably be going

4 beyond 2:00 o'clock, does the Panel want to take

5 about a five minute break now and then come back, or

6 should we proceed on to the next subcommittee? Any

7 thoughts?

8   MS. RUTTLEDGE: I'm fine with just going.

9 This is Lynnae.

10   DR. GIBSON: Let's proceed.

11   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I'm going to

12 ask if Deborah Lechner is on.

13   MS. LECHNER: Yes, I am, Mary.

14   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Then I know,

15 Deborah, that you are dealing with a timeline today.

16 So Tom, if you don't mine I'm going to ask Deborah

17 to submit her Physical Demands Subcommittee report,

18 and then we will get to yours.

19   MR. HARDY: Oh, absolutely. I was going

20 to go off just in case. So that's great.

21   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Tom.

22   Deborah is the Chair to the Physical

1   Demands Subcommittee. If you will start maybe by

2   introducing your subcommittee members.

3   MS. LECHNER: Yes. Thank you, Mary. I

4   appreciate everyone being flexible on the schedule

5   today to help me out. The Panel members who were on

6   our Physical Demands Subcommittee are Dr. Mary

7   Barros-Bailey, Dr. Gunnar Andersson, and Sylvia

8   Karman, who also serves as the Project Director from

9   Social Security Administration.

10   And just to give a little recap, the

11   subcommittee has met twice face-to-face during panel

12   meetings; twice on a teleconference meeting, and then

13   we have considered input from presentations that were

14   given at the Panel meeting. We've considered the

15   written input from AOTA, ATA, and IARP. We reviewed

16   13 Social Security Administration papers, and about

17   50 external references. Some of the panel members

18   have attended DDS and ODAR hearings.

19   And then the issues that were considered

20   foremost in our deliberations were the application of

21   physical demands taxonomy within Social Security's

22   five step process. We certainly considered the

1 deficits or the changes we felt were needed in our

2 current DOT, SCO classificational content model. We

3 considered the effects of changes on our medical and

4 rehab communities who also use the classification

5 system, and considered the input from user groups.

6 And so I will move on to a list of our

7 recommendations.

8   First of all, in the manual materials

9 handling strength categories, I think the unanimous

10 input that we received from almost everyone was that

11 we needed more categories, and categories that were

12 not as broad; and that a system that increased the

13 categories by small weight increments might provide a

14 solution. And that we -- we deliberated on several

15 specific recommendations, but then we decided that we

16 would be better off to wait and just have the data

17 collection begin, analyze that, and make some future

18 recommendations about a scale that might be more

19 applicable or better -- more -- better utilized than

20 our current scale.

21   Within the specific postures and positions,

22 mobility and movements and psychomotor issues, we

1 were recommending that SSA develop a system that

2 distinguishes two types of lifting, above and below

3 waist. Primarily because both of those different

4 types of lifting require entirely -- or emphasizes

5 entirely different muscle groups that are important

6 depending on the applicant's or the claimant's

7 specific disability.

8   We also recommended that reaching be

9 subcategorized in three different heights; above

10 shoulder, shoulder to waist, and below waist. In

11 addition, that the reaching requirement should be

12 designated as either one handed or two handed.

13   We also recommend the addition of

14 keyboarding and use of the mouse "slash" touchpad

15 function, just because the use of computer

16 keyboards -- computer keyboards and mouse or mice --

17 I guess however you want to say it -- but that

18 utilization is so prevalent. And even in industries

19 that were not formally considered an office

20 environment that we just think that that's important

21 to separate that out in terms of hand function.

22   We also felt that we needed updated

1 descriptions to address gripping and forceful

2 pinching.

3   We also recommend that documenting

4 unilateral and bilateral requirements of occupations.

5   We recommend the addition of descriptors

6 for trunk or body rotation and twisting; and we

7 recommend the same sorts of descriptors for neck

8 rotation, twisting and bending.

9   We recommend the addition of descriptors

10 for forward bending from a sitting position.

11   We recommend increased specificity for

12 climbing.

13   We need an addition of a category of

14 running as a physical requirement.

15   We recommend the expansion of categories

16 for balance.

17   We recommend a separate classification for

18 sitting, standing, and walking. And when we say

19 "separate," we mean separate from the overall

20 materials handling or strength classification.

21   Currently, the strength classifications of

22 sedentary, light, medium, and heavy also include the

1 requirements for sitting, standing and walking; and

2 we feel that those should be separated out into two

3 different classification systems.

4 We recommend the addition of jobs for which

5 a sit/stand option is possible; and we also recommend

6 notation of occupations that allow the use of

7 assistive devices.

8 We recommend adding documentation for the

9 operation of foot controls, and whether one or

10 two feet are required.

11 We recommend additional descriptors for

12 repetitive twisting of the wrist and forearm; and

13 addition of descriptors for handwriting.

14 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Deb, I'm going

15 to ask you to stop right there and see if anybody

16 has any questions or concerns or comments? Okay.

17 MS. LECHNER: You want me to continue,

18 Mary?

19 DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Yeah, that would be

20 great.

21 MS. LECHNER: Okay. With the -- those are

22 basically the new or modified descriptors that we're

1 talking about.

2   Then we also made some recommendations of

3 how these descriptors should be rated. So there was

4 a request for the addition of some sort of rating

5 relative to repetition. We recommend a thorough

6 analysis of the literature on repetition, so that we

7 can come to definitions for repetitive work that are

8 appropriate and substantiated in the literature.

9   And the duration. Several groups have

10 mentioned that a scale for duration is important.

11 Most of the folks that provided input and the user

12 groups feel that the current categories of never,

13 occasional, frequent, and constant, having the day

14 divided into a third is a bit too broad. So most of

15 the user needs groups and individuals recommended or

16 requested some sort of category at the lower end of

17 the scale that was designated as a seldom or a rarely

18 category; and in addition to that, IARP has requested

19 that our classification system include something that

20 addressed those who have to work longer than an eight

21 hour day.

22   Physical demands performed in the length of

1 the work day should be captured in the data gathering

2 process when the jobs are analyzed; and then once the

3 data is analyzed, we could have more specific or

4 develop more specific recommendations regarding how

5 we should best address this issue of duration.

6   In addition to having or to documenting

7 just a total duration for the total work day, we also

8 felt it was important to document how long of a

9 continuous duration was required. For example, an

10 occupation could require that something be performed

11 up to a third of the day, which would fall into the

12 definition of occasional; but then some occupations

13 might require all of that one-third of the day be

14 performed continuously, where in other occupations

15 that one-third of the day would be interspersed

16 intermittently throughout the day; and there is quite

17 a bit of difference in the physical demand depending

18 on whether it's continuous -- the whole one-third of

19 the day is continuous or whether it's divided up

20 intermittently. So we felt that some indication of

21 continuous versus intermittent direction should be

22 provided.

1   And then maximum continuous distance for

2   the dynamic movements like, carry, push, pull, walk,

3   run, climb, crawl, et cetera, the maximum continuous

4   distance could be a really important occupational

5   demand relative to -- because if a claimant can only

6   walk 50 continuous feet and the occupation requires

7   considerably more continuous walking, then, there is

8   an obvious mismatch between what the claimant can do

9   and what the occupation requires, you know.

10   And so then there is this whole issue of

11   variation within an occupation. Because we -- if

12   these occupational categories are to be populated by

13   data that's collected on the various -- on a variety

14   of different jobs, one job in the same occupation

15   could theoretically fall into -- let's say if we're

16   still using the sedentary, light, medium, heavy

17   category. One occupation -- one job within that

18   occupation could fall into the medium category,

19   whereas at another location it falls into the heavy,

20   depending on the size of the thing -- of the material

21   being handled.

22   So each job analysis we are proposing that

1 on every job that's analyzed that the analyst reports

2 what is the worse case scenario for that job, and I

3 know we need to work on some other language other

4 than, perhaps, worse case scenario. But let's say if

5 you are analyzing the job and above waist lifting

6 happens and there is a 20 pound above waist lift, and

7 there is a 30-pound one, and there is a 50-pound one;

8 then for that individual job the 50-pound weight

9 would be required to perform that specific job.

10   Once that data is locked into an

11 occupational category we thought that instead of

12 trying to say, okay, let's classify the occupation

13 according to the worse case job that instead we would

14 try to capture in some way the mean requirement for

15 that occupation, or depending on how detailed our

16 database is to know how many jobs within that

17 category are at the different levels of materials

18 handling.

19   So the occupation itself, the occupational

20 category would not necessarily be categorized

21 according to the worse case job, because you could

22 have an outlier in that category of job that was

1   required at 50 pounds, and that's the only job out of

2   100 jobs in that category that really required that

3   much lifting. So I will pause again before I start

4   with Sensory and ask for questions.

5   DR. SCHRETLEN: Deborah, this is David

6   Schretlen.

7   Let me make sure I understand what you are

8   suggesting for the -- in that last point, each

9   occupation will be studied by observing and measuring

10   physical demands in multiple representative jobs.

11   What you are suggesting is that if you study ten

12   specific jobs in an occupation that the maximum

13   weight lifted above the waist might vary across these

14   examples of the occupation from 20 to 50 pounds. And

15   what you are suggesting is that what is designated as

16   the required strength for that job would be the

17   average of those maximum.

18   MS. LECHNER: Yes. Possibly the maximum

19   or the average, or we also had some discussions

20   about if there is knowledge of what percent of the

21   jobs fall into a certain category so that if

22   80 percent of the jobs fell into the 30 pound

1 category, then, that is what would be listed. There

2 would be some sort of cut point. Does that make

3 sense?

4   DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes, but either way you

5 are looking at the maximum requirement; and then you

6 are taking some -- you are either taking the average

7 of those maxima or some cut point within the

8 maximum --

9   MS. LECHNER: Yes.

10   DR. SCHRETLEN: -- that are represented.

11   Rather than just saying what is the average

12 weight required on each of these ten -- what is the

13 average amount that people are required to lift on

14 each of these ten jobs.

15   MS. LECHNER: Right.

16   DR. SCHRETLEN: Because that's very

17 different. The average of the average, versus the

18 average of the maximum.

19   MS. LECHNER: Yes. I am talking about --

20 we're talking about doing the average of the

21 maximum. Because in reality when people are

22 required to do the job, they are required to do the

1   maximum amount for that job.

2   DR. SCHRETLEN: Right. Right. I

3   certainly agree that it should be higher than the

4   average of the maximum, because otherwise you would

5   be eliminating -- I mean, you would be setting the

6   bar at an extremely high level.

7   MS. LECHNER: Exactly.

8   DR. GIBSON: This is Shanan. Can I please

9   just have classification on that as well.

10   My concern is that we stick to rating the

11 work on the job side as it exist and not asking

12 people what is the worse case possible they might

13 imagine, because then that becomes an extreme, which

14 is not necessarily the work as it exist. Does that

15 make sense?

16   MS. LECHNER: Yes. No, that's not what

17 I'm suggesting Shanan.

18   I'm talking about if we go and measure a

19 job, and there are -- we measure three different

20 above waist lifts, then, we have to report that job

21 requirement as the heaviest of those three that we

22 have measured. Does that make sense?

1   DR. GIBSON: It does. That would be the

2   requirement of the job, to lift up to 50 pounds?

3   MS. LECHNER: Right.

4   MR. HARDY: This is Tom. I just want to

5   make sure I am following along here real quick, Deb.

6   Say you got a drill press operator who is

7   working on some really tiny thing and lifting is

8   listed as 10 pounds. Then you have got another drill

9   press operator who is working on something very large

10   and it's 50 pounds. In that case are we talking

11   about -- because you are talking about, perhaps,

12   maybe a different product or a different material.

13   Would you see that as being a way of breaking those

14   down to two different occupations once you have

15   reached that great amount of variability and

16   difference in product and what's being utilized? Or

17   would you keep those together and then go with what I

18   think I hear you saying?

19   MS. LECHNER: Yes, that's a question that

20   I would kind of bounce back to Mark's committee, you

21   know, when -- how much variability -- when we start

22   analyzing jobs that are within an occupational

1 category, how much variability do we have to

2 discover before we start breaking it down into two

3 separate occupations.

4   MR. HARDY: Yes, that's exactly my

5 concern.

6   DR. WILSON: This is Mark Wilson. A

7 couple of issues here. One, sure, if we could find

8 that there are -- you know, for lack of some better

9 word, you know, heavy drill press operators versus

10 light ones and what seemed to split those was the

11 enormous amount of additional physical effort in one

12 area versus another that, you know, that would seem

13 to be some logical place to split work apart. And

14 again, it goes back to what we don't know now. You

15 have to understand that right now there is no common

16 metric. There is no way to accurately compare one

17 type of work to another in any kind of consistent

18 manner. So what we will be able to do will allow us

19 to get at that.

20   But on the physical side and on the

21 cognitive side, to me, the bigger issue is what are

22 the underlying taxonomic structures of physical and

1 cognitive interpersonal attributes that will be

2 inferred from what the work requires. You know, how

3 much and what level of precision is something that

4 SSA is going to have to determine when it comes to

5 setting specific job side descriptors. And so there

6 is really two issues here. What do you ask about the

7 work that would allow us to infer physical

8 requirements? And then the second one is, you know,

9 in what ways do you look at that and use it to

10 combine into much more accurate job descriptions of

11 what's actually taking place?

12   MR. GUNNAR: This is Gunnar.

13   I think that, generally speaking, we -- we

14 will find that there are a large number of

15 occupations in which the physical demands are quite

16 different. So if you work, for example, in retail

17 you may be in a job where you have to handle mortar

18 rockets, and you may be in one where you handle motor

19 rockets; but you are in the same type of job. The

20 demands are different.

21   MS. LECHNER: Yes.

22   MR. GUNNAR: The same applies to lots of

1 categories. You know, there are carpenters who do a

2 lot of very heavy physical work; and there are

3 carpenters who basically do no heavy physical work.

4 They work inside and just make boxes.

5 DR. WILSON: I think it's an important --

6 this is Mark Wilson again.

7 It is an important point. Again, if we

8 have a common metric where we have a standard set of

9 descriptors, and we have information about what the

10 physical demands are, and if Social Security does, we

11 want to know not just -- you know, if you think about

12 it from the standpoint of the way the Department of

13 Labor does things where they like to not look at what

14 the physical demands are, but what industry you are

15 in. So they will talk about, you know, accountants;

16 and they will have 15 different accountants in their

17 database based on what industry.

18 Same thing with Gunnar's recommendation of

19 our discussion about the types of retail employees.

20 If Social Security wants to, they can -- the

21 classification system is up to them to design based

22 on what policy issues they have, and what they want

1 to focus on, on both the physical side and on

2 cognitive, interpersonal side.

3   MR. GUNNAR: Right.

4   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Is there anymore

5 discussion on that one recommendation? Anymore

6 discussion on this section?

7   Okay. Deb, thank you. If you would go on

8 with your report.

9   MS. LECHNER: Okay. I'm going to go on to

10 the sensory. Basically, our recommendations there

11 were defining talking within the physical demands

12 context in terms of the quality of speech rather

13 than the receptive or expressive qualities that are

14 more part of the mental and cognitive issues. And

15 then consider more discrete, appropriate, functional

16 levels of measurement for feeling, vision, and

17 hearing than are in the current DOT, SCO. And

18 although not frequently encountered as an impairment

19 consideration, also including some taste and smell

20 sensory demands due to their relevant and -- as

21 essential and core functions in a few occupations.

22   And then in the -- I will go on to the

1 environmental, then we can pause and comment on

2 sensory and environmental.

3   In environmental we are looking to describe

4 environmental conditions as they relate to heat,

5 cold, humidity, moisture, wetness moisture, dust,

6 chemical fumes, gases, smoke, mold or mildew, fibers

7 including asbestos, vibration and general conditions

8 of the workplace, such as hazardous environment,

9 heights, closed spaces, and so forth; animals, noise,

10 et cetera.

11   Define appropriate measures for each

12 condition where possible. For example, on noises and

13 vibrations there would be details of the level and

14 time of exposure; or, at a minimum, include

15 descriptions of levels of exposure, concentration or

16 severity, frequency, and any accommodations that

17 might be available to address the effect of the

18 exposure, like personal protective equipment.

19   Okay. And that concludes the

20 recommendations for the physical demands.

21   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any comments

22 or concern or questions about the sensory or

1 environmental sections of the report?

2   DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes. David Schretlen. I

3 guess one thing I wonder is sort of going back over

4 the entire report, Deb. There are all these

5 recommendations at the top -- at the beginning it

6 says, we recommend adding this or documenting

7 increasing specificity. Are all of those -- I mean,

8 are those on top of existing physical, residual

9 functional capacity assessments or job demands that

10 are already implicit in physical RFC assessments?

11   In other words, are these recommendations

12 in addition to something that already exist?

13   MS. LECHNER: Yes, that's right. It's in

14 addition, David; that's a good point. It's in

15 addition to the current DOT "slash" SCO

16 Classification System.

17   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. And is there any --

18 did you give any consideration to eliminating things

19 or reducing, you know what I mean, simplifying.

20 Because I mean, it seems like this is significantly

21 increasing the complexity of job characterization.

22   MS. LECHNER: Right.

1   DR. SCHRETLEN: Was there any effort to --

2   in a compensatory way to simplify anything?

3   MS. LECHNER: Well, we did not get any --

4   I can't think of any request from any user group or

5   within SSA internally to eliminate anything.

6   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. I guess in a way

7   that doesn't surprise me. But in some ways I am

8   wondering if some of these are just so, so discrete

9   that we wind up sort of capturing very, very small

10   percentages of variants.

11   Like, for instance, I can definitely

12   appreciate the value of noting extreme environmental

13   conditions, like extreme heat or cold or exposure or

14   heights; but I am wondering like mold and mildew, and

15   fiber, and animals. What percentage of jobs, you

16   know, vary significantly in those dimensions in ways

17   that relate to impairments caused by diseases?

18   MR. GUNNAR: This is Gunnar.

19   DR. SCHRETLEN: What disease -- what

20   common disease makes you really intolerant of mold?

21   MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia. Asthma.

22   MR. GUNNAR: This is Gunnar. I think that

1 because they are so rare, it's not a heavy

2 requirement, because you are going to rarely have to

3 put it in as a descriptor.

4   DR. SCHRETLEN: Well --

5   MR. GUNNAR: But if it does exist, I think

6 it is important, because there are certain people

7 who clearly cannot handle it.

8   DR. SCHRETLEN: But aren't these things

9 that every job -- every single job would be

10 characterized in terms of?

11   MR. GUNNAR: Hopefully.

12   MS. LECHNER: I guess I'm not

13 understanding, Dave, what you are asking.

14   DR. SCHRETLEN: I guess I'm wondering

15 whether characterizing jobs in terms of the exposure

16 that a job incumbent has to animals it would be -- I

17 mean, just adds a lot to the information burden of

18 characterizing jobs for a very, very, very small

19 fraction of jobs.

20   MR. GUNNAR: For those it could be quite

21 critical.

22   MR. HARDY: This is Tom. David, you are

1   actually saying several things that I'm sitting here

2   thinking. I have to say I think we need to expand

3   on some of these categories. We need to increase

4   the specificity with which we are doing some of this

5   stuff. Conversely, Deb, do you have an idea of how

6   many things from the critical side -- how many

7   discrete things you would be tracking if you added

8   these new pieces to what is currently existing?

9   MS. LECHNER: I have not counted the exact

10 number, Tom; but we can go back and do that.

11   MR. HARDY: Okay. Well, I guess from my

12 point of view -- maybe I am not quite following

13 along with you, Dave -- but from my point of view I

14 am sitting back and go, we need to measure at

15 certain levels. We need more complexity.

16 Obviously, you know, we can't keep measuring on

17 measurements that came up a long time ago.

18 Conversely with every measurement that we are adding

19 in, we are adding data collection. We are adding

20 data tracking.

21   We are also adding for the possibility of

22 maybe when we come to the slice and dice part of all

1 this down the road for classification that we may end

2 up classifying in more discrete ways and ending up

3 with a much larger number than 12,000 if we have to

4 start doing any slicing and dicing using all of these

5 pieces of information. So I see a couple of down the

6 road implications.

7   That's why I go back to Dave and say, yeah,

8 I kind of hear what you are saying about maybe it's

9 good to add new pieces, but can we offset that in any

10 way so that we are not making a very large complex

11 system that's going to require a lot of data

12 collection? And conversely we're going to be

13 requiring physicians to rate.

14   Does that get where you were going, Dave?

15   DR. SCHRETLEN: Yes.

16   MR. HARDY: Okay.

17   DR. WILSON: This is Mark Wilson. I think

18 that's an important discussion. It's one reason I

19 think, in terms of how you go about generating items

20 whether you are talking about work descriptor items

21 or human side attributes. If you start out from a

22 taxonomy, you know, whatever the existing taxonomy.

1 And we were lucky in our case that there were

2 several empirical articles out there. I think that

3 helps with the whole efficiency of measurement

4 argument.

5   I think if you start out with end users and

6 start collecting laundry lists, it's going to get

7 pretty big, pretty fast. And a lot of times what you

8 will find is that they're useful in a few cases -- or

9 they're highly related to other things in terms of an

10 intercorrelational sense. If you know "X" about a

11 job, you will also know "Y" and "Z" exist. So it may

12 not necessarily be the case that we have to ask all

13 of these things, because they're so highly

14 intercorrelated.

15   I think it's one of the ideas of the -- one

16 of the ideas of the pilot study is that -- the

17 assumption we should probably look at more items than

18 what would end up in any kind of an operational sense

19 precisely because we want to deal with the kinds of

20 concern that Tom is talking about. As you get more

21 items and generate more specificity in certain areas,

22 you oversensitize your description to things that may

1   not really matter for the purposes of disability

2   determination.

3   So I don't think it's something that we can

4   necessarily identify for sure what exactly the right

5   level of precision is, but I think the way to

6   proceed -- and that was kind of my question for

7   Deborah is linkage of all of this back to existing

8   taxonomies with human physical attributes might help

9   you identify, you know, are we oversampling in some

10 areas, and potentially undersampling in others?

11   MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia.

12   Mark, are you suggesting that -- because

13 I'm thinking that this may -- well, this is what I

14 was thinking about is that if we -- the extent to

15 which we might be identifying elements that are

16 initially studied so that when we go out and do our

17 field testing of job analysis instruments, then, we

18 can take a look at the data when we get it back and

19 determine how things are grouping, and some things

20 are just going to come off the list, because we see

21 that they're either correlated with other things; so

22 you know that if A exist, B exist; that sort of

1 thing.

2   DR. WILSON: Right. Exactly. Which I

3 think was David's point was that -- and where you

4 get your data -- where your suggestions come from

5 are important in the sense that if you just start

6 from previous taxonomies or your known existing

7 taxonomy, that's likely to be more efficient than if

8 you simply go to end users and start off with what

9 would you like to know about. They're going to base

10 that on, you know, unique experiences that they have

11 had where, you know, they wish they had asked as to

12 why. You might end up with a much larger list if

13 you are going to need to pair and organize around

14 some sort of systematic, hopefully empirical

15 taxonomic structure.

16   So unfortunately -- and I think David

17 before has said that, you know, in some areas on the

18 cognitive interpersonal side there is pretty good

19 factor analytic evidence for what the underlying

20 structures are and other cases, that there is not as

21 much. I'm not as sure on the physical side, but I

22 mean, that's how I would go about this issue of

1 whether it's, you know, designing a new RFC and what

2 all needs to be on there, and an MRFC or a new work

3 analysis instrument.

4   The closest we have to theory to guide us

5 are empirical taxonomies. And if we start from that

6 we're less likely to over -- to ask for too much,

7 overburden the system with the number of potentially

8 unnecessary items.

9   MS. KARMAN: So --

10   MS. LECHNER: And that's -- just to let

11 the group know, that's something that the Physical

12 Demands Subcommittee has had multiple discussions

13 about just because, you know, we have struggled with

14 how much detail is too much and how much is not

15 enough. So we certainly had those discussions and

16 we share the group's concerns.

17   The challenge that I wonder about, and

18 let's say we decide that through our own empirical

19 studies and -- are looking at some of the other

20 empirical databases that, well, we don't really --

21 you know, running only occurs in maybe a tenth of the

22 occupations, and so we're going to eliminate running

1 from the physical demands list.

2   And then let's say there is a city

3 firefighter or a policemen that has to run for their

4 jobs and they apply for Social Security disability.

5 Then -- and there is no data collected on the

6 requirements of running for their occupation or any

7 occupation. So then -- and that's one of the key

8 things they can no longer do. So what does Social

9 Security do in that instance?

10   Or you know, another example might be, I

11 have got asthma. I cannot work in environments where

12 the mold count is over "X," and there is no data

13 collected on that in any of the jobs. So then what

14 do we do? What does Social Security Administration

15 do with those kinds of claims?

16   DR. SCHRETLEN: This is David Schretlen.

17 I think if you are going to error, it makes sense to

18 error on the side of being overly specific on the

19 front end, then pair it down through pilot studies,

20 and then, you know, other studies. I am just

21 wondering if some of these are already going to be

22 characterized as demands of work environments or

1 jobs that are so rare that there are many, many

2 other jobs that don't involve those characteristics,

3 like exposure to animals or mildew.

4   MR. GUNNAR: And therefore, it's not a big

5 deal.

6   DR. SCHRETLEN: It's only a big deal if

7 you are going to characterize 2,500 jobs for the new

8 OIS; if you're going to go through and try to

9 determine for each and every job how much

10 environmental mildew there is.

11   MR. GUNNAR: You think that is very

12 difficult? I mean, I think you are running up the

13 wrong tree. I think that figuring out whether or

14 not these things are part of the job is important,

15 because a lot of people will not be able to do their

16 jobs under certain of those circumstances.

17   What I get today when I have a patient with

18 back pain and I send the patient to a functional

19 capacity evaluation, it is mostly -- what's in the

20 occupational titles is very little of it. When I

21 get -- if I ask for a job description it is most of

22 these things, almost all of them always. So people

1 are connecting them. They are just not part of the

2 occupational titles.

3   But if I want to know what -- if I have a

4 patient with back pain and I want to know what kind

5 of load that patient is going to have at work, it's

6 more important to me to know if he lifts from the

7 floor, than to know if he lifts 25 or 50 pounds.

8   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: This is Mary. We are

9 just over 2:00 o'clock. I wanted to kind of wrap up

10 the Physical Demands Subcommittee to make sure that

11 there are no additional questions or concerns.

12   Okay. If there are none, thank you,

13 Deborah, for doing that.

14   Let's go ahead and take a five minutes

15 break. Come back in about five minutes, and we will

16 go on with the other two subcommittee reports.

17   (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

18   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We're going to be

19 reassembling here. I'm going to ask our Designated

20 Federal Officer to go through the list again and

21 make sure everybody is still on.

22   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Hi. Okay. We have

 1   Gunnar Andersson.

 2   DR. ANDERSSON: Present.

 3   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Mary Barros-Bailey.

 4   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Here.

 5   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Robert Fraser.

 6   DR. FRASER: Here.

 7   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Shanan Gwaltney

 8   Gibson.

 9   DR. GIBSON: Present.

10   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Thomas Hardy.

11   MR. HARDY: Present.

12   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Sylvia Karman.

13   MS. KARMAN: Present.

14   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Deborah Lechner.

15   MS. LECHNER: Present.

16   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Lynnae Ruttledge.

17   MS. RUTTLEDGE: Present.

18   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: David Schretlen.

19   Okay. Dave is just a way for a second.

20   Nancy Shor.

21   MS. SHOR: I'm here.

22   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Mark Wilson.

1   DR. WILSON: Present.

2   MS. TIDWELL-PETERS: Okay. So we're just

3 waiting for David.

4   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I think because we

5 have a quorum, I'm just going to go ahead and

6 continue on with the subcommittee reports.

7   Tom Hardy is the Chair of the Transferable

8 Skills Analysis Subcommittee. And I would ask Tom if

9 you could introduce your subcommittee members and

10 proceed with your report, that would be great. Thank

11 you.

12   MR. HARDY: Okay. This is Tom Hardy

13 speaking. I am the Chair of the TSA subcommittee.

14 Members of the subcommittee panel are Lynnae

15 Ruttledge, Mary Barros-Bailey, Nancy Shor, Sylvia

16 Karman, and initially Jim Woods prior to his

17 resignation. Hopefully you got that, and we are

18 going to go ahead.

19   I know that we're under time constraints,

20 and I refer everybody to the history of the panel

21 activity as found in the report; and I will try to

22 just move right on into the meat of the

1   recommendations.

2   I will give a caveat that the

3   recommendations are pretty brief. They run from very

4   general to specific. This morning I spoke with Mary

5   and Sylvia about, perhaps, moving some suggested

6   areas of further research underneath these. I'm not

7   going to do that for purposes of this conversation,

8   since everybody does not have that. I will refer you

9   to page 23 and 24 where there are some suggested

10 areas, and you may see those moved in underneath

11 recommendations in the final product that comes out

12 at close of business.

13   Transferable Subcommittee analysis. We,

14 the panel, recommend the following -- the first three

15 are general recommendations, which I think pretty

16 much echo and tie into other recommendations that

17 have already been presented.

18   We recommend that SSA develop the

19 Occupational Information System in such a way that

20 the inference necessary to apply the data is reduced

21 to the greatest extent possible.

22   We recommend that SSA develop the OIS in

1 such a way that the degree of overlap or redundancy

2 between data elements and rating of data elements be

3 reduced to the greatest extent possible.

4   We recommend that SSA conduct validation

5 studies on the OIS information that it collects

6 regarding the data elements; and we recommend that it

7 be reported, first of all, whether the data that has

8 been captured or the data we intend to be captured;

9 and second, whether the data that's been captured

10 fulfill the needs described in this report. I will

11 stop there.

12   Those are the large general ones, which,

13 obviously, I think, refer back to being sure that we

14 are, you know, going in the right direction with

15 validity and all that stuff that we have discussed in

16 some of the other subcommittees. Are there any

17 questions on those three recommendations?

18   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Was that a question?

19 I missed that. Somebody spoke up, and I wasn't sure

20 who it was and if there was a question. This is

21 Mary.

22   Okay. I guess not.

1   Go ahead, Tom. Thank you.

2   MR. HARDY: Okay. Moving on to specifics.

3 For content model and data development purposes we

4 recommend that SSA use work activities as an

5 observable and measurable data element as a proxy

6 for skill.

7   We recommend that SSA validate and study

8 the work activity data it collects to determine, one,

9 which of the work activities when combined with other

10 requirements of the occupation may rise to a level

11 appropriate to be called a skill. Two, what

12 continuum of skill level may be appropriate for SSA

13 application of these OIS data in its disability

14 adjudication process.

15   We recommend SSA develop a method for

16 determining the complexity level of the occupation

17 and the individual work activities.

18   We recommend SSA develop a method to

19 identify the time to proficiency for satisfactory

20 performance of an occupation.

21   We recommend SSA explore methods for

22 developing a rating scale for the length of viability

1 of the occupation based on its component work

2 activities.

3   And finally, we recommend that SSA develop

4 work context factors for the OIS, such as industry,

5 work setting, tools, machines, technologies, raw

6 materials, products, subject matter, processes, and

7 services related to the occupation.

8   And move for any questions on a specific

9 recommendation. It was our attempt to respond to

10 recommendations and findings that we delineate in the

11 report, especially regarding complexity, proficiency,

12 viability of skills; and then the ranking of skills

13 which were identified.

14   DR. FRASER: Tom, this is Bob Fraser.

15   The time to proficiency is kind of like the

16 specific vocational separation in the old DOT. In

17 the real world, you know, typically they say it's an

18 education criteria, "X" amount of education, or "X"

19 number of years of experience to reach proficiency.

20 Are we going to look at that two ways or --

21   MR. HARDY: The idea behind that is yes,

22 we would probably take the SVP ranking as it

1   currently exist and break it down into smaller

2   component parts. There is more specific

3   recommendations -- in fact, that is one of those

4   things I would be moving over from the back of my

5   report. We have looked at complexity as being

6   really a combination of things, because, as you

7   say -- or as everybody has said, SVP really talks

8   about education; but we also have a component of

9   on-the-job training. We have components of

10 expertise and proficiency that are not necessarily

11 looked at right now.

12   We would like to break that down from a

13 single scale into maybe two or three other component

14 scales to give a little more specificity and to

15 capture information that may be present for one

16 occupation and not for another that are now lumped

17 together and makes it hard to adjudicate.

18   DR. FRASER: Great.

19   MS. KARMAN: Hi, this is Sylvia.

20   Bob, I don't know whether this gets at your

21 question, but I will put this out there. The

22 question about SVP is that -- well, SVP is looking at

1 the specific vocational preparation for a particular

2 occupation not like on the job, so not like the

3 educational background individual.

4   DR. FRASER: Well, it's always been kind

5 of confusing to me, particularly at Social Security

6 hearings, because the SVP is -- was used as

7 something great. It was confusing, because SGA

8 wasn't factored in.

9   MS. KARMAN: Yes.

10   DR. FRASER: Say for accounting, you know,

11 I mean, if you have a degree in accounting, you

12 know, a degree in accounting pretty much relates to

13 being able to proficiently work as an accountant;

14 maybe not. Maybe you need six months. Maybe it's

15 education plus six months or something like that, or

16 a year to full proficiency. That has never been

17 really kind of taken into account.

18   MS. KARMAN: Right. This is Sylvia again,

19 yes.

20   One of things we have encountered is when

21 you go back and you look at what was originally

22 defined in the RHAJ, or the Revised Handbook for

1 Analyzing Jobs, the GED or general education

2 development element captured more about education;

3 and the SVP was a separate element. Where today

4 we're trying to get at, you know, what are you --

5 what does the person need to be able to do to become

6 proficient on the job? And that may be in addition

7 to whatever educational requirements they may have.

8   Because you are right, I think it is used,

9 you know, in a blanket way to cover a number of

10 different things; and we're trying to deconstruct it

11 so that we can be more accurate about what it is

12 we're actually measuring.

13   DR. FRASER: It has presented kind of a

14 nightmare for a lot of VEs.

15   MS. KARMAN: Right. Yes.

16   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any other

17 comments, or recommendations, or thoughts?

18   Tom, I had one. This morning when we spoke

19 and we looked at the list that you had in the back,

20 the question was, are any of those recommendations

21 that you have there for further study something that

22 is specific to this set of recommendations at this

1 point in time in terms of the content model or

2 classification? And so we had talked about are there

3 general concerns or implications at some point down

4 the line.

5   I know one of them was -- and I don't have

6 that list in front of me -- but it was the whole

7 concept that we talked about earlier in the

8 teleconference about the number of jobs, and how do

9 you account for that and the occupation, that kind of

10 thing.

11   So some seem to be just general thoughts or

12 implications or considerations; but I was wondering

13 off that list -- because we really do need to talk

14 about that and deliberate on that -- was there

15 anything that you suggested for specific studies

16 regarding the content model or the classification for

17 the set of recommendations where we are right now?

18   MR. HARDY: Yes. I went through and

19 reviewed them, and I eliminated some that appeared

20 to be overlap. And I tried to break them down to

21 four additional things I'm going to add in. I can

22 go over those right now if you wish.

1   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: That would be great.

2   MR. HARDY: Under point -- I believe point

3 number five, that SSA validates any work activity

4 that it collects, and then assess work activities

5 when combined with other items to become a skill.

6 Under that I put, one, SSA policy addresses degrees

7 of transferability which should be considered.

8   Consequently, what are the work activities

9 that when they combine with other requirements of an

10 occupation they rise to a level appropriate to be

11 called a skill that leads to a worker's capacity to

12 perform work activities of other occupations? That

13 is, what factors indicate that skills should be

14 transferable? Can transferability be predicted?

15 What is the error rate for that prediction?

16   And then number two under those, current

17 SSA policy states that work activities and

18 semi-skilled or skill levels provide the worker with

19 vocational advantages over workers with no work

20 history or with an unskilled level of work history.

21 What would be the work activities that would provide

22 the worker with vocational advantage? Could this be

1 quantified along with any skill within or between

2 occupations?

3   That would fit under general heading of

4 trying to take work activity and make it at the level

5 where we want to start calling it a skill. And these

6 are some areas where we can begin, because they are

7 part of SSA policy.

8   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So it sounded

9 like you were reading from your draft report in the

10 back where that is kind of a list; and could you

11 identify -- because you went through those pretty

12 quickly -- what number that would be within that

13 list?

14   MR. HARDY: Yes; sure. If you go to page

15 23, for those of you who have the report in front of

16 you. Those first two, bullet point one and bullet

17 point two, are the two that I pulled over and put

18 under number five of our recommendations.

19   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: So the first one was

20 degree of transferability. The second one was the

21 issue of vocational advantage, is that correct?

22   MR. HARDY: That's correct. And the only

1 other two that I thought of bringing over into the

2 actual recommendations were for number six of the

3 recommendations, developing a method for determining

4 complexity level, both on the occupation and within

5 the occupation. As a starting point I pulled over a

6 suggested review of CIP, O*Net 11 Point Educational

7 Scales, current tools and training scales, a scan

8 scale, and other measures to start to conform a

9 complexity system.

10   And "B," additional research regarding

11 potential complexity components in relation to

12 transferability issues. Specifically possible

13 weighting of measures to result in overall ranking

14 for the occupation. And those will be found on page

15 23 as number -- numbers 4 and 5. The others were

16 either eliminated or truncated.

17   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Tom, when you say

18 "tools and training," do you mean tools and

19 technologies from the O*Net?

20   MR. HARDY: Which one are you referring

21 to?

22   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: The first one that you

1   mentioned under six, which is number four from page

2   23.

3   MR. HARDY: Okay. I got it. What was

4   your question, Mary? I'm sorry.

5   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I think you said

6   "tools and training," but I wondered if you meant

7   "tools and technology" from the O*Net.

8   MR. HARDY: That could be. I'm sorry. It

9   imprecise here. The tools and training of O*Net,

10 that wouldn't fit.

11   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: So "tools and

12 technology."

13   MR. HARDY: Yes.

14   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. So maybe the

15 best way to address this, because these are four new

16 elements that are from another part of your report

17 that are being brought up into the recommendations,

18 is can we go to number five and the two that you

19 have under there and see if we can get some

20 discussion and deliberation about those two --

21 either of those.

22   MR. HARDY: I will repeat again for those

1 who don't have it in front of them. "A," and,

2 again, this comes under skills -- SSA addresses

3 degrees of transferability in their policy.

4 Therefore, there is a recommendation that we need to

5 start doing research into how we take the work

6 activity and combine it with other requirements of

7 an occupation, so that we can find out when the work

8 activity rises to a level appropriate to be called a

9 skill.

10   And then under that, "B," SSA policy

11 addresses work as semi-skilled or skilled levels to

12 provide vocational advantage. How would we, again,

13 address work activities that provide the worker with

14 vocational advantage? These are two subsets of the

15 whole skill conversation.

16   Are there any questions on either of these

17 two?

18   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: I have a question. I

19 think earlier you had mentioned that work activity

20 was going to be used as a proxy of skill. So when

21 you are talking about the first recommendation under

22 five, you are not saying rise to the level of being

1   called a skill, but some sort of skill complexity;

2   is that what I'm understanding you to say?

3   MR. HARDY: The way we looked at it was

4   that we're looking right now as work activities as a

5   proxy for skill or data collection. The easiest way

6   to start gathering information to inform the OIS.

7   Now, I know that there has been much discussion as

8   to whether all work activities actually rise to the

9   level of a skill, and this kind of goes to that.

10 Can we say that work activity "A," is, in fact, a

11 skill when it's combined with other things, or maybe

12 we need to rate it under a continuum where it's a

13 work activity, but it's not necessarily a skill, but

14 we are looking at transferability of skills. So

15 it's a work activity for proxy for skill for data

16 collection, but in application under skills, it may

17 not necessarily be so, or it may be so; but I think

18 we need to be sure about that.

19   MS. KARMAN: Hi, this is Sylvia.

20   Tom, I just want to be sure I'm

21 understanding. So when you're referring to skill --

22 also our listeners and other Panel members can,

1 perhaps, track on this a bit if -- by skill you mean

2 whatever aspect of that work activity that hasn't

3 risen to a level of something that would provide an

4 individual vocational advantage.

5   MR. HARDY: Um-hum.

6   MS. KARMAN: So it has a complexity level?

7   MR. HARDY: Um-hum.

8   MS. KARMAN: Or some sort of -- involve

9 some kind of technology or tools or something

10 that --

11   MR. HARDY: It's something more than, yes.

12 I'm going to use a bad example, but walking. You

13 know, there has been discussion that walking is a

14 skill. It's a learned activity. Well, for data

15 collection purposes maybe yes; for transferability

16 of skills under the Act, I'm not sure. Walking when

17 combined with other things may rise to a level of

18 skill, perhaps.

19   DR. WILSON: This is Mark Wilson. I think

20 the issue goes back to something we have talked

21 about a few times, and that's the kind of higher

22 level of construct that might be derived from work

1 descriptors. I think that's what Tom is talking

2 about; but in terms of what -- almost all of the

3 items in the instrument are going to load on at

4 least one and potentially more factors.

5 So the idea that there would be some subset

6 of items that get elevated to some new level -- and

7 that's the point at which TSA becomes available --

8 could get kind of complex. I mean, my view would be

9 to the extent that a job profile is similar to

10 another job profile, you know, with all the various

11 physical and cognitive side things that we have

12 talked about earlier, you know, then that would lead

13 to an indication that work was similar enough to be

14 transferable.

15 Now, in terms of -- I don't know if we're

16 talking about a policy decision here or how similar

17 things have to be that Tom was talking about; but if

18 the issue is linkage between person side and job side

19 activities, how that does is sort of validation study

20 of a linkage between cognitive and physical

21 interpersonal characteristics of people and work

22 demands. I very much am in favor of this.

1   This is something that industrial

2   psychologists have talked about for a long time.

3   More systematic valid linkages between these two

4   areas, studies to examine these two things that are

5   very important; but I don't think what Tom is saying

6   is that he is interested in particular factor

7   structures or things of that sort or saying, you

8   know, that you can only use factor "X" as opposed to

9   factor "Y." I think if I understand it he is just

10   simply saying that, you know, this should be based on

11   some scientific measure of job similarity.

12   MR. HARDY: Yes, and that's part of it. I

13   think you have got it. Yeah.

14   MS. KARMAN: So this is Sylvia again.

15   So what we're talking about here is really

16   the recommendations that I think we have been hearing

17   from a number of folks today that we go ahead and

18   develop the instruments, test them, get the data

19   back, and then look at where is the linkage between

20   work and person side -- am I hearing that correctly?

21   As opposed to then also Social Security might be

22   informed by that and also some of our applied

1 research with regard to policy development. Am I

2 characterizing that the way I'm hearing from Tom and

3 from Mark. Hello?

4   MR. HARDY: I'm pondering your statement,

5 Sylvia.

6   DR. WILSON: I don't think it's

7 necessary -- there could be studies of what various

8 types of work that are, you know, commonly

9 identified jobs where someone could do person-side

10 studies of the existence of various attributes of

11 prior work analysis.

12   So I'm not as worried about sequencing.

13 The idea is to get good, solid, defensible

14 occupational analysis information, and then as people

15 do, you know, person-side studies of various kinds of

16 work. If we have enough of those that we can, you

17 know, in a policy capturing sense try and figure out

18 if there is a relationship between that and what the

19 occupational data tells us.

20   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

21   DR. WILSON: I definitely think that

22 the -- one of the key events for any of that to take

1 place, what Tom is talking about, is to get a common

2 metric OIS in place, at least in a policy form, that

3 we can then play around with and address the kind of

4 issues, you know, that Tom and others have raised

5 about what rises to the level of being transferable

6 and what doesn't and things of that sort.

7   MR. HARDY: Because I do believe in the

8 final analysis there is going to be a difference. I

9 think for us to be defensible and also stay within

10 the confines of SSA's requirement, we have to be

11 sure that what we are saying is a transferable skill

12 is, in fact, that. And not a generalized skill, or

13 a generalized work activity per se, but it's a

14 skill.

15   That's something that as we gather

16 information for work activity we can analyze and

17 maybe at that point when we start applying a

18 complexity level to it break those down and identify

19 what is a transferable skill versus something that's

20 present at all jobs. That may not be a skill per se.

21   MS. KARMAN: Hi, this is Sylvia again.

22   I think I just want to interject this one

1 thing about -- transferable skills analysis is a work

2 side assessment of the work activities regardless. I

3 don't want to get it into whether things rise to the

4 level of skill. That sort of thing I'm not debating

5 that. That is something that needs to be looked at

6 from Social Security's point of view.

7   But I was hearing Mark early on talk about

8 making the linkage between the work side and the

9 person side. I just wanted to be clear about the

10 fact that the TSA aspects are work side. So that's

11 one thing. There was another point I was going to

12 make, but it flooded my head, sorry.

13   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Because we're running

14 out of time, very quickly I want to see if under

15 recommendation number five, the two areas that have

16 been discussed in terms of areas we intend to study,

17 if there are any additional questions,

18 recommendations, comments? Or if that gives you

19 some ideas, some guidance, Tom, in terms of the

20 discussion, there may be ways to articulate that.

21 Where there might be some understanding more of what

22 is meant by that recommendation -- or at least the

1   first one.

2   MR. HARDY: I will take it under

3   advisement.

4   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Anything else in terms

5   of second recommendation, the vocational advantage,

6   or was that pretty much covered, does everybody

7   feel? Okay.

8   So then on to number six, you had two

9   areas, again, of study there from page 23, being

10   number four and number five in terms of complexity

11   level, in terms of weighing of measures. Mark might

12   have covered some of that in terms of his discussion

13   in the earlier part, but I just wanted to see if

14   there is any thoughts, or discussion, or comments

15   within those two recommendations?

16   Okay. Silence tells me no.

17   So overall -- I will open it up to the

18   overall recommendations in terms of transferability

19   of skill, if there are any thoughts or comments?

20   Okay. Thank you, Tom.

21   MR. HARDY: Thank you.

22   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We're moving on to the

1 fifth subcommittee, the Mental Cognitive

2 Subcommittee. Dr. David Schretlen, if you will

3 start off by indicating who was on your

4 subcommittee, and then go into your recommendations.

5   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. Thank you. The

6 other subcommittee members are Bob Fraser and Sylvia

7 Karman; and we basically have five recommendations.

8   The first is that the underlying conceptual

9 model of psychological abilities that are required to

10 do work as reflected by the current MRFC assessment

11 should be revised. And we are recommending that the

12 revision should aim to address shortcomings in the

13 current conceptual model; be based on scientific

14 evidence wherever possible; lead logically to the

15 elements that can be reliably assessed and

16 empirically tested for their predictive validity; and

17 finally, that the revision retain elements of the

18 current MRFC assessment that are consistent with

19 scientific evidence and reliably measurable, and

20 valid predictors of the ability to work. In other

21 words, where possible to retain the existing system

22 that is working for the sake of continuity.

 1   So that's the first recommendation. Two

 2   sort of subcomponents under that recommendation are

 3   that the revised MRFC assessment should specifically

 4   redress the following shortcomings; the

 5   underrepresentation of neurocognitive abilities.

 6   Lots of people gave us input. There is a lot of

 7   evidence that neurocognitive abilities are important

 8   predictors of work outcomes and lots of diseases.

 9   Secondly, the reliance on course and underspecified

10   categories to rate residual abilities; thirdly, the

11   failure to account for longitudinal fluctuations in

12   mental ability; fourth, the inclusion of elements

13   that combine desperate abilities. In other words, a

14   number of the current MRFC items have multiple

15   components, and a person might have an impairment on

16   one, but not the other. So it gets confusing.

17   The fifth, the failure to recognize

18   differences in the predictive power in various

19   abilities. Some are -- they're all sort of weighted

20   equally, and they ought not be; and then finally, the

21   large inferential leaps that are required in order to

22   match residual abilities with job demands. So our

1 recommendation is that the revised system attempt to

2 redress these shortcomings.

3   Relatedly, our subcommittee recommends that

4 SSA include aspects of neurocognitive functioning in

5 a revised conceptual model. And this recommendation

6 came from many sources. In particular, there is a

7 widely perceived failure of the current assessment to

8 account for impairments of specific cognitive

9 abilities. Whether these result from traumatic brain

10 injuries, other disorders, developmental disorders,

11 and even psychiatric conditions. For instance,

12 schizophrenia is well known to be characterized by

13 cognitive impairments. Yet, these are not well

14 represented in the current MRFC assessment.

15   And so then the subcommittee discusses

16 under this recommendations a variety of models.

17 We're not advocating necessarily -- you know, we're

18 sort of acumenical in our approach. We make

19 recommendations, but acknowledge that there may be

20 other ways of going about this.

21   We note, for example, that the most

22 parsimonious approach would be to assess general

1 cognitive ability. But we know note that there are

2 problems with that. And the -- if you were to assess

3 general cognitive ability, it's important to

4 recognize that other empirical research might know

5 that other aspects of cognitive functioning predict

6 the ability to work better than a single measure of

7 "g," for instance.

8   We ultimately recommend a six-factor model;

9 but we recognize that an alternate model with fewer

10 or different factors might provide a more efficient

11 assessment with little lost of predictability. So in

12 any case, we make provisional recommendations and

13 acknowledge that SSA may -- that further research

14 might lead to substantial modifications of these. So

15 that in a nutshell is the first and major

16 recommendation. Any comments about that?

17   Okay. Secondly, we recommend that the SSA

18 reorganize the elements of the existing MRFC

19 conceptual model up to four categories. This is sort

20 of a modification. Rather than throwing out the

21 current system, we're suggesting -- we're

22 recommending that SSA sort of revise it, or modify

1   it; and we suggest that it be -- the revised model be

2   predicated on -- be based on four sort of categories

3   or dimensions of functioning. The first is a

4   neurocognitive functioning; the second is initiative

5   and persistence; the third is inter-personal

6   functioning; and the fourth is self-management.

7   And then flowing from that is the third

8   recommendation, which is that SSA adopt a -- an -- a

9   set of 15 more specific abilities that we have

10 outlined under each of these major headings. And

11 again, recognizing that -- we explicitly note in here

12 that the subcommittee recognizes that Social Security

13 might choose to discard or replace some of these 15

14 abilities, or add others that are not listed.

15   In other words we're suggesting these. We

16 describe each of the 15. We explain how we arrive at

17 each of those. I'm not going to go through that now.

18 And we also note in the report others that were

19 suggested that we didn't include on the list, but we

20 wanted to bring to the attention of the Panel as a

21 whole, and Social Security in general, because

22 they're important. Some people advocated for their

1 inclusion in the list. We discuss why they didn't,

2 but Social Security may well want to change that.

3   Any comments about recommendations two and

4 three?

5   Okay. Number four is that we recommend

6 that the Panel provide ongoing consultation to the

7 OIS's project psychometrician as the Social Security

8 develops new items for data collection.

9   And then, also, we recommend that Social

10 Security Administration consider the possibility that

11 MRFC abilities be assessed using different methods.

12 That is, there may be more than one method to assess

13 these things. Some might be better assessed using

14 rating scales, like Likert scales. Others might be

15 better assessed by performance based measures, like

16 computer-assisted testing.

17   And just that the Social Security not be --

18 we recommend that the Social Security Administration

19 not be wedded to one particular approach while not be

20 considering others.

21   Finally, the fifth recommendation is

22 that -- that we conduct -- that we recommend a series

1   of studies to examine the reliability and predictive

2   validity of any instruments that are developed to

3   assess residual functional capacities and

4   occupational demands as part of the overall project.

5   And then we discuss suggestions for that research in

6   more detail.

7   But essentially, it is to do what has

8   already been suggested by others, and that is to

9   begin with a relative small set of homogenous

10 occupations that are really widely represented

11 throughout the economy, and then to essentially

12 examine incumbents who are in those positions to

13 using all of the instruments that are developed

14 through this project, both the new instrument and

15 existing instruments to compare them in terms of

16 their ability to distinguish between people who are

17 essentially working in those jobs, and people who

18 have been adjudicated unable to work.

19   So those are the major recommendations.

20 Any other -- any comments?

21   MS. SHOR: This is Nancy Shor. I do have

22 a couple of questions.

1   Looking at the very last page of the

2   recommendations, which is the description of the

3   study; I had two concerns here. One is that it is

4   completely inappropriate for this Panel to be

5   involved with any reference to the physical health or

6   state of the disability trust fund as being a

7   mechanism that opens the process to allow more

8   disability claims or deny more disability claims.

9   DR. SCHRETLEN: What are you responding

10   to?

11   MS. SHOR: I'm at the end of the --

12   DR. SCHRETLEN: Oh, I see. Where I'm

13   talking about the implications.

14   MS. SHOR: Right. So that's -- this is

15   totally inappropriate for this Panel to be going

16   there.

17   DR. SCHRETLEN: Um-hum.

18   MS. SHOR: My second comment there is,

19   with the specific investigation that you're

20   suggesting here about interviewing job incumbents

21   that have migraine headaches. Setting aside issues

22   about whether people accurately know whether or not

1   they suffer from migraine headaches, but my main

2   point here is that the statute requires individual

3   assessment of disability claimants. So that if a

4   person documents to the satisfaction of an SSA

5   adjudicator that they suffer from migraine

6   headaches -- to use your examples -- to the point

7   that they are incapacitated; then, it doesn't matter

8   whether other people out there report that they

9   suffer from migraine headaches, and yet, we see that

10   they're working.

11   The statute requires an individual

12   assessment not of the universe of people with

13   migraine headaches, but the statute requires an

14   individual assessment of this particular claimant.

15   So I am troubled by the notion that

16   establishing that a certain percentage of people with

17   migraine headaches are able to work has relevance to

18   the adjudication of Mr. Jones's disability claim.

19   DR. SCHRETLEN: Well, perhaps, migraine

20   headaches wasn't the best choice of an example. But

21   the principle that I'm trying to get at, Nancy, is

22   that one way of looking at job demands is by looking

1   at people who do those jobs. In other words, let's

2   suppose you're looking at how heavy -- how much

3   lifting is required by a job or what is the -- what

4   is the minimum ability a person needs to be able to

5   lift in order to do a job?

6   One way is -- one way of assessing that is

7   to follow people around who are doing the job, and

8   tracking how much they lift between, you know, 9:00

9   and 5:00 or whatever. But another possibility is --

10 another approach is to look at incumbents on those

11 jobs and find out how much they can lift. And if --

12 if the job analysis suggest that you need to be able

13 to lift 50 pounds to do this job, but in fact, you

14 find that two-thirds of people who do the job are not

15 able to lift 50 pounds above their waist, that seems

16 to me that that provides very important information

17 about the job demands.

18   MS. SHOR: I think when we moved to the

19 mental cognitive arena, those points become much

20 mirkier. I can't imagine a job description that's

21 going to say, a person really doesn't need to pay

22 attention very much. A person really doesn't need

1   to be persistent. It's okay if a person has a

2   migraine headache once a day. They can still do

3   this job. I understand what you are saying on the

4   physical side. I understand the -- what seems would

5   fit the physical. It makes sense to see if it will

6   fit the mental cognitive side. I'm very concerned

7   that, in fact, it may not.

8   DR. SCHRETLEN: Are you willing to let

9   empirical data answer that question?

10   MS. SHOR: As long as we maintain the rock

11 bottom principle that claims are going to be

12 adjudicated individually, then, yes, for collecting

13 that data, certainly. But it is troubling to me if

14 there is a sense that this is moving in the

15 direction of the average person that can do blah,

16 blah, blah. We're talking what the law requires.

17 We're talking about individual claimants.

18   DR. SCHRETLEN: And I guess I think that

19 it's important to assess the individual claimant

20 against people who are able to do work. I mean, if

21 the individual claimant's abilities fall below the

22 threshold required of people to do a job; then, I

1 totally agree with you, that they should be

2 adjudicated disabled and they should be evaluated as

3 an individual. But I guess what I'm thinking is

4 that we're not suggesting -- I don't think the

5 subcommittee is suggesting moving away from

6 consideration of applicants on an individual basis,

7 but rather evaluating an individual applicant's

8 abilities against those required to do various jobs.

9   MS. SHOR: And would part of that

10 evaluation be administration of the "g" test or

11 other tests? Would that be part of your

12 recommendation?

13   DR. SCHRETLEN: It certainly could be. I

14 think that what we're recommending is that whatever

15 instrument Social Security ultimately develops to

16 assess person-side variables, that those instruments

17 be used in a study that includes people who are

18 successfully doing jobs; and those instruments, you

19 know, could be mental as well as physical capacity.

20   MS. KARMAN: This is Sylvia. I have a

21 question.

22   I'm wondering if I'm understanding that,

1 perhaps, the distinction here is between a study that

2 has to do with -- or testing or getting information

3 about the demands of work vis a vie what incumbents

4 are able to do on the job or are doing on the job,

5 sort of like job component validity study, versus the

6 adjudication of a claim and looking at somebody's

7 residual functional capacity.

8   MS. SHOR: Right.

9   DR. SCHRETLEN: The former.

10   MS. KARMAN: Okay.

11   DR. SCHRETLEN: Now, it might have

12 implications for the latter.

13   MS. KARMAN: Correct. Thank you.

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

15 other comments, concerns, questions to the Cognitive

16 Demand Subcommittee?

17   MR. HARDY: This is Tom Hardy. I guess I

18 just wanted to echo that I have the same concerns I

19 think I heard Nancy voice; and the recommendations

20 are pretty long. This is a pretty dense document

21 here. And I'm just wondering -- I guess two things.

22 "A," I want to say I have the same concerns that

1 Nancy does. And I'm a little concerned about some

2 of the language I see in here right now, especially

3 as an attorney who represents claimants. It does

4 give me some pause.

5   Are these recommendations going to be

6 distilled down any further, or is this what we're

7 looking at as the final recommendation?

8   DR. SCHRETLEN: This was going to be the

9 final document.

10   MR. HARDY: Okay.

11   DR. SCHRETLEN: Can you identify

12 particular things, Tom, that you are also concerned

13 about?

14   MR. HARDY: Well, I have to echo Nancy's

15 comment on the phrase "alternately, the SSA could

16 lower or raise the cut off, and thereby allow fewer

17 or more claims, depending upon national priorities

18 and the level of funding available to support

19 beneficiaries." I find that to be a very, very

20 troubling statement coming out of our Panel.

21   DR. SCHRETLEN: It just overreaches, you

22 are saying?

1   MR. HARDY: It takes us -- I know we're

2   always distancing around trying not to get to

3   policy, but I think that takes us beyond policy. It

4   takes us into a very, very dangerous place that I'm

5   very uncomfortable with.

6   DR. SCHRETLEN: Okay. I guess I'm

7   certainly happy to talk this over with Bob and

8   Sylvia, and you know, back off from some of these if

9   that's a consensus. I think that -- in my mind the

10   major point was to suggest doing the study. I think

11   the study has important implications, but we

12   certainly don't have to implicate all these

13   implications.

14   DR. FRASER: This is Bob. I agree, David.

15   I think we tried to stay out of that domain in terms

16   of policy.

17   MS. KARMAN: I was just going -- this is

18   Sylvia. I was just going to concur with that.

19   I think when the subcommittee -- our

20   subcommittee was discussing these things, our main

21   focus was on just making sure we can actually do the

22   study.

 1   DR. FRASER: Yes.

 2   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: We're at the

 3 3:00 o'clock hour, so I'm going to ask that we kind

 4 of move beyond the subcommittee reports at this

 5 point. Thank you to the Cognitive Demands

 6 Subcommittee. Thank you to all the subcommittees

 7 for all your hard work.

 8   Just one question before we go into issues

 9 and questions. Were there any -- was there anything

10 that has not been covered in terms of the

11 subcommittee report to the OIDAP that we need to

12 cover?

13   Okay. It seems like the Panel

14 deliberations have brought up for the subcommittees

15 some issues to consider, and to put this kind of in

16 the context of what will be happening between now and

17 LA and also talk about what's happening in LA. I

18 know that as we have been talking we have been

19 referring to materials we're looking at that are in

20 draft form. We've talked about Table 2, for example,

21 and the Work Taxonomy and Classification

22 Subcommittee. These are draft reports from the

 1 subcommittees to the Panel to get us to this point

 2 where we can deliberate as a Panel for -- with each

 3 other in terms of the recommendations.

 4   At this level we would like the

 5 subcommittee chairs -- we ask the subcommittee chairs

 6 to consider all of the comments that have been made,

 7 all of the suggestions, that type of thing; and to

 8 provide us with final reports by the close of

 9 business tomorrow.

10   What will be happening during this week is

11 that the overall report that will include the

12 subcommittee reports as appendices will be written.

13 It is the draft report of the report to the

14 Commissioner in terms of the content model and

15 classification recommendations that we hope to have

16 out to the Panel by the 9th of September, so that we

17 can then at -- in LA in September go through each of

18 the recommendations again, the final recommendations;

19 and actually go to a vote on these.

20   The vote will be held by secret ballot. We

21 will go through these one by one, and take a vote on

22 each of these. You will be provided with more

1   information as we get closer in terms of the

2   procedure, the process for voting.

3   MR. HARDY: Mary, can I ask a quick

4   question? This is Tom Hardy.

5   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Sure.

6   MR. HARDY: When you say go each by each,

7   are we going to do individual recommendations or

8   individual subpanel, or subcommittee

9   recommendations?

10   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Because of the ability

11 for us to be able to -- as you see before you, the

12 Panel, you see that the structure of the

13 recommendations is different. So we have to add

14 some level of consistency in terms of numbering and

15 that type of thing; and so there is a way in terms

16 of starting the voting process and the motions that

17 we can take them section by section, or

18 recommendation by recommendation. So you will get

19 some information between now and LA that will better

20 define how we are going to go through this process.

21   Does that answer it?

22   MR. HARDY: Okay. Thank you.

1   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Let me think.

2   I want to really thank you. This last month has

3   been incredible. This whole last six months has

4   been incredible, but particularly the last month.

5   You have all worked incredibly hard to get us to the

6   point where we are. Just a reminder, as has been

7   said on the call for the last three hours, that

8   really these are our preliminary recommendations as

9   we proceed, you know, to hopefully the next level

10   and start refining some of these things.

11   This is not the finish line. This is the

12   starting point, and so very exciting. If you need

13   help as the executive subcommittee in terms of the

14   Chairs, I would encourage you to get ahold of your

15   leads if you need to work with them over the next day

16   or so in terms of finishing your recommendations and

17   your reports due tomorrow.

18   I'm going to ask if there are any final

19   questions, thoughts, concerns before we move to

20   adjourn?

21   DR. GIBSON: Mary, this is Shanan Gibson.

22   I want to once more try to follow-up on

138

1 what I believe Tom asked. Just correct me if I'm

2 wrong, or give me a little more direction, please.

3   So at this point each subcommittee will go

4 back, consider what was recommended from the full

5 Panel, and then submit to you our final

6 recommendations as a subcommittee. From there those

7 recommendations will be compiled into a, if you will,

8 final format, which we will then vote upon. Is that

9 correct so far?

10   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: That is correct, and

11 all the subcommittee reports, as of tomorrow, will

12 be appendices to the overall report that will

13 include the recommendations.

14   DR. GIBSON: Once they are compiled into

15 their voting standpoint, will we be voting on them

16 as written, or can we, as in other committees, for

17 example, put forth a motion to revise the wording

18 prior to voting as a result of deliberation, or will

19 there not be time for that?

20   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: What usually happens

21 somebody starts with a motion to accept or --

22 whatever wording is to be part of the motion. So

1 that wording could be accept, or reject, or

2 whatever. As the discussion occurs, there could be

3 amendments to the motion.

4   DR. GIBSON: But we will absolutely have

5 the opportunity to deliberate the wording as it,

6 perhaps, is revised prior to actually voting. It is

7 not just here it is, vote on it as it is?

8   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: No. That is correct.

9 There is room for modification there.

10   DR. GIBSON: Thank you.

11   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any other

12 questions? Thoughts?

13   It is 3:07 eastern time. I want to thank

14 you all for staying way over, and for all your hard

15 work. I look forward to reviewing everybody's report

16 in the next 24 hours and to seeing a lot of you in a

17 couple of weeks in LA. Thank you.

18   DR. GIBSON: Thank you very much.

19   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Oh, wait a minute.

20   MR. HARDY: Mary, I make a motion to

21 adjourn.

22   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you.

1   Do I have a second?

2   MS. KARMAN: I second.

3   DR. BARROS-BAILEY: Okay.

4   MR. HARDY: That was Tom Hardy.

5   (Whereupon, at 3:07 p.m., the proceedings

6   were adjourned.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1   CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2

3   I, Stella R. Christian, A Certified

4   Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I was

5   authorized to and did report in stenotype notes the

6   foregoing proceedings, and that thereafter my

7   stenotype notes were reduced to typewriting under

8   my supervision.

9   I further certify that the transcript of

10   proceedings contains a true and correct transcript

11   of my stenotype notes taken therein to the best of

12   my ability and knowledge.

13   SIGNED this 4th day of September, 2009.

14

15   _____
                STELLA R. CHRISTIAN
16

17

18

19

20

21

22