Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel
Quarterly Meeting Minutes

Social Security Administration
Radisson Plaza Lord Baltimore Hotel
Baltimore, MD
May 4, 2011

This document contains the minutes for the quarterly meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel (the "Panel"). This discretionary Panel, established under the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "the FACA"), will report to the Commissioner of the Social Security ("Commissioner"). The Panel will provide independent advice and recommendations on plans and activities create an occupational information system tailored specifically for SSA's disability programs and adjudicative needs.

Panel Members Present:

>Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D. (*Chair*)
>John W. Creswell, Ph.D.
>Robert T. Fraser, Ph.D.
>Shanan Gwaltney-Gibson, Ph.D.
>Thomas A. Hardy, J.D.
>Janine S. Holloman
>H. Allan Hunt, Ph.D.
>Timothy Key, M.D.
>Deborah E. Lechner, PT, MS
>Abigail T. Panter, Ph.D.
>Juan I. Sanchez, Ph.D.
>David J. Schretlen, Ph.D.

SSA Staff Present:

>Michael Dunn
>Debbie Harkin
>Byron Haskins
>Sylvia E. Karman
>Elizabeth Kennedy
>Sika Koudou
>Mike O'Connor
>Clare Ritterhoff
>Mark Trapani
>Debra Tidwell-Peters, Designated Federal Official

Agenda:

WEDNESDAY—May 4, 2011
Location: Calvert Ballroom, Ballroom Level
8:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.   **Call to Order**
                                Overview of Today's Agenda
                                Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *Chair*

                                Presentation to New OIDAP Members

                                Welcome Address
                                David A. Rust, *Deputy Commissioner*
                                Office of Retirement and Disability Policy

                                Richard Balkus, *Associate Commissioner*
                                Office of Program Development and Research

9:00 a.m. to 9:15 a.m.   **OIDAP Chair's Report**

                                Review of the OIDAP Annual Report
                                Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *Chair*

9:15 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.   **Project Director's Report**
                                Sylvia E. Karman, *Director*
                                Occupational Information System Development Project

                                International and Domestic OIS Investigation
                                Mark Trapani, Social Science Research Analyst
                                Sika Koudou, Intern

10:27 a.m. to 10:43 a.m.   **BREAK**

10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.   **Sampling and Collection in the Occupational Employment Statistics Program**
                                Dixie Sommers, *Assistant Commissioner*
                                Office of Occupational Statistics and Employment Projections
                                Bureau of Labor Statistics

                                Laurie A. Salmon, *Branch Chief*
                                Occupational Employment Statistics Program
                                Bureau of Labor Statistics

12:02 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.   **LUNCH**

1:15 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.	**Overview of O*NET Data Collection and Activities** Pamela L. Frugoli, *O*NET/Competency Assessment Team Lead* Employment and Training Administration U. S. Department of Labor Phil M. Lewis, *Technical Officer* National Center for O*NET Development. David R. Rivkin, *Technical Officer* National Center for O*NET Development.
2:45 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.	**Public Comment**
3:15 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.	**BREAK**
3:30 p.m. to 4:15 p.m.	**Occupational/Medical/Vocational—Initial Claims Review Final Results** Deborah Harkin, *Social Insurance Specialist* Office of Vocational Resources Development Mark Trapani, *Social Science Research Analyst* Office of Vocational Resources Development
4:15 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.	**OIDAP Deliberation**
5:00 p.m.	**ADJOURN** Debra Tidwell-Peters, *Designated Federal Officer*

Call to Order:
Debra Tidwell-Peters, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Ms. Tidwell-Peters called the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m., EDT conducted a roll call, and turned the meeting over to the Panel's Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey.

Overview of Today's Agenda:
Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., OIDAP Chair

Dr. Barros-Bailey reviewed the agenda and announced that the meeting's theme was sampling. She reviewed changes in Panel membership since the charter renewal[1], including the departure of Dr. Gunnar Anderson and Sylvia Karman, who remains SSA's Occupational Information System (OIS) Project director, and the addition of three new members. She introduced two of the new members who were physically present at the meeting – Dr. Tim Key and Dr. Juan Sanchez, and the new member, Dr. John Creswell, who attended telephonically and was available for a few hours of the morning meeting.

---

[1] On January 7, 2011 the OIDAP charter was renewed until January 6, 2012.

Presentation to New OIDAP Members/Welcome Address
David Rust, Deputy Commissioner (DC) of the Office of Retirement and Disability Policy (ORDP)
Richard Balkus, Associate Commissioner (AC) of the Office of Program Development and Research (OPDR)

AC Balkus reviewed the accomplishments of the Office of Vocational Resources Development (OVRD), headed by Sylvia Karman, since the December 2010 meeting. He said OVRD developed and implemented a prototype business process for communication within SSA and with the Panel and drafted an initial research and development (R&D) plan. OVRD compiled an inventory of disability evaluation constructs, and progressed on two important projects - the Occupational Medical-Vocational Study and the investigation of existing international and domestic OIS's. AC Balkus said OVRD will post the R&D plan on the public website, and he considers it to be a living document that will reflect realities in the project as it moves forward. He concluded by thanking the Department of Labor's (DOL) Employment Training Administration (ETA) and Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and the Census Bureau for sharing their expertise on sampling methods with the Panel.

Dr. Barros-Bailey asked AC Balkus about the status of the collaboration between SSA and DOL. He responded that DOL's participation in the meeting is evidence of SSA's efforts to work with DOL, and he said SSA could gain critical information from ETA and BLS about defining a sampling methodology. AC Balkus said a Memorandum of Understanding between SSA and DOL is under review, and SSA has requested that DOL submit a nomination for Panel membership.

Dr. Barros-Bailey introduced DC Rust who swore in new Panel members, Drs. Key and Sanchez. DC Rust stated SSA's budget restraints were affecting staffing, staff training, and travel. He said the agency has operated under a hiring freeze since July 3, 2010; however, he received permission from the Commissioner to hire a lead scientist for the project as the Panel recommended.

DC Rust said SSA is expanding activity with other agencies that have a vital interest in the development of the OIS. He reviewed areas where the Panel would be assisting SSA in the future such as sampling options or helping find employers and jobs. He also said their input would be important in obtaining occupational information through field job analysis and in developing a work analysis instrument.

OIDAP Chair's Report
Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., OIDAP Chair

Dr. Barros-Bailey began the Chair's Report by framing the Panel's role as defined by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) guided by three main themes: advisory, transparency, and independence. She said the Panel's report about the National Academy of Sciences report, "A Database for a Changing Economy," is available online. She said the Panel presented a report to SSA Commissioner Michael Astrue on December 7, 2010 that summarized nine months of

public comment to the Panel from the seven recommendations the Panel had made to SSA in 2009.

Dr. Barros-Bailey acknowledged SSA's budget pressures but said the project still needs to acquire a scientific skill set. She pointed out that both DC Rust and AC Balkus emphasized the importance of collaboration with other Federal agencies to avoid recreating the wheel and to allow creating an OIS as efficiently as possible.

Dr. Barros-Bailey said the Panel advised SSA to develop a comprehensive plan of OIS R&D activities and share it with the public. She noted that this is a work analysis project which explores the demands of work, and it is important not to confuse this with the process of exploring the ability of people to work. She stressed the importance of keeping those concepts distinct. She indicated that Panel members and SSA staff had presented to more than 3,000 people as part of public outreach during the public comment period. She also noted the timeliness of the Executive Branch's memo on scientific integrity.

Dr. Barros-Bailey concluded by stating that one of the challenges SSA faces is trying to create the OIS while simultaneously creating the framework upon which it is to be built. She thanked ORDP, OPDR, and OVRD for setting up the business process.

Office Director's Report
Sylvia Karman, Director of OVRD

Sylvia Karman started her report by thanking the Panel, new members, the OIS Development Workgroup, and individuals within SSA who have supported the project for their support and collaboration. Ms. Karman said OVRD responded to the Panel's eighth recommendation[2] by developing a business process and an OIS R&D plan.

Ms. Karman spoke about several project activities. She said staff had completed the investigation of existing international OIS's and started reviewing domestic occupational classification systems. Ms. Karman previewed the Occupational Medical-Vocational study presentation later in the meeting and said it would reveal data analysis of the initial case review. She said ICF International consultants continued to work on benchmarking of job analysis methods, which involves interviewing job analysts and Industrial/Organizational psychologists about the methods they use to analyze jobs. Ms. Karman said the next important step is to identify usability, scientific, and legal standards that will be used to evaluate project research activities.

Ms. Karman emphasized the importance of the presentations from BLS and ETA and said although other agencies' purposes for data collection differ from ours, we can learn from the challenges they confronted and from their design and decision processes. Ms. Karman then briefly reviewed the items from the table of contents of the OIS R&D plan and took questions from Panel members.

---

[2] In September 2009, the Panel submitted a list of seven recommendations to SSA regarding the creation of an OIS. In a teleconference meeting November 17, 2010 the Panel added an eighth recommendation that SSA develop a project plan and an R&D Plan and make both documents available to the Panel and the public.

Dr. Schretlen asked whether the OIS investigation had focused on disability systems or job classification systems generally. Ms. Karman responded that OVRD looked into others like SOC, O*Net, etc. She discussed efforts made by SSA staff in the past to contact other Federal agencies that have occupational information needs similar to SSA's in order to make decisions such as the Veteran's Administration and the INS[3]. These efforts, she said, revealed that these agencies were also using the DOT. Dr. Schretlen asked whether it was possible to evaluate any of the foreign systems for usability, and Ms. Karman responded staff would be presenting on this topic shortly, and they would address this question.

Dr. Hunt asked if there is an update on the job analysis benchmarking. Ms. Karman responded that a draft report went to the project lead, Debra Tidwell-Peters, and the Panel's Ad Hoc Subcommittee for review. Dr. Barros-Bailey said Deborah Lechner would be reporting on it during the next day of the meeting.

International and Domestic OIS Investigation
Mark Trapani, Social Science Research Analyst, OVRD
Sika Koudou, Student Intern, OVRD

Mr. Trapani summarized that the study's objective was mainly to investigate occupational systems developed by other countries and identify whether SSA could learn from their development. He said the goal was to identify the principal features of these systems such as their structure, the types of data elements included in them, the degree of specificity of their elements, the focus on work versus person-side characteristics, and the methodologies that were used to develop them. In the end, he said, the study team reviewed the information to determine what features might apply to SSA. Mr. Trapani said the study team had a sense from discussions before initiating the investigation that there would not be an OIS available that SSA could just pull off the shelf and use, so this was approached in terms uncovering general ideas that could help SSA develop its own OIS.

Mr. Trapani said they analyzed several different systems including the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO), which is used widely by 50 or more countries. He said this system is used as a basis for much of what's developed by other countries. Mr. Trapani said they also investigated the World Database of ISCO Occupations, which a consortium of European countries developed based on ISCO, and OIS's from the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Netherlands. He said the investigation revealed some similarities amongst the systems, in part because many of them derived from the ISCO. Mr. Trapani said most of the OIS's examined in the study are used for matching people to jobs, and only the Dutch system is used for disability evaluation. He said the Dutch disability process also evaluates the disability applicant in terms of their functional capacity, but adjudicators must use inference to match that up to the occupational information. Ms. Koudou stated the ISCO serves

---

[3] US Citizenship and Immigration services was formally known as Immigration and Naturalization Services or INS. USCIS requires occupational information for some visa eligibility programs where certain types of skilled workers are granted permission to work in the US based on the need for the type of skills they possess

as a model for national classifications and international comparisons. Mr. Trapani added that in addition to ISCO, some of the countries pulled information from O*NET and DOT categories.

Mr. Hardy asked whether the results would be summarized in a more comprehensive report with recommendations or if the table was the work product.   Mr. Trapani responded that the table would be part of an OIS investigations forthcoming report that would combine the domestic and international work, and the report would include some implications but not necessarily specific recommendations. Dr. Sanchez asked whether they gathered information about the number of occupational titles in each system, and Mr. Trapani said this information would be in the final report. Dr. Schretlen commented that from the information presented, it sounds like no system in the world comes close to what SSA is creating in terms of scope, complexity, and direct applicability.

Sampling and Collection in the Occupational Employment Statistics Program
Dixie Sommers, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Occupational Statistics and Employment Projections, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)
Laurie A. Salmon, Branch Chief, Occupational Employment Statistics Program, BLS

Ms. Sommers said BLS has employment and wages for over 800 detailed occupations, and BLS uses this data to produce estimates for the nation.   She said some of the uses of this data include statistical analysis, foreign labor certification, employment decisions, employment counseling, and marketing and media information. She added that academic researchers use the data to understand the structure of the labor market.

All Federal statistical agencies use the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Ms. Sommers said, and this includes the BLS. She said BLS uses the NAICS to classify establishments based on the goods or services they produce. She defined establishment as the physical building, not the company that owns it. Ms. Sommers said the NAICS is unique because it is also an international classification that is jointly developed by the US, Canada, and Mexico. The NAICS, she said, allows governments to compare economic information across all three countries. Ms. Sommers said the NAICS is updated every five years, and recommendations for classifications are made by the US Economic Classification Policy Committee, which the Census Bureau chairs.

In order to classify workers and jobs into occupations based on their work performed, Ms. Sommers said, the BLS uses the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC). She said OMB issues the SOC, and an interagency committee, chaired by BLS, makes recommendations for revisions. She added that revisions to the NAICS and SOC are published in the Federal Register to allow public comment. Ms. Sommers said the SOC is different from ISCO which uses a skills hierarchy, because the SOC groups occupations according to the similarity of the work performed. Despite the differences, she said, SOC staff is developing a crosswalk between ISCO and the SOC. Ms. Sommers said the SOC's structure includes 23 major groups, 97 minor groups, 400 or so broad occupations, and 840 detailed occupations.

Adjourn

Ms. Tidwell-Peters adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m. EDT.

Call to Order

Ms. Tidwell-Peters called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. EDT. Panel member, Dr. Creswell, was not present at the afternoon meeting. The meeting was turned over the Dr. Barros-Bailey, Chair.

Overview of O*NET Data Collection and Activities
Pamela L. Frugoli, O*NET/Competency Assessment Team Lead, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor (DOL)
Phil M. Lewis, Technical Officer, National Center for O*NET Development, DOL
David R. Rivkin, Technical Office, National Center for O*NET Development., DOL

Ms. Frugoli began by explaining ETA is not a statistical agency like BLS. She said O*NET is operated through a grant to the North Carolina Employment Security Commission. Ms. Frugoli summarized the goal of their briefing is to give an overview of the O*NET project with specific emphasis on data collection, answering the Panel's questions, and providing information about the products and tools O*NET uses in special projects.

Mr. Rivkin briefly reviewed the O*NET from a historical perspective, explaining that the beginnings of O*NET date back to the 1980s. He said during this time the National Research Council (NRC) began reviewing the functionality of the DOT and their findings included that many titles were infrequently updated and some of the information was too specific. Mr. Rivkin said the NRC raised questions pertaining to the reliability and validity of the DOT's information, and they noted that the DOT methods for data collection (on-site observation) made it very cost-prohibitive. DOL formed an interagency panel, APDOT, to learn from the DOT and find ways to improve it. He said the APDOT decided to use new data collection technology, more standardized procedures, less labor intensive data collections methods, and the SOC.

Mr. Rivkin said O*NET follows the SOC but gives more detail. He said O*NET describes 974 occupations, which is 269 more than the SOC. The new jobs, he said, were added through research of new and emerging occupations.

Mr. Lewis discussed the O*NET data collection program. He said continuous data collection for O*NET started in 2001 when DOL obtained OMB clearance. He said O*NET developers designed a multi-method data collection approach that is cost-effective and minimizes public burden (on businesses and individuals). Mr. Lewis described efforts to keep the O*NET current including a comprehensive update of all occupations in 2006 and a recent transition to the 2010 SOC. He said initially response rates for their data collection efforts were low, but the rates have increased over time and now fall just short of OMB's requirement for an 80% response rate.

Mr. Lewis described the two-stage sample design to obtain information from incumbents. He said in the first stage, they sample business establishments to identify a point of contact, and in the second stage, they sample job incumbents through that contact person.

Mr. Lewis said they collect occupations in waves of approximately 50 occupations at a time, and a four-wave approach is used to collect data. In the first wave, he said, they cluster similar occupations to get "coverage" from a sampling perspective - originally designed to get at least 34% of the data collected for the occupation sample. Mr. Lewis said each subsequent wave provides at least 20% of the data to complete data collection for the occupation.

Mr. Lewis explained that the O*NET Center gets a special run from the OES data supplied by BLS that helps identify the initial industry distributions for each occupation. But, he said, in order to get information about the establishments for the actual sampling frame, they use Dunn and Bradstreet, which has information about roughly 15 million establishments.

Mr. Lewis said the O*NET Center offers incentives to employers and the incumbents for participating in the data collection. For example, he said, the business contact might receive an O*NET clock and a certificate of appreciation from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and employees completing surveys receive payment.

Mr. Lewis stated they use the occupational expert method to collect data in a small number of cases when the occupation is difficult to locate, possibly due to a small employment size. He said they rely on this method frequently for new and emerging occupations because BLS does not have a lot of information about them. He explained that this method involves collecting data from experts in the targeted occupation, such as supervisors, trainers, and other people who have extensive knowledge of it.

Another method of data collection mentioned by Mr. Lewis involves using occupational analysts to rate the ability and skills domains. He said these analysts go through extensive training, and the analysts are subject to quality insurance reviews.

Dr. Frasier asked for an estimate of maintaining the operation on an annual basis. Ms. Frugoli responded that it was about $6 million a year (including data collection, website, tools, and research). Panel members then asked specifically whether the estimate included the NC State University grant and the contractors at RTI and HumRRO, and Ms Frugoli replied that it did.

Dr. Hunt asked why DOL used occupational analysts to do the ability and skills demands. Mr. Lewis said there were better sources for collecting one type of information versus another. Mr. Rivkin noted that initially, they collected the skills data using both analysts and job incumbents, and in comparison the responses were similar. So, he said, from a cost perspective, it made sense to go with the occupational analysts. In response to Dr. Schretlen's question about whether O*NET utilized job analysts observing incumbents, Mr. Lewis and Ms. Frugoli stated they did not.

Dr. Gibson reminded the speakers that our OIS would need to stand up to legal scrutiny, and O*NET did not. She asked, would they have done anything differently with the sampling methodology if O*NET had the same legal requirements. Mr. Rivkin stated it would be important for SSA to think about what it wants the metadata to look like and what is going to be acceptable for SSA. For instance, he said, what are acceptable confidence intervals and sample sizes?

Dr. Barros-Bailey asked if the decision not to use field job analysts, as had been done in the DOT, was a cost issue for the most part or if there were other issues. Ms. Frugoli responded that for the DOT's data collection, many of the job analysts were state employees who had travel restrictions so they focused on jobs in their region. She said this prevented the sample from being nationally representative. Mr. Lewis added that it takes less time to send the questionnaire than it does to actually go out and observe a person, which reduces the burden on the participants.

Dr. Barros-Bailey asked whether changes were in the works for O*NET as a result of the National Academy report. Ms. Frugoli responded that she believed some changes have been made to make the database more accessible and to publish more of the metadata, but ETA has focused its recent efforts on responding to the recession.

Dr. Gibson asked how they know when it is appropriate to split occupations into more detailed occupations, and she asked what mechanisms are in place for identifying and tracking emerging occupations. Mr. Rivkin responded that in order to go down to the detailed level, they have a project where they look at the occupations in the SOC and through detailed analysis they determine whether there are different skills, tasks, etc. that are significantly different from the SOC and could be broken out and stand alone. He said there has to be significant employment, at least 5,000, and they must be able to collect information from sources such as associations or the government. He added that they look for training and certification programs. So far, Mr. Rivkin said, they have identified about 154 new and emerging occupations.

Dr. Sanchez asked if they are considering ways to make data collection more cost. Ms. Frugoli responded that they are considering collecting skills data from analysts, and they have considered other collection methods through technology. Dr. Sanchez asked whether they plan to reduce the number of abilities they collect data on from the current number of 52t. Mr. Lewis pointed out that some people advocate reducing the number but others want them to collect more. As a result, he said, they plan to research this area in the future.

Dr. Barros-Bailey asked how Detailed Work Activities (DWA) map onto the Generalized Work Activities (GWA) and how they continue the concept of the common metric. She also asked whether they were derived empirically or rationally. Mr. Lewis responded that a DWA is more detailed than a GWA but not as specific as a task. He said they have tried to link the DWAs to the GWAs in O*NET. Mr. Rivkin said the original DWAs were derived rationally. He explained that they had the DWAs, which they tried to link back, using the GWAs to categorize the information.

Ms. Frugoli says that one of the questions the Panel asked of DOL was what advice they might have for SSA in the developmental of its OIS. She recommended that SSA look into job banks as a source of information. She said if SSA needed more detailed information, similar to DOT titles, that there are a number of companies that do data mining of job banks and this would be a good source. She also recommended SSA consider using observation for certain occupations where it is relevant, or for certain parts of occupations, in combination with other survey methods.

Public Comment
Jeff Truthan, President, SkillTRAN

Mr. Truthan said he applauds SSA's efforts to build a new OIS, and he encouraged starting with the DOT. He said many of the DOT jobs are obsolete, particularly in the sedentary, unskilled base that is so important to SSA disability decisions. He said that although SSA is developing the OIS for disability adjudication purposes, they should keep in mind that the system will be critical for the rehabilitation industry around the world. He encouraged SSA to include elements that might not be necessary for its disability programs but would be helpful for rehabilitation professionals. Mr. Truthan also said SSA needs to obtain adequate staff to build the OIS. He said SSA should electronically capture the work history information supplied by claimants to help establish the existence of occupations and where they are performed. Mr. Truthan requested that SSA update the website for the project with information from the quarterly meetings. He also said that for people listening into the meetings telephonically, it would be helpful to have access to the PowerPoint presentations possibly through a webinar.

Occupational Medical-Vocational Study—Initial Claims Review Final Results
Deborah Harkin, Social Insurance Specialist, OVRD
Mark Trapani, Social Science Research Analyst, OVRD

Mr. Trapani stated they were presenting the results from the initial-level portion of the Occupational and Medical-Vocational Claims Study and reminded the Panel that this entailed a review of 3,867 claim folders. He said the primary purpose of the Study was to identify the primary occupational, functional, and vocational characteristics of SSA's disability program adult applicants whose claims adjudicators decided at the initial or hearing level at steps four or five of the sequential evaluation process. The study results will give a starting point to job analysts when data collection begins for our OIS, Mr. Trapani said, so they can target the occupations that are most prevalent in our disability claimant population first. He informed the Panel that the four primary study questions are: 1) What occupations are most commonly cited by disability claimants as work they performed in the past? 2) What occupations are most commonly identified by adjudicators at the initial and hearing level in step five denials as examples of work in the national economy that a claimant is capable of performing? 3) What functional limitations of claimants are most commonly identified at the initial and hearing level? 4) Which vocational rules are most commonly cited by adjudicators at both levels? Mr. Trapani then briefly reviewed the study methodology.

Ms. Harkin stated experienced disability adjudicators performed the data collection, and they were recording the information from the folder, not readjudicating the claim. She stressed, however, that in recording claimants' past relevant work histories, which is one of the most important data elements for the study, reviewers followed the same policy guidelines as they would if they were adjudicating the claim. She reviewed some of the limitations in identifying claimants' past work histories for the study, and revealed that in 15.7% of cases where claimants

had past relevant work (PRW), one or more jobs could not be assigned a DOT title because the folder did not contain an adequate job description. In an additional 1.4% of cases, she said, jobs were adequately described in the folder, but reviewers could not assign n a DOT title because the job was modern or obscure. Ms. Harkin stressed the difficulty reviewers faced assigning DOT codes for outdated DOT job descriptions to inadequate claimant job descriptions.

Ms. Harkin said identifying the jobs most commonly cited at step four of sequential evaluation presented similar problems as the work histories, and a DOT code could not be assigned to the job cited at step four in 11% of the study cases. She mentioned a different problem for study cases denied at step five. At this step, she said, adjudicators frequently cited jobs that are obsolete or whose DOT job descriptions are outdated.

After addressing the study limitations, Ms. Harkin continued with the results of the study, presenting the jobs that most commonly appeared in claimants' work histories. She said the job of cashier/checker was the most frequently cited job. The study identified 5,274 past relevant jobs which boiled down to 1,171 distinct DOT titles. Most of the PRW identified represented unskilled or semi-skilled jobs that can be learned in six months or less, and 75% of the past jobs were performed at a light or medium exertional level. She reviewed the functional limitations most commonly assessed for these claims, and exertional physical limitations were at the top of the list. Some mental functional limitations made the top 20, she said, and most of these fall under the heading of "sustained concentration and persistence."

Ms. Harkin said the study reviewers captured some decisional information from the folders, including the most commonly cited vocational rules. The rule that was cited the most in these cases was 204.00. She informed the Panel that adjudicators cite this rule when there are no exertional limitations, such as in cases where claimants have mental impairments.

Important conclusion drawn from the study, Ms. Harkin said, are that a small number of job titles account for a large percentage of claimants' past work, and a small number of functional limitations account for a large percentage of the limitations assessed by adjudicators. She also mentioned the status of the second stage of the study, which is underway, and involves reviewing cases decided at the hearing level.

Dr. Sanchez asked whether training disability adjudicators would improve the quality of the work history information in the folders. Ms. Harkin said the problem of insufficient work histories is not caused by poor training but by the overwhelming caseloads that adjudicators carry and the complexity of the forms that are sent to claimants.

OIDAP Deliberation

Dr. Barros-Bailey opened up the meeting for Panel discussion. Dr. Key stated it would be important to identify the DOT jobs that are obsolete so SSA adjudicators will stop citing them. He also added that job analysis should focus first on sedentary or light unskilled jobs and work

its way up eventually to skilled work. Dr. Fraser stated the results of the Occupational and Medical-Vocational Study are a good starting point for job analysis. Mr. Hardy cautioned that we would not be able to focus on just the top 100 or so jobs, because people with skilled past work also apply for disability. Dr. Sanchez stated that an important result of the Occupational Study is that the DOT is not the only problem; SSA needs to make changes to the administrative process by improving information technology and simplifying the forms. Dr. Gibson reminded the Panel that their mission involves focusing on the work-side and worrying about things such as the forms the claimants complete could amount to mission creep.

Adjourn
Ms. Tidwell-Peters adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. EDT.

Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel
Quarterly Meeting Minutes

May 5, 2011

Panel Members Present:

>Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D. (*Chair*)
>Robert T. Fraser, Ph.D.
>Shanan Gwaltney-Gibson, Ph.D.
>Thomas A. Hardy, J.D.
>Janine S. Holloman
>H. Allan Hunt, Ph.D.
>Timothy Key, M.D.
>Deborah E. Lechner, PT, MS
>Abigail T. Panter, Ph.D.
>Juan I. Sanchez, Ph.D.
>David J. Schretlen, Ph.D.

Panel Members Absent: John W. Creswell Ph.D.

SSA Staff Present:
>Michael Dunn
>Debbie Harkin
>Byron Haskins
>Sylvia E. Karman
>Elizabeth Kennedy
>Sika Koudou
>Mike O'Connor
>Clare Ritterhoff
>Mark Trapani
>Debra Tidwell-Peters, Designated Federal Official

Agenda:

THURSDAY—May 5, 2010
Location: Calvert Ballroom, Ballroom Level

8:30 a.m. to 8:35 a.m.	**Call to Order** **Overview of Today's Agenda** Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *Chair*
8:35 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.	**Collecting Industry and Occupation Data Using the American Community Survey**

Jennifer C. Day, *Assistant Division Chief for Employment Characteristics*
U. S. Census Bureau
U. S. Department of Commerce

Overview of the American Community Survey Sample Design
Steven P. Hefter, *Chief, American Community Survey Sample Design Branch*
U. S. Census Bureau
U. S. Department of Commerce

10:10 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.	**BREAK**
10:30 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.	**Research Subcommittee Report** Allan Hunt, *Subcommittee Chair*
10:45 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.	**User Needs & Relations Subcommittee Report** Janine Holloman, *Co-Subcommittee Chair*
11:00 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.	**Ad Hoc Subcommittee** Deborah Lechner, *Subcommittee Chair*
11:15 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.	**OVRD Presentation—Content Model: Disability Evaluation Constructs Inventory** Sylvia E. Karman, *Director* Occupational Information System Development Project Mark Trapani, *Social Science Research Analyst* Office of Vocational Resources Development
11:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.	**Public Comment**
12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.	**OIDAP DELIBERATION**
1:00 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.	**Administrative Business** • Approval of Minutes—December 2010 • Review of Operating Procedures • Review of Future OIDAP Meeting Dates • Agenda Items—July Public Teleconference
1:15 p.m.	**ADJOURN** Debra Tidwell-Peters, *Designated Federal Officer*

Call to Order:

Debra Tidwell-Peters, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Ms. Tidwell-Peters called the meeting to order at 8:30 am, conducted a roll call, and turned the meeting over to the Panel's Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey.

U. S. Census Bureau--Collecting Industry and Occupation Data in the American Community Survey (ACS)
Jennifer C. Day, Assistant Division Chief for Employment Characteristics, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce

Dr. Day discussed the Census Bureau's process of collecting and coding occupation data obtained from the American Community Survey (ACS), which asks people--rather than businesses, about their work and labor force participation. She said they collect at the same time industry and class of worker information, which shows them more precisely the type of work people perform. The industry and organization (I&O) data, Dr. Day said, is used to formulate government policy and employment programs, for career development and training, to analyze career trends, and to create allocation formulas for many Federal programs.

Dr. Day reported that the I&O data process has four basic steps: data collection, data capture, clerical coding, and edits. She said ACS has three modes of data collection: paper, computer assisted telephone interview (CATI), and computer assisted personal interview (CAPI). For the CAPI, Dr. Day said, they send a field representative to a sample of addresses they could not reach via telephone or mail. She explained that they gather half of the ACS from paper, 10% via telephone, and the remaining 40% via CAPI.

Dr. Day described the ACS layout and said the first question in the I&O series is a class of worker item, which categorizes people according to the type of ownership of the employing organization – private, government, self-employed, or family business/farm. She said the next three questions are used to determine industry, and this is followed by two questions to determine the occupation.

Dr. Day detailed the procedure for how clerks handle the paper forms when they are received at the National Processing Center in Indiana. First, she said, clerks review the form, then scan and save it. Next, she continued, an optical reader records the check boxes, and the clerks manually key in written text from the forms. Then, she said, they merge all of the data into a Data Capture File. At this point, Dr. Day said, a complex coding process begins where coders review the data and determine a person's occupation code, industry code, and class of worker using the Census' unique set of industry and occupation codes. She pointed out that the Census derived its codes from the NAICS, but Census is limited by the quality of the information received from survey respondents. Dr. Day cited as an example, a post-secondary teacher who does not state what subject she teaches. In a situation such as this, she said, Census codes to a broader level than NAICS. She said the Census codes cover the 20 NAICS industry sectors, but at differing levels of classification. Dr. Day said the Census occupation codes are based upon the SOC, covering all 23 major occupation groups, but again, at differing levels of classification.

Overview of the American Community Survey Sample Design
Steven P. Hefter, Chief, American Community Survey, Sample Design Branch, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce

Mr. Hefter explained that the ACS has replaced the Census long-form data. He said, the housing unit address sampling frame is the Master Address File, maintained by the Census, and updated through data from surveys and the Postal Service. This file identified drop points, he said, but not housing units. Mr. Hefter said they select the sample twice a year, in what they call phases and each phase has two stages. The goal of the first stage sample selection is to partition their universe of addresses into five groups, he said, which they rotate over five years. He said this means no address should be eligible for the ACS more than once in the five-year period. He explained that they partition every address in every county into one of five bins, and in the second sampling stage they select independent sub-samples of the first stage sample at the county level. They have a fixed sample size, he said, and their universe of addresses on the frame grows, so they need to recalculate the sampling base rates every year. Mr. Hefter said they have 16 sampling rates that are functions of that base rate and they assign those sampling rates based upon their estimate of occupied housing units at the census tract level and historical response rates.

Dr. Hunt asked how large the average tract is, and Mr. Hefter answered that it is around 2,500 occupied housing units, about 4,000 people. He explained that the ACS is a monthly sample because when they select a sample, they allocate all of the addresses for the year, randomly, to each of the 12 months of the year. Mr. Hefter said they mail out one month, do telephone interviews the next, and select a sample for personal interviews in the third month. Therefore, he said, this means they are doing three data collection modes for three separate panels in every given month.

Mr. Hefter then discussed the sampling for group quarters (GQ), which include correctional institutions, juvenile facilities, nursing homes, long-term care facilities, college dorms, and military. He said they use a two-phase sample where they sample large GQs proportional to size and small GQs based on the unit. Mr. Hefter said they do a similar first-stage sampling of the GQs as they do for housing units, and they sample small GQs only once every five years. But, he said, they sample the large GQs proportional to size. He estimated that they attempt to interview about 200,000 people every year.

Mr. Hardy asked about the cost per interview, and Mr. Hefter responded that it is about $150 to $200. Dr. Schretlen asked how long the interview typically takes, and Mr. Hefter responded about 35 to 40 minutes. Mr. Hardy asked about the standards or requirements for the people doing the interviews. Mr. Hefter responded that they must be U.S. citizens, and they receive special training that lasts several days. He added that they are a permanent workforce in their local area. Dr. Barros-Bailey asked if this permanent workforce would be working on the special runs Census does for other agencies, and Dr. Day replied affirmatively. She said Census has field staff across the US and is willing to contract with other agencies to do surveys.

Dr. Schretlen asked whether it would be possible for an organization to contract with Census to tack on questions or a follow-up survey to the ACS. Mr. Hefter responded that would be a

possibility, and Dr. Day said that the Demographic Surveys Division is the group that does surveys for other areas. She said, the data that the ACS collects is under Title 13, so they can run surveys for other agencies but cannot reveal respondents' identities.

Dr. Hunt asked whether ACS data could help SSA locate a particular occupation. Dr. Day responded that one possible option is a special tabulation on workplace geography by occupation. Mr. Hefter added that the other possibility is to run a survey through Census as a reimbursable survey, with all of the constraints that go with that. Dr. Hefter suggested that the Panel formalize its thoughts and provide some options to Census regarding what data it would like.

Dr. Barros-Bailey asked whether they keep information regarding cost and data quality of each mode of data collection. Mr. Hefter provided some estimates of the various costs, and said they have not conducted much analysis into the differences of data quality between modes.

Research Subcommittee Report
Allan Hunt, Subcommittee Chair

Dr. Hunt reported the Research Subcommittee reorganized in December, and the current members include Shanan Gibson, Abigail Panter, David Schretlen, and himself. The Subcommittee is available to OVRD for one-on-one consultations and has not been meeting on a scheduled basis. He said this seems to be meeting the needs of SSA without burdening the members with unnecessary meetings.

User Needs and Relations Subcommittee Report
Janine Holloman, Subcommittee Co-Chair

Ms. Holloman reported that the subcommittee is comprised of two chairs, herself and Dr. Gibson, and includes members Deborah Lechner, Tom Hardy, and Robert Fraser. She said the Subcommittee held one teleconference call this quarter on March 10, 2011 during which it was agreed to table further meetings until the project team completed their work on the OIS R&D Plan. Ms. Holloman said they reviewed the draft of a newsletter with updated information about the project. She stated that the Subcommittee met on Wednesday, May 3rd, and began exploring the possibility of webinars and other methods of disseminating information. Subcommittee member continue to make presentations to stakeholder organizations, she said, including the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals and the National Association of Disability Representatives.

Job Analyst Subcommittee Report
Deborah Lechner, Subcommittee Chair

Ms. Lechner reported that her subcommittee members have provided feedback on the work by ICF International, who is reviewing job analysis methodologies and the recruitment, training, and certification of job analysts. Ms. Lechner said subcommittee members feel positively about what ICF is producing after receiving preliminary reports.

Content Model and the Disability Evaluation Constructs Inventory
Sylvia E. Karman, Director, OVRD
Mark Trapani, Social Science Research Analyst, OVRD
Elizabeth Kennedy, Social Insurance Specialist, OVRD

Ms. Karman began by reminding the Panel that this is the first activity performed using the OVRD business process. She said SSA defined the content model as a totality of constructs that will form the basis of the new OIS, and it will be a blueprint of the items, scales, and measures included in the work analysis instrument. Ms. Karman said job analysts who travel to sites to interview or observe, or both, will use the instrument to conduct the work analysis, and the data from those work analyses would then populate the OIS.

Ms. Kennedy summarized the various DEC inventories the team developed. She stated one analyst developed the inventories, and two policy experts reviewed them. She said the team reached consensus on any changes made, and staff did not exercise judgment by combining constructs. It was important to realize, Ms. Kennedy said, that they were examining functional and vocational constructs.

Ms. Karman stated that staff is writing a phase four document that will summarize what they encountered developing the DEC and will reveal the next steps. She said OVRD staff would finalize the inventory after senior staff, the Panel, and the workgroup review it.

Dr. Gibson stated she was looking forward to receiving the consolidated inventory of all items identified by source. She expressed some concerns about policy-derived items because many came from the DOT. Dr. Gibson asked about criteria for items removed from the list, especially those removed due to contra-indications with agency policy. Mr. Trapani emphasized that staff applied a strict standard and were conservative in their process. Ms. Karman stated that items that did not make the final compiled inventory can still be found in the inventory from the source that submitted it, and it would show an explanation about why it was excluded from the final list.

Mr. Trapani concluded by saying this work is intended to inform the development of the content model—a work side project.

Public Comment
Lynne Tracy, International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals
Angie Heitzman, International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals

The IARP representatives reported that they conducted a survey of Social Security Vocational Experts and asked them to record claimants' past work information from the cases they worked on over a period of four months. They said IARP analyzed the data and found that 30 percent of cases contained insufficient information given by the claimant to identify the jobs. Preliminary results show they have 5,193 job entries from this data collection, and they are working to compare the survey results to those of the Occupational Medical-Vocational Study. The representatives reported their top 10 jobs are in line with the top 10 jobs from OVRD's study. They found it interesting that their top 10 jobs represent only 19.85 percent of all their jobs, but the OVRD study results showed the top 10 jobs accounted for about 28 percent of all of the jobs.

IARP encouraged SSA to use field analysts, possibly even their contracted vocational experts, to collect data for the OIS due to problems with consistency of data from self-reports. They also would like to see the data released into the public domain. They suggested that vocational counselors could provide information to SSA about sources and locations of jobs. They encouraged SSA to develop a field analyst training manual.

Dr. Schretlen asked whether they would include a cumulative frequency distribution in their findings report and Ms. Tracey replied that they would be glad to do this. Dr. Sanchez asked if they had suggestions for how to deal with potential conflicts of interest if vocational experts are employed in the field as job analysts. Ms. Tracy said they would consider that issue. Dr. Schretlen asked about the differences between IARP's study findings and the OVRD study. AC Balkus reminded the audience that the IARP findings are from the hearing level and the findings OVRD staff presented were from the analysis of claims decided at the initial level, thus different samples.

OIDAP Deliberation

Dr. Barros-Bailey said SSA has indicated it needs help with sampling, field job analyst business process, the work taxonomy, and instruments. She started the deliberation around the issue of sampling. She pointed out that the Panel may want to talk to more people at the Census because it sounds as though there is more than one area within the Census that might be able to assist SSA. She mentioned the County Business Patterns website where you can look up data from the US Census, by county, metro, or zip code. Dr. Hunt pointed out that NAICS codes, or any industry codes, can be broader than they would want. Dr. Hunt said it seems as though the taxonomy is the priority and asked how the Panel can accelerate progress on that. Dr. Gibson said SSA staff is working as fast as possible and the targeted feedback from the Panel has been beneficial.

Dr. Sanchez pointed out that on April 20, the Federal Register had a solicitation for consulting services for the project. He asked whether this is for the lead scientist. Ms. Karman said the

consultant will assist with developing the study design for the work taxonomy and will review various documents for SSA. On the issue of sampling, Dr. Hunt said, SSA needs to make a decision about whether to obtain information from the employer or through a sample of individuals. However, the instrument has implications for the sampling design. Dr. Gibson pointed out that SSA is going to need to sample at several points in the research and development process. She said the methodology used for the initial pilot test might differ from the long-term sampling plan.

Dr. Sanchez suggested the Panel develop a list of strengths and weakness of various data collection methods and speculate on what type of person will make the best analyst.

Dr. Schretlen suggested the Panel should consider the variety of ways SSA could partner with the Census Bureau.

Ms. Lechner suggested a pilot study of sampling approaches should be coupled with the pilot study phase for the instrument.

Mr. Hardy stated he would like to see the Panel work on multiple areas and plan ahead as much as possible.

Dr. Panter said that they should begin outlining various options for sampling.

Administrative Business Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes from the previous meeting as printed. Dr. Barros-Bailey highlighted some changes to the operating procedures and said the Panel would vote on them during the July teleconference meeting. She said the last quarterly public meeting will be on September 20-22 and would most likely be in Baltimore or Washington, DC.

Dr. Barros-Bailey asked the Panel for input regarding agenda items for the July teleconference. She said the operating procedures, the OIS development plan, and the Project Director's report would be agenda items.

Dr. Barros-Bailey said the September meeting would have the Project Director's reports and a report from ICF International. She said the Panel might also invite the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the U.S. Census. Dr. Barros-Bailey said a presentation about SSA's data would be advantageous to the Panel. Dr. Schretlen suggested they discuss strengths and weaknesses of alternate approaches to sampling during the meeting and have further discussion with SSA prior to the meeting about collaboration with other agencies. Dr. Schretlen asked whether the job analysis experts on the Panel could provide information about scaling of job demands and Dr. Sanchez and Ms. Lechner agreed to contribute. Dr. Gibson suggested they talk about the importance of the various types of scales that can be used and why they are valid or not valid in this setting.

Adjourn
Ms. Tidwell-Peters adjourned at 1:15 p.m. (EDT).

Certification:

I, Leola S. Brooks, Designated Federal Officer for the Occupational Development Advisory Panel, hereby certify that the above minutes accurately describe the Quarterly Meeting of the Panel held on May 4-5, 2011, at the Radisson Plaza Lord Baltimore Hotel, 20 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD.

March 8, 2012

_____

Leola S. Brooks
Designated Federal Officer