UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL (OIDAP)

+ + + + +

QUARTERLY MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

+ + + + +

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

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ALSO PRESENT

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

8:32 a.m.

MS. BROOKS: Good morning, everyone. My name is Leola Brooks. I am the Designated Federal Officer for the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel.

Welcome to the Fourth Quarterly Meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel. The meeting is called to order.

I will now turn the meeting over to the Panel Chair Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey.

Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Leola. Good morning, everybody. How is everybody this morning? All right.

Thank you for your attendance at the second day of the Fourth Quarterly Meeting for the OIDAP for Fiscal Year 2011.

The agenda for this meeting can be found on the website if you're following along remotely or telephonically. It is at www.ssa.gov/oidap. On the left tab, you will see meeting information. The very first set of meetings that you will see are the September 21st and 22nd. If you click on the agenda link there, not only can you get to the agenda, but also to the PowerPoints that are hotlinked to the agenda.

The website also has information about past meetings. The same will apply there. If you click on the agenda, you can get to the PowerPoints that were associated with that meeting. You'll find Panel documents and formal correspondence associated with the Panel.

As we indicate at the beginning of each meeting, the charter of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel or the OIDAP is to provide Social Security Administration with independent advice and recommendations for the development of an occupational information system to replace the Dictionary of Occupational Titles in its disability adjudication.

Our task is not to develop the OIS itself. I say that every time, but I know that people continue to mistake the Panel as developing the OIS. We are not developing the OIS. SSA is. Although sometimes we use we in our discussions, we are not developing it.

Therefore, as our name implies, it is to provide advisory recommendations to SSA.

Let's go through today's agenda. You can find that -- the Panel can find the agenda at the beginning of Tab 3 and we are going to have a presentation about SSA's own data. Then we are going to have a presentation following that from Michael Weiler from Census.

We'll take a break and following that, we are going to have a presentation from Pamela Frugoli and also David Rivkin on the DOL/O*NET. We will follow that with the subcommittee reports into this afternoon.

We will go into deliberation, public comment. I understand we have at least one public comment scheduled and then we will go in administrative business and adjourn at 3:00.

So, I will at this time ask Sylvia Karman who is going to provide a presentation on

SSA's own data to lead that off.

Yes, Sylvia.

MS. KARMAN: Good morning, everyone. Presentation is probably a bit larger description of what I'm going to do. I just think I'm going to describe a little bit about what the question was.

At the May Panel meeting in 2011 a few months ago, some of the Panel Members engaged in a conversation about what kind of data set Social Security currently has that may include information that might assist us in identifying employer entities that may be something useful for us to consider in our development of sampling plans.

So, we have embarked on a review of the data sets and, you know, so, at this point, we have approximately 50 data sets that are either Social Security data, data that we received from not only complainants but individuals who pay FICA throughout the nation as well as -- the 50 data sets also include information that Social Security has through interagency agreements where we obtain data from other Federal Agencies.

So, one of the things I thought we were -- so, we were interested really in surveying the landscape of existing data sets. We are not finished. We did manage to pull together some basic information about the data sets.

Types of categories of data that we looked for within the types of data sets for Social Security included employee data. That would be the type of job that the individual may be citing and frequently, it's the person's job title and the location of the work performed.

So, these were the kinds of things that we had in mind when we went to go look for what we would consider to be relevant information within any of these data sets and also, we looked to determine if, in fact, to what extent SSA has any employer-related data and that would be the location of the employer, for example, the industry or occupational codes.

Also, the fields that we searched for

specifically are data source, year of the most recent data so we had a sense of, you know, how frequently the data are updated and what the recency is of the information that we're looking at, the name of the work establishment if we can possibly obtain that, location of the work performed, occupational code I mentioned that earlier, the type of work performed by employees if, in fact, that is at all mentioned, location of the employee or the location of the individual. Their residence. Do we have zip codes? Anything along that line.

So, the manner in which we conducted this review was we went to our Intranet and we also spoke with the officials within Social Security who manage those data sets, who are responsible for those data sets including they also may have responsibility for the interagency agreements that involve a combination of data sets. So, for example, if Social Security and the IRS have a data exchange, we would have been speaking with the individuals who are responsible for that interagency agreement.

In addition, we also took note of any what we would consider red flags associated with those data sets that might be problematic for our development. For example, you know, in the data set, can we be sure, you know, to the extent that the data are input regularly? Just because there's a data field does not mean that it is routinely updated depending on what the source of that data may be. So, you know, that's always something that we want to look for.

Again, I mentioned that we looked at about 50 data sets. Fifty-six percent of them had information of potential use and when I say that, I mean, without our needing to go further which we will, we already identified at least in 56 percent of cases where we could see we had hits in terms of well, there's some information about employer entity or, you know, there's some information that the individual is providing that's included in the data set.

None of them so far had occupational

codes and I don't think that that's surprising because most people -- in fact, I would not have been able to give you my occupational code at this point either.

So, about 6 percent of those fields had industry codes. So, again, you not sure how useful that will be in the end and 14 percent did have employer IDs. I think a lot of that may be coming from perhaps the exchange of information when people pay FICA and individuals pay toward their Social Security benefits. We do have that information.

So, we met Tuesday afternoon with the Sampling Subcommittee to discuss our findings. Our staff had assembled a placemat of a chart. It sort of maps out all of the different data sets that we looked at and also indicating, you know, which data sets that SSA currently has. It might include employer information or employee individual information.

So, at this stage, what we're needing to do is to go into those -- beyond going into those data set actually go back and speak with the individuals in the Social Security who manage the data sets and talk to them about the sort of the employer or employee information to determine whether or not that information would even rise to the level of being something that could assist us.

So, in a large part, some of what we did was an effort to say well, you know, before we go searching the world over for possible ways in which SSA can get at -- you know, find the entities that may, in fact, have occupations of interest to SSA, we probably should check our own data sets first and see if there's anything that SSA has for which there is a legal ability for us to actually use that data and that's another feature.

We had not searched along those lines yet. Obviously before we would move forward with anything that we found, we would have to check to see if, in fact, the interagency agreement between SSA and another agency would permit the use of data for another purpose other than what has already been determined. We didn't want to go at it from that point of view because that might actually take us off track initially.

So, we first want to find out what's there. Then determine if it's even relevant to us. Then we want to look at the legality of it.

So, pretty much that's what I have to report.

I do have some other numbers. So, for those of you who may be interested, well, you know, in how many cases of these 50 data sets we had the sets that had actually employer ID numbers. So, for example, if you worked for a company that was owned by Procter & Gamble, Procter & Gamble may be among the data, you know, that are in the employer ID field. So, that -- just to give you an idea of what kind of level of data may be there. But, we had approximately seven data sets that included that kind of information. It's about 14 percent.

Employer location not surprisingly is around the same amount. It's like about eight of our data sets included that as well as the employer location. That's telling me that I'm suppose to be speaking to you right now. And yes, and so that was about 16 percent.

Industry code, which actually could be very helpful to us, I know we've spoken many times with Pam Frugoli about the use of industry in combination with other information to help us target, but only in three data sets do we have that. It's only 6 percent. But, again, if the data are useful and they cover a wide range, the fact that we only have it in one data set is still good. So, you know, the fact that it's only reflected in a few of our data sets is really not that significant.

Also, when it comes to occupational code, as I said earlier, we only had -- we had none. Zero. And I think again this gets at the issue of what happens when information comes into Social Security.

For example, a person files for disability. If the claim cannot be decided, it's step three. We then need to use the person's vocational history, their vocational information what they are able to give us and then our adjudicators will, in fact, code that information along the lines of what is currently reflected in the DOT. So, it is not surprising to me that currently the raw data that the agency has would not include that.

We did have some data sets, frankly, 22 percent, that actually showed the type of work performed and again without knowing more specifically what the source of that data is, that may or may not be useful.

I think about my own information that I put on my 1040 every year. You know, how I describe what I do. So, when I think about that, I'm not sure that that would be all that helpful and again, we also obviously do have a number of data sets that do show obviously the residence of the individual and the location of the employer.

So, we do have more work to do to determine the extent to which any of this information may be specific enough for our needs and so, that's where I'm -- where we are at the moment. I'm sure that the next time we are meeting, we'll be in a better position to talk more specifically about what we've found

Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Sylvia. Allan, did you have anything you wanted to say about this?

MEMBER HUNT: I think that's a good job.

I would say I at least was a little disappointed in the review of SSA data. I had hoped that it would be a little deeper particularly on the occupation side because the key to this is going to be occupation by industry and then location.

The other thing that you alluded to let me just make a little clearer. There is a problem with Proctor & Gamble example. There's no consistency in the type of coding that's done for employer. So, is it the establishment which means the local entity or is it the firm which might mean a national or international entity?

And that's a familiar problem for those who work with these kind of data and we have it in spades in the Social Security data.

I'll also just second the problem of the type of work performed may or may not be of any value. So, we'll see.

The last thing that I would say is that in terms of our visits to Census and BLS earlier, we did discover that there may be some interest in exchanging data at some level at some point and so, this also -- this review also gives us a firmer grip on what is it the SSA has that we might exchange for something that some other agency has whether it's currently an interagency agreement or not.

So, there's hope.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, Pam.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I just want to say I think this was a good first phase. You know, because you needed to look at everything and there were quite a few different sources. So, then I think it gives you a starting point to then hone in on the ones that look like they might have some promise to look into further. So, I think it's a good start.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Dave.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Sylvia, you probably said this and I missed it, but across these various data sets, what are the sample sizes? Are they the samples of all people with Social Security numbers? Are they people who are in the workforce who are, you know, and those not or just I'm not sure how evenly distributed across all these data sets the sample size is.

MS. KARMAN: That's an excellent question. In fact, I was noticing when I looked at some of the data sets, so, let me give you an example and I'm going to have to take my glasses off to read this, but so, we have 1 percent in one of the files under the continuous work history sample. For those of you who are familiar with it, it's the CWHS files. It's a 1 percent sample from 1937 to date and, you know, so -- and that would be of all individuals who were paying into FICA and then some of them are, you know, like the Disability 832 Master File. So, that would be only individuals who filed an initial claim.

So, you know, I think there are a wide variety of -- range rather of sample coverage. So, coverage of the different individuals and then also the size of the sample.

So, I think part of what we should do when we report this out is include the context for that. So, you know, to have the sense of all right what does this particular file cover? Is it the entire nation? All adults who are working or is it all people who have Social Security numbers? Which, of course, means that if, you know, people are providing -- getting Social Security numbers for their infants, clearly, they're not going to have, you know, work information. But, those data fields would be blank and so, then that contributes to a portion of the data being "missing."

So, I think it would be helpful for us if, you know, to the extent that we find that any of these data sets have anything useful first, you know, that we -- once we've identified let's say there is one or more data set here that actually does contain information that would be of value to this investigation for sampling, then we would want to also show, you know, in addition to the fact that we found that it has data fields that deliver something that could be of value to us. Then we also want to say oh, you know, by the way, here's what it covers. This is the universe that we're talking about in this data set and this is a sample size.

So, I think it's a very good point. Thank you, David.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any other questions? All right. Thank you, Sylvia and Allan. Okay.

At this point in the agenda, we are going to welcome Mike Weiler.

The PowerPoint and also his bio are

behind the first red tab in Tab 3 in our folders.

Mr. Weiler is the Assistant Division Chief for Survey Division at the U.S. Census Bureau. He has worked for Census for 36 years in the areas survey and census field data collection operations. He has been in the current position for five years and one of the things that was of a lot of interest when we met in May and had other individuals from the Census presenting to us was this topic of the field representatives and so, welcome. Thank you.

MR. WEILER: Thank you. I'd like to thank Leola Brooks and the Panel for the invitation today and the opportunity to talk a little bit about the survey data collection work that the Census Bureau does.

Obviously, most people know us very, very well and I hope everybody actually knows us very, very well from our Decennial head count that we take in the years ending in zero. Our most recent head count was in 2010 when we enumerated just over 308/almost 309 million Americans in about 130 million housing units. Certainly, a very, very large, large task and it is clearly one of the, if not the, largest peacetime mobilizations that the Federal Government does.

The Census Bureau in terms of who we are, right now, we're an organization of about 18,000. During the Census, we balloon to much, much larger. We are a little bit larger than we normally are largely because we are conducting a very significant size survey for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We usually have a staff of about 6,000 field representatives working across the country. They work out of their homes. They do virtually all of our household demographic data collection. That workforce now is about 9400 to accommodate and to conduct this Housing Survey.

In our headquarters, we're located in Suitland, Maryland, we have about 4500 people, but actually, most of our organization is as you would say located outside of the Beltway.

We have currently now 12 permanent

regional offices. They have about 600 staff. Most of those people are the survey statisticians who actually manage this workforce of 6,000. We are in the process of over the next 18 months reducing that from 12 regional offices to six regional offices to do some major cost reduction and make ourselves more cost competitive.

We also have a national processing center located in Jeffersonville, Indiana and there are three telephone centers.

In terms of what we do, as I said, most people when they find that I work for the Census Bureau, you know, they ask me what do we do the other nine years when we're not taking the census? In fact, I tell people -- my response to that is if I had a nickel for every time a person asked me that, I would not be here today. I would be wealthy and retired.

But, in fact, what we do is we do a large number -- we are actually the fact find for the nation. Most of the survey data collection that we do in the household demographic area, we actually do for other Federal agencies. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Center for Health Statistics, the National Center for Education Statistics are some of the examples of organizations that sponsor surveys that we actually conduct data collection for them.

We also every five years conduct the economic census and the Census of Government and those are based on the years two and seven. So, we are in the process of preparing for the next round of economic and Census of Governments and in support of those, we do a large number of surveys. Most of them are actually mail out/mail back or now moving into the Internet with businesses as our economic surveys and surveys of Government.

When we look at the subject matter of the data that we do household demographic surveys for, it very much reads like the news that you hear each and every evening. The topics include income, employment and unemployment. The unemployment rate that you heard at the beginning of August at 9.1 percent announced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Census Bureau actually collects the data for the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the calculation of that figure and we've been doing this survey for more than 60 years.

We do surveys on health, education, consumer expenditures. The Consumer Expenditures Survey that we do is a quarterly survey and a diary survey. Feeds into the Consumer Price Index. It's another one of the surveys that we do for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

There's the very large Housing Survey that we're doing now that we do every other year for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

For the Bureau of Justice Statistics, we do a major Crime Victimization Survey and I think many of you probably heard our announcement back on the 13th of September where we announced for the calendar year 2010 information about income, poverty and insurance coverage and that actually comes from a part of the data collection that we do for one of the surveys that we conduct for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In fact, it's the survey from which the unemployment rate is done. Over three months, we do an annual and social economic supplement that enables us to provide these data to the nation.

In terms of the field staff that do the data collection, this is one of the questions that was posed to me and I was told that the Panel wanted to get a good sense of that field staff and we're very proud to talk about them. As I said, right now, there's about 9400 of them. Typically, our field force is about 6,000.

In terms of their major characteristics, they do work out of their homes. Because of the nature of our surveys, we have this 6,000 or right now 9400 field staff literally located across the country. In almost each and every county across the country, we have field staff located because our data collection, our major emphasis in terms of data collection, is to get someone local to do that data collection for us.

They are all Census Bureau employees, but in terms of their schedule, it's very much a part-time, part-time schedule. They typically only work about 60 hours a month. They usually work on two or three surveys simultaneously and from that perspective, when you look at data collection organizations whether in the private sector, in academia or nonprofits, our approach is very, very much different in that we have our labor force working on many surveys simultaneously.

In terms, as I said, they have part-time, part-time schedule working out of their homes.

In terms of the backgrounds that they come from, they come from a wide variety of backgrounds. We have very, very minimal requirements in terms of becoming a Census Bureau Field Representative. Basically, what we're looking for is someone who likes people. Someone who can go up and knock on a stranger's door and convince them to participate in a Government survey of vital importance.

It's a person that's usually drawn to challenges. Someone who's persistent, doesn't take no for an answer. We are very, very proud of the response rates that we are able to attain largely through the persistence of the field staff and also making sure that they are aware of the importance in which -- of which the data that they're collecting is.

We are looking for self-starters and very, very importantly, someone who knows the area. Someone who knows how to approach people within the community.

As far as their schedule, I said part-time, part-time and it's really -- since we are trying to contact people, either by phone or in person, we usually find their most busy times are evenings and weekends.

As far as our number of contacts per year, the 12 to 15 surveys that we're conducting, we are usually contacting on the order of 2.1 million households or housing units a year to conduct our surveys. Since our field staff worked in the community, work from home, they accumulate about 45 million miles of driving during the course of the year.

As far as how we go about identifying candidates, we're at a very, very fortunate period of time right now as we come out of a Decennial Census where a little over a year ago we had almost three-quarters of a million people working across the country doing this type of work. Right now, in terms of our recruiting pool, we are going back to people who worked on the census and asking them are they interested in continuing the door-to-door type of work that they did.

There's a big difference obviously in terms of the census. The census is a very, very streamlined data collection operation. It was ten questions. It took only about ten minutes.

The surveys that we conduct are much more intensive in terms of the data collection.

They involve a lot more technical concepts and the survey interviews can last anywhere from 20 minutes to several hours based on the type of data that we're collecting.

We have them go through a three-part test. It's just basic skills test. But, we give them two portions of the -- this test that we want to qualify them on where they have an opportunity to actually go through and present a mock interview and go through a scenario that would be somewhat similar to what they would be actually doing on the job.

We will then get a pool of applicants that we make a contingent offer from and then it really becomes intense in terms of doing background checks and criminal history checks that people have to pay us before they are hired and then there's a great deal of paperwork.

I have listed just one form. It is the I-9 and I just wanted to cite that as an example. It's the Employment Eligibility Verification Form that we use through the Federal Government where people have to bring quite a bit of background or actually identification information with them.

At the bottom of this slide, when people become Census Bureau employees, probably the most important first step that they take is they take the Oath of Confidentiality that we all take.

The data that we collect for almost all of our household demographic surveys and then also as it expands out to out censuses and other surveys is typically covered under Title 13 of the United States Code.

And the Census Bureau guarantees that individual information that we gather through censuses and surveys that are authorized under Title 13 we will not disclose individual information in any form, in any fashion whether it be in publications or data tabulations or in any other way.

This Oath of Confidentiality is critical because one of the ways in which -- or one of the most important ways in which we are successful is the fact that we do recognize, we do value, we do understand the need for public trust in terms of gathering information and we do understand -- when we tell people that we will not disclose their information, we do take that very seriously and the real bottom line for all of us working at the Census Bureau is that there are very strict penalties for divulging information.

If I was to divulge information, I would -- I better have $250,000 because that's the fine and five years to spare because that would be the jail sentence.

When we identify people, as I said we have people really coming from all walks, all background and for most people, unless they have worked in a Decennial Census or perhaps have worked doing this type of work with other organizations, going out and doing survey work, knocking on doors, is something that we really have to train them from the very beginning on and what we do is where we really start is before they come to classroom training that we provide on the survey that we have selected them for we send them a great deal of materials for them to prepare with. It's background materials in terms of describing their job.

We send them a laptop computer. All of our surveys that we are conducting now are gathered using a laptop computer and we also send them survey specific information. Then they will come to the classroom training and we will continue and give them administrative training and survey procedure training.

Once they complete the training, we know that they are beginning to feel comfortable doing the work in a classroom environment and what we have to do is now really help them translate what they've learned in the classroom to actually doing the work on the street, in the field and this is how we translate that classroom learning into actual field work and we spend the first day or two with them where we have a survey supervisor or a senior field representative actually work with them to do the first several interviews that they are responsible for.

Training doesn't stop with the initial training as they start out on a survey. For all of our surveys, there are periodic refresher training sessions where we get them together either in a classroom setting or we will provide them with extensive materials to read through and extensive exercises to prepare them for. The future of the survey that they're working on.

As far as the training, the training also we have to make sure that they are well versed in the use of their laptop because that is their key tool and since they are really working in a true field environment, we don't overlook. We don't ever underestimate the importance of their personal safety and their personal security. We recognize that the most important thing about all of our employees, but particularly the people that we have working in the field is yes, they do a very, very important job for us and we have high expectations of them. But, we also recognize that the number one priority for us is their safety and security.

We also recognize that in terms of a large part of their job, a large part of their job is not just knocking on doors being a data collector, but being a driver. So, we do include a lot of training on vehicular safety. When you've got a group of people driving 45 million miles a year, you want to make sure that they're staying safe particularly when they're behind the wheel.

Probably the most important training that they get and the training that they're probably most anxious about is part of the training that takes probably the smallest amount of time in terms of their actual job and that is how we train and prepare them to actually sell the survey that they're working on.

We make sure that they well understand what the survey is about, how the survey is used in terms of the results, who uses the results, who the survey is being conducted for as well as, you know, some of the legal authorities and the other background. Because we recognize that really an incredibly important key to their success and to our success is really the first seven seconds in which they make contact with the household either on the doorstep or actually through the telephone.

Usually, the last thing that someone is expecting especially in a year other than zero is to hear from the Census Bureau and, you know, people are immediately and understandably cautious and what we need to do is very quickly convey to them why we're contacting them, the importance of the data that we're collecting, how the data are used and who the data impact and who the data provide benefit for.

It's really to answer a key question for that respondent. What's in it for them?

As I said, one of the most important things in terms of our ability to be successful is our pledge of confidentiality. Where we really make sure that people understand when they are providing an important service to the nation in participating in one of our surveys that we understand and we will keep their data safe and confidential. We will not share their individual data. We only share data or provide data in the form of tables, in the form of statistics.

We also understand and have long understood, but are continually updating ourselves on the need to respect and really to convey to people that we also understand privacy. That is also a very, very important thing.

Another way in which we announce ourselves is not just showing up on the doorstep or being on the other end of the telephone, but always in advance of some household being contacted, we will send a letter in advance that describes the survey, describes the purpose of the survey, describes our uses of the data, describes how we're going to be protecting the data.

First and foremost, the first impression is incredibly important and as I've said, the first critical seconds make a lot of the difference.

As far as quality control and quality

assurance, I apologize for the typo on the title. When I was doing this, it was late in the evening and I apologize.

But, I really wanted to convey to you that as far as the data that we collect, we set very high standards for ourselves. We know that since we are doing most of our survey data collection for someone else, we have customers that we have to satisfy. Customers that come to us with high expectations that are usually generating numbers of national important, national impact. So, we have to make sure that we're providing them our very best and one of the most important ways to make sure that you're survey data usually are as best as they can be is to get a high level of participation, a high level of response.

We also go through and make sure that our field staff stay current with the techniques, with the tools, with the requirements of their job by periodically going out and actually observing them do the work in the field and then we also do a reinterview to make sure that we are deterring falsification and making sure that our content, our critical content is being well gathered.

As far as data quality, over the last couple of years and largely through the influence and direction from our current director Dr. Robert Groves, we are really starting to engage more in terms of monitoring the work that we do and the quality through the actual survey process data. Using the process data to supplement operational information, to really make sure that from a quality standpoint, from an operational standpoint, we're doing well.

And in terms of the paradata, the types of things that we look at that are really, really essential are the pace of the interview. Sometimes going fast, sometimes going too slow can really adversely influence the amount of data that we collect and adversely influence the respondent.

We also make sure that in terms of the data that we're collecting we look very closely and we drill down particularly to critical items to make sure that we are getting full answers, complete answers and in terms of the timing of the first contact and the interview, we also know that that can have a large impact on the quality of the data and the operational efficiency in which we're doing our work.

We are always looking for performance outliers and trying to identify trends and patterns so that we can very, very quickly address if we have field representatives who we need to resharpen their skills.

The one thing about this use of survey process data or what we call paradata, we know that it's extremely important to make sure that it works in harmony with the survey goals and that the survey goals and the goals that the -- the requirements that we get from our survey sponsors that our use of paradata works in harmony with them, but it also works in harmony with our operational information.

Survey paradata, survey process data

allows us to really do some beneficial response management. We need to make sure that it's the kind of thing that's easy to understand, easy to use. That we don't paralyze ourselves with paradata.

And that most importantly, we explain to our field staff. They understand from an operational standpoint what we expect of them in terms of response rate, in terms of productivity, but we also want to make sure that they are understanding as we are really drilling down into the data that they collect and providing them with feedback, what this feedback means and how we can really continue to motivate them to collect data and would be continuing to move in the right direction.

In terms of the monitoring of data quality and cost and productivity, I've talked a little bit about the survey process data, but we also do a lot of work on a daily basis in terms of gathering information from an operational standpoint.

One of the many, many benefits that the use of a laptop brings us is that survey work that is completed in a day is transmitted to us at the end of the day so that we can very, very quickly start to gather operational information in terms of how much of the survey work is completed, how many cases are completed. We can also gather from gathering daily payroll information key productivity figures and making sure that our efficiency is working well, but most importantly, that we are staying within budget.

We are able to very quickly be able to generate things like hours per case, miles per case and that is through -- just through the daily submission of payroll. It sounds like an easy task and it generally is, but it can very much yield a lot of very, very important information in terms of keeping a survey on target.

We also make sure that we are providing daily support in terms of procedures and technical requirements to our field staff.

There's a lot of feedback going back

and forth in terms of response rates, timing, cost expectations. A lot of daily monitoring.

As far as the field assignments that we provide to our field representatives for each of the surveys that we have them working on, we always are starting and making sure that we're trying to keep them as compact geographically as we can. Really to do our very best to keep them as close to home as possible so that they are familiar with the area, familiar with the population, but also that they're not spending a lot of time and, therefore, a lot of money driving or spending time traveling getting to the work that they have to do. We want to make sure that they're really spending as much time in terms of productivity doing the interviewing work that we want to have them do.

We want to make sure that the assignment sizes are achievable. They vary from survey to survey. The surveys that have typically the longer interviews typically have a smaller number of cases that we assign. So, we can make sure that the field representative can complete the work within the assigned period.

For most of the surveys that we do, the data collection period is a month. So, we will provide at the end of the month work for the upcoming month as well as instructions and guidance and then monitor the work throughout the course of the month.

Another huge advantage that the use of laptops has brought us it the opportunity that if we need to reassign work, if a field representative is having difficulty either making contact or convincing a household or a particular individual to participate in one of our surveys, we can reassign the work and have another person, perhaps a person who has a little bit more experience, a little bit more background on the survey, a little bit better track record in terms of influencing people have that person do the work or it will go to one of our senior field representatives.

There are a number of things in terms

of the steps in the data collection process just to touch very, very quickly on. You know, first and foremost, we are always making sure that when someone is, an organization, another Federal agency is approaching us that we have a good understanding of the data that they need, the information that they need.

Most of the surveys that we do have quite a long history that we have been working with the Federal agency. As I mentioned earlier, our current Population Survey, the survey from which the unemployment figure is generated, we've been doing that for 60 years. We have one of our health surveys, the Health Interview Survey that we do for the National Center for Health Statistics. We've been doing that for well over 50 years. Our Consumer Expenditure Survey for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we've been doing for 30 years. For our Crime Victimization Survey, we have been doing that since the early '70s.

But, we're always making sure because we recognize and certainly the sponsor, the

Federal agency, is making sure that we're staying up-to-date with the very dynamic environment of data requirements and making sure that we are well in tune with their needs.

We will usually then make sure that we are selecting a proper data collection methodology and approach. Most of our Household Demographic Surveys are done either by phone or by personal visit. A sampling frame is developed. A data collection instrument is developed and that is a very collaborative effort going back and forth with the agency sponsoring. Making sure that we get their data needs down.

We test the questions. We develop training. Develop our data processing and tabulation processes. Make sure that we are from the beginning building in quality control, quality assurance and then we actually start and establish the operational standards and make sure that we have an administrative support system.

If there's one thing that we've learned over the years in terms of doing and preparing for and keeping surveys up-to-date, is that we always have to test everything and make sure that we're well prepared and that we well understand and that they work according to what the requirements are.

I'd like to spend the next minute or so talking about the changes or the challenges that are faced in terms of doing data collection.

Much of the work that our field representatives do is really focusing on and making sure that they are well prepared to successfully engage and get the participation and cooperation from the public. As we know and probably as most of you would expect, a contact, as I said earlier, by the Census Bureau outside of the Decennial Census is not something that the people are expecting and, you know, certainly we know that over the last couple of years in particular, there have been growing concerns in terms of confidentiality, privacy and identity thief and we really need to make sure that we can very, very successfully and very convincingly address those things. There's a very, very reluctance to provide personal information especially with the Government.

The mobility and movement of our population is a challenge. Several of our surveys are person-based surveys as opposed to being address-based surveys. So, we will follow a person through the course of the survey period which can be several years and if they move, we need to find them.

People have very, very busy schedules and that's why our part-time part-time field staff spend most of their working hours as evening hours and weekend hours.

It may seem counter-intuitive what I'm about to say, but really our most productive day is Sunday and the reason for that is that when we think about people most of us on Sundays where we do have obligations and things that we need to do, we usually don't have the tight schedule of the work week and if we have something that pops up, we can usually adjust that schedule. So, that -- we really try to, you know, take advantage of the weekend hours when we're finding people have the opportunity to take a little bit of time to spend with us in terms of conducting an interview.

Another thing in terms of Sundays, as we are training our new field representatives, we say work on the weekends because it does give a slight advantage to our field staff because there usually is a little bit of a shock factor in it. Not a huge shock factor, but here's somebody from the Government coming to my door on the weekend. This must be important.

Since we do a lot of our surveys by phone, the great explosion of the use of cell phones really clearly is a challenge to try to be able to contact people. Cell phone and telephone technology also form a bit of a challenge in that with things like caller ID people know who is calling them or they don't know who is calling them and they make some choices in terms of screening incoming calls.

There are physical barriers more and more to being able to contact a household or contact an individual. Things like gated communities and security buildings.

Another barrier is certainly our diverse population and the number of languages spoken in the household. That forms a challenge that we have to be prepared to meet.

As households become more complex and housing units are more complex, to be making contact and doing surveys and really making sure that we are doing a full and thorough job in enumerating all of the necessary members of the household is more and more of a challenge with a complex household.

And then as I said, where the data that we are collecting are hugely important and being able to drill down and have more detailed characteristics and really combine characteristics is hugely valuable to the organizations, the agencies that sponsor our surveys and to inform the nation and the public.

The only way you can usually get that information is through a long complex interview and people are not always willing or able to spend several hours with someone to do an interview and in many, many cases, it's not a single interview that we conduct in terms of a particular survey.

Our Consumer Expenditure Survey, we do five interviews over the course of 15 months to gather the information that the BLS uses for pricing. For our Current Population Survey, we actually do eight interviews over a two-year period so that we can do and provide data month-to-month comparisons, year-to-year comparisons. Our Survey of Income and Program Participation, we actually cover several years where we're interviewing people on every four-month period. This obviously provides a great wealth of information, but from the respondent's standpoint, we really have to make sure that they understand and we can convince them to continue to participate.

In terms of actually doing this work, sustaining rates is extremely important. That's one of the things that we pride ourselves for.

That's one of the things that differentiates the Census Bureau from other survey data collectors.

But, we also know that not only in the most immediate environment, but over the course of the years, we need to be cost competitive and that's one of the reasons why we are taking the very bold move of reducing the number of our regional offices from 12 to six.

Improving measurement and monitoring the survey from an operational standpoint, financial standpoint, time standpoint. Making sure that we're providing information on time at the quality levels in the cost that the sponsors have provided us are very, very important and then making sure that, you know, the data quality is of the highest quality through a more expanded use of paradata.

Keeping people is very, very important. To train a field representative is several thousands of dollars, but it's not just so much of the cost. But, making sure that we can continue to do our work in a timely fashion.

And since we're really working in the field, we have to be able to react and respond to weather and natural disasters.

I hope this gives a little bit of background on the work that the Census Bureau does in terms of our survey data collection, gives a little bit of background in terms of who we are, what we do, the type of work that we do.

I'd be very, very happy to respond to any questions.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay, Shanan.

Thank you before I turn it over to Shanan. This has been very, very helpful. There's a lot of interest in this area. So, thank you for your excellent presentation.

Shanan.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: First, thank you for -- it was highly informative for me and now, I might even be nicer to the people when they call and answer their questions since I've gone through all this.

I actually have several questions and

I'm going to try to string them into a coherent whole so I can sneak them all in and you won't have to come back to me.

Obviously, the maintenance of this large field staff is central to your -- to the accomplishment of your mission as an agency. Your job is to collect data and that also explains why many agencies for whom this is not central to their mission contract out to you.

So, my first question is can you speak to an estimate even of the size of the resource requirements for your agency to manage this part, the field rep part of your workforce, the cost of selecting, training the overall management and oversight of this group?

Because you've described and it's a very extensive process. So, how big of an expense is it to keep 9,000 field reps out there? Basically is what I'm looking for.

And now just resource expense in terms of dollars and cents, but also number of staff within your agency required to select, train and oversee the 6,000 to 9,000 group of individuals?

Also, since it's evident that this isn't the central mission for many organizations and, therefore, they do subcontract out to you, you've said that it's a very collaborative process between you and the sponsoring agency to develop the survey or the instrument itself. Can you talk to what degree other agencies may have actually also been collaborative or have played a major role in the selection of the training design for said survey once they helped you develop it and maybe have you ever had another agency who played an active role in also selecting which individuals actually become the administers of their survey?

You said you begin with your Census people and work from there. But, if you had an agency who said we want to not only help develop the survey, we want to have a say so in the training and we want to have a say so in you hire, you know, how would that work or could that work?

And then my third and I promise final question at least for the moment is you said it cost several thousands of dollars to train an employee. I was just going to ask you could you give me a real good estimate, you know, on average to do the pretraining, the on-site training and then the oversight training? Are we talking $3,000 an employee? Eight thousand dollars per?

MR. WEILER: I'll start with the first question last. It typically costs $7,000 on average, but that is very, very much a ballpark and the reason why it is very, very much of a ballpark is that the amount of training particularly in the classroom varies survey to survey. For some of our surveys, it only requires three days of classroom training. For others of our surveys, it's five days of classroom training. So, that's a very, very big driver.

But, to respond to your question, about $7,000 to do the initial training, both the work that the individual does at home and then their work as they come to the classroom and that also includes the first day or two of translating the experience from the classroom to the field. What we call our initial field observation.

As far as giving you a dollar figure or even trying to estimate a dollar figure for the management, the oversight, the direction, I really off the top of my head really couldn't do that in that we very much segment all of our costs by the survey that we do.

But, let me try to respond to the question more from the numbers of people. As I said, we've got about 6,000 field representatives. Of that 6,000, about 10 percent of those are senior field representatives and these individuals really provide a lot of the technical support, a lot of team leadership, a lot of the on-the-ground support for our field representatives. They are not their supervisors although that's going to change in our new alignment.

So, kind of working up our organization from our large foundation, we have these 600 field representatives in the regional offices. As I said, we have about 600 people in our 12 regional offices and about half of those are our survey statisticians that actually monitor and measure and lead and direct an individual survey.

For the most part, our survey statisticians in our regional offices are assigned one particular survey for the geography of that region. The geographics are widely differing. We try to do our best in terms of distributing the workloads.

The workloads do vary by survey. To give you an example, our current Population Survey for the unemployment rate we do 66,000 interviews in about a 10-day period. For the survey of Income and Program Participation, it's about 11,000 interviews nationwide. So, you know, the amount of work is variable, largely determined by the sample size.

But, we usually are having a single professional statistician in our regional office do all of the measuring, monitoring, the direct supervision. So, there are several hundred of those.

As far as our headquarters, the area in

which I work our responsibility is to provide the support to the regional offices. We have about 40 people and we work across the organization with the different divisions that interact with our external sponsors.

I'm sorry I can't be more specific in terms of dollars, but just to kind of in a very, very high level in terms of our reimbursable work, the surveys that we do for other agencies on an annual basis, that is about $250 million worth of work.

As far as the development of instruments and the development of training, we do work very collaboratively with the particular sponsor. In most cases, the wording of the questions that go into the data collection instrument come directly from the sponsoring agency.

The National Center for Health Statistics develops the questions that we ask on the Health Interview Survey. The Bureau of Labor Statistics develops the questions that we ask on our Current Population Survey Employment and Unemployment. The Consumer Expenditure Survey, the Bureau of Justice Statistics develops the questions and in many cases, they actually do the testing, the cognitive testing of those questions. Now, the National Center for Health Statistics has as part of their organization a questionnaire research lab.

We will do question testing more from an operational and a feasibility standpoint and more to really be able to get a sense of what the productivity standards we should be using.

As far as the training, we at the Census Bureau usually develop all of the training, but the training is usually reviewed by the sponsor before we deliver it. We're in the process of preparing for two groups of centralized training for the surveys that we're doing for the National Center for Health Statistics and as we're developing those training packages, we're providing them to the National Center for Health Statistics to review before we administer them.

As far as the skills and the requirements, for the most part, the data collection requirements that we get from our sponsors really do not call for any degree of specialized skills and so, our recruiting from the general population, our selecting from the general population works well.

You know, certainly, as I said, we do take advantage of people who have worked on our Decennial Census during these years as our primary source, but in many, many cases, since there aren't any particular knowledge, skills or ability sets that the sponsor is looking for, there really is, you know, really no passing a requirements from them to us in terms of, you know, looking for particular capabilities.

We really don't have the situation where the sponsors, you know, tell us this is who they want us to hire. You know, I think they recognize, they trust our ability to do that. We are also very much banking on the very long-term relationship that we've had with them.

They are always welcome -- as long as they take the Oath of Confidentiality and are up-to-date with our data stewardship training, they are always welcome to participate in the training that we give, to observe the training that we give and we do encourage them to go out with field representatives so they can actually see how their surveys are being conducted in the field.

We recognize as our key customers to make sure that we are fulfilling all of their requirements. We want to make sure that they are as much as possible part of the process.

But, we really don't find that -- you know, I think that they quite candidly recognize that in terms of processing the data, analyzing the data, making sure that the data fulfill their needs, they have quite a huge amount on their plate and they're only too willing to come to the Census Bureau and say handle these parts for us.

Does that answer your questions? Very good questions. Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. We

have Tom. We have Dave and I think Allan. Are you? And then Janine.

MEMBER HARDY: Kind of a geography question. You said that you have representatives in almost every county in the country. I'm kind of curious if you could give us a percent of how much of the continental, Alaska, Hawaii -- how much of the country you have someone and the percentage and then you said you had regional offices, how many, how are they dispersed and how did you choose to disperse them? And that's where the classroom training takes place. Correct?

MR. WEILER: In terms of the coverage, probably with the exceptions of some of the very, very remote areas, in every county, we have at least one field representative.

With our American Community Survey which is the survey that we do where we've taken the long form census and have spun that into an annual survey, we do have the need for have this wall-to-wall coverage. For the American Community Survey, we also include Puerto Rico.

So, really with the exception of some remote areas, although we have the capability of getting to those remote areas, we really do have people literally in every county and obviously, the concentration -- because the samples are usually more heavily concentrated in urban and suburban areas, we have larger numbers of field representatives and the geography that they cover is on a much finer level and smaller level of a particular county.

As far as our regional offices, we have 12 regional offices. Our regional office network is a network that is more than 50 years old. The last time we had any changes in the location of one of our 12 regional offices, and I'll go through that in a moment, was in the early 1970s where we took a regional office that we had in St. Paul, Minnesota and moved it to Kansas City.

But, our 12 regional offices are located in Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, New York and Seattle.

The geography that they cover widely varies and I'd like to use two examples that are extremes.

Our New York regional office basically covers the five boroughs of New York City, the surrounding counties in New York State to New York city and some of the counties in the northern part of the State of New Jersey. I think it's on the order of 300 and some square miles.

Our Denver regional office covers ten states that literally border -- that literally span from the Canadian border to the Mexican border.

We have an interesting tug of war if you will geographically between a couple of our offices. Our Denver regional office is very proud to say they cover ten states, but our folks in Seattle will come back and quickly say where they only cover a few western states, the one western state that they have is Alaska and hands down, they cover the largest geographic area.

Our Los Angeles regional office covers

the southern portion of California, actually our Seattle office has the northern portion of California, and the State of Hawaii.

But, what we're always trying to do is really try to balance the workload and that largely drive the geography and what we have to do is we have to balance workload not just from a survey standpoint because these 12 regional offices really form the nucleus for our survey data collection, but then they also form the nucleus for our Decennial data collection where we actually expand our organization to open a regional census center and have a network of more than 500 offices.

We are going to be compressing that down to six regional offices.

In terms of the training, a good part of the training is conducted in our regional offices, but not all of the training and, you know, in our regional offices that have -- the Denver regional office, we will frequently do our initial training and our refresher training.

Going out and gather people together. Certainly, in Seattle and Los Angeles, usually if they have training in Hawaii or Alaska, send the trainer there.

So, in some very real sense, we have field representatives who work for our regional office and on average, they work about five years, but it's not at all rare for field representatives to work 10/15 years. Our senior field representatives, many of them work as many as 30 years and in some cases, they never go to the regional office that they work for because we're always going out to them to provide the training.

But, in terms of the trainer, it is usually the survey supervisor or the survey supervisor's supervisor, one of our coordinators and in many cases, they are assisted by senior field representatives.

Thank you.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Thank you for a wonderful presentation and just as an aside, I wanted to comment that we previously heard from some of your colleagues on the ACS -- who conduct the ACS and I remember being equally impressed by that presentation. I just think that the Census Bureau does this with such scientific rigor and methodologic sophistication. It's very impressive the work you do.

The question that I have is whether or not there's any precedent in the history of the Census Bureau for a partnership with another Federal organization that might be suitable for what Social Security is faced with doing here.

But, ultimately, Social Security is going to need to go out to see citizens at the places of their employment to talk with their supervisors and observe them on the job and so forth and I'm wondering has the Census Bureau ever partnered with an organization in which the Census Bureau ascertains a sample, conducts an initial survey, initial interview and then as part of that asks the respondents whether or not they would give permission to be contacted by another agency who would then follow up with further contact, further interview or observation.

MR. WEILER: For the most part, no and the reason for that is our Title 13 confidentiality requirements.

We select the samples and we are working with -- usually our primary base to select the samples come from the nationwide master address file that we've developed and that's covered under Title 13.

But, that doesn't mean that it's an impossibility. We do have -- our Health Interview Survey is probably the primary example. This is a survey that we don't collect under Title 13. It has some additional requirements and, therefore, additional expenses.

The work that we have to do in terms of the development of the sample, we have to actually do a separate field listing to develop the sampling frame. We can't take advantage of our Title 13 covered sample frame, our master address file. But, with our Health Interview Survey, we do do the listing and what that does is that enables us to provide the full set of data to the National Center for Health Statistics.

One thing that both of our agencies are very, very cognizant of and very, very careful about is we still recognize that confidentiality and confidentiality guarantees are extremely important. So, anyone who works on any of our health surveys including -- even though I don't work directly on one of the health surveys since I'm involved with the management and direction, all of us -- not only we have our Census Confidentiality Oath that we take, we also take the Confidentiality Oath that's required under CIPSEA for the National Center for Health Statistics.

That's very interesting and very important in that, you know, it enables us to really, you know, further amplify to the respondents, the households that we're contacting, that we really, you know, collectively and collaboratively across the two organizations take confidentiality very, very much to heart and the penalties are exactly the same. The five years, $250,000.

With the National Health Interview Survey, since we provide that data to the -- all of the data to the National Center for Health Statistics, one of the parts of that interview that we do is that we are seeking information to do follow up on immunizations and so, there is a part of the survey where we ask the respondent's permission and ask them to provide particularly for two groups of children and infants information about the immunizations that they've received, but also to identify the providers and that we will be -- not we, that the National Center for Health Statistics will be following up with those providers.

So, as I said, for the most part, Title 13 doesn't permit us to do this, but we do have at least one or two examples where we do have some of these direct collaborations that you were asking about.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: So, then just a brief follow up. So, if the survey's conducted outside of -- not under Title 13, do you find that there are significantly different response rates? I mean do the public really appreciate that difference and are they less willing to participate in the survey when it's explained to them that it's not being conducted under Title 13?

MR. WEILER: A very, very good, very insightful question and we really do find that when we look at our Health Interview Survey and our other large scale surveys, there really isn't a significant difference in the response rates that we obtain.

We are still striving. The field representatives takes that survey just as important as the other survey. They are rated on the response rate. They are rated on their capabilities just the same.

Well, we do make sure the public is well-informed. In a very real sense, much of our success in terms of our household demographic surveys is really that person-to-person relationship. You're the field representative. I'm the respondent. You've convinced me to help you.

So, we really don't find a significant difference in terms of our response rates.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: So, it sounds like, while there is not necessarily a precedent for what I was suggesting, that you can imagine a path or that it's at least remotely possible that the U.S. Census Bureau could, for example, conduct a survey of 20,000 or 30,000 people, find out the kind of -- ask them about the kind of work they do and where they work and ask their permission to be contacted for a follow up and that it might be possible for another agency to then follow up with a subset of them if they give permission to be contacted.

MR. WEILER: I think that's possible. It's obviously outside of what we usually do, but I think it would be worth exploring.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Allan.

MEMBER HUNT: I was basically going to ask the same question. So, I'll pass on that. Although note that Social Security as an agency may also have access to some of those same assets in terms of that initial sampling frame. I don't know how that might complicate things.

But, I was going to also ask more about the quality assurance program that you have. It sounds extensive and I'm wondering if you can give us some idea of how much of a burden that is both for you and for the field reps and what kind of, I don't know, fall-out rate you might have from that kind of examination.

I'm particularly curious to hear a little bit more about the daily payroll reporting.

MR. WEILER: For all of our -- well, our primary quality control tools, I'd like to start with our reinterview program where we have a sample of all of the households that we contact that we will be recontacting and we are usually just doing a small subset of the questions that we ask and some operational questions to really make sure that the field representative was there and did the job properly. We'll ask things like, you know, did they have a laptop and some of the key.

I think for the most part our field representatives expect this. You know, we let them know that, you know, the quality of the data that we provide is why we are able to have long histories of relationships with organizations.

In terms of respondents, yes, that in some cases can push a person over the edge. I'm the field representative and you're my supervisor and, you know, within a week, you call back and you're really -- you know, you're explaining that you're checking on me. You're not. You're checking on the respondent. We're not -- you know, we're not double checking the answers that they gave. Our fundamental premises is that they are being complete and accurate.

You're checking on me, but sometimes that just, you know, pushes people over the edge or, you know, in some households, the primary respondent is one person. We reach another person and they say no. No. No.

So, there is a little bit of loss there, but for the most part in terms of the data quality people, you know, our staff understands that.

Another important part is actually going out in the field and working with people where we have a checklist, a very comprehensive checklist and it's not just, you know, the technical concepts, how they administer the interview. But, it goes into come of the things that are just important in terms of they're doing the job and it includes things like vehicular safety.

You know, there's a question. Does the field representative use their seatbelt? And if we go out to observe, we better know that we're always using the seatbelt because that's a Federal requirement and that's a pattern that we need to make sure that we emphasize.

As far as the data quality, those are the longer term activities that we've been doing, that we build into our surveys.

For the last 10 or 15 years from and operational standpoint, we've been able to take advantage of the use of computers and from that, we get daily transmissions of work. So, we know exactly what a person did. We don't have to rely on them saying it's in the mail. Anybody who is a supervisor that has been around for more than 15 years probably has been burned by one or two field representatives that have guaranteed that those last cases that you need to close out the survey for the month and, you know, attain that response rate, they've mailed them when they haven't.

The vast majority of our people are -- you know, their integrity is tremendous, but you do run into situations.

Again, the laptop really allows the survey supervisor, as they come in first thing in the morning, they can look at their individual field staff and see who's transmitted work, how much work has come in. It gives them a great sense of where they stand on their survey all the way down to the individual level.

The submission of daily payrolls really does two things. It helps us create the biweekly payroll. All of our field representatives just as all Federal employees are under a biweekly payroll system. So, that actually starts the development of that biweekly payroll on a daily basis.

We have them -- as they are working on surveys, they charge the time and the travel and the mileage to the particular survey that they work on and what we do is we rely on them to distribute across the surveys their time and their travel and their miles by the individual surveys.

In addition to having a project number that they charge to, we have them subdivide into major categories so that we can get, you know, the financial information at an operational level. It doesn't go all the way down to the case level, but it enables us to -- on a daily basis because we're getting the work in and we're getting the payroll information in, we can be looking at their hours, their miles per case and, you know, make sure that we're, you know, not all of a sudden seeing some dramatic outliers.

The field representatives understand that and there is very, very much an incentive for them to be submitting their payroll because that really -- because it's coming in with their work and having the work and the payroll together, you know, enables them to really show what they've done on a particular survey on a particular day to substantiate the time and charges.

So, that enables us to do a lot of the fundamental operational and financial management and then that all rolls up into monthly cost reports.

MEMBER HUNT: Are you always able to achieve the flaunted OMB 80 percent response rate?

MR. WEILER: For most of our surveys, we have response rates in the 80 percent. There's just one or two of our longer surveys that we have not been able to maintain that.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Janine, Tom and then John.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Thank you. I've got two questions specifically about your field representatives.

If you were posting a job posting for a field representative, could you go over the minimum qualifications for someone that you would hire as a field representative?

I also was wondering about if you could give me a composite picture of a typical current field representative, how long they've been a field representative, how old they are, what background they came from? Things like that. Just the overview.

Thank you.

MR. WEILER: When we're recruiting, when we're posting a vacancy for a field representative, as I said, we really have just a minimal number of standards. It's primarily a high school education. We're really looking for people who are people people. We're looking for people who in their previous work experience, you know, show the ability to deal with details, to be able to deal with technical concepts. But, there's not a very, very high level in terms of particulars as far as knowledge, skills and abilities. Really the educational attain is, as I said, you know, the high equivalent.

As far as the work experience, they don't necessarily have had to have done this work in the past, but, you know, if they have work experience that, you know, demonstrates where they have had to make community contacts, reach out, perhaps doing fundraising, you know, working, you know, some type of job in the community and not necessarily a paid job.

So, those are really -- you know, it's really that combination of the minimal level of educational requirements and work experience, but what we really do is as we go through the testing and interviewing process try to identify, you know, people who have the skills that we're looking for.

As I said, in terms of, you know, being a people person first and foremost. You know, be very comfortable walking up to a stranger and asking a whole lot of questions of a wide variety.

You know, being organized. They work out of their homes. They do have supervisors, but their daily schedule, they set their own daily schedule. We tell them these are the surveys that you have to do. These are the deadlines. But, they work in terms of saying okay, this is my daily itinerary in terms of the cases that I'm going to be visiting.

As far as their characteristics, as I said, they work on multiple surveys. That's our business model to have people work on multiple surveys and the reason behind that is that for any one survey it would be very, very difficult to really provide, you know, enough monthly work to, in many cases, make it worthwhile for a person to want to do the job and in the other case, we would have to do a lot of training and have a much larger field force and that makes it very, very difficult for us to -- you know, for the individual sponsors to distribute training costs.

In many cases, when we have experienced field representatives that we can move on to new surveys, it really is -- we don't have to train them on the basics. They bring the basics. So, the sponsor, we only have to charge them for the specific things that we have to train them.

As far as their length of service, they average about five and a half years.

As I said, in terms of the hours that they work, it's about 60 hours a month.

As far as their salary, they are typically -- if you're familiar with the grade structure of the Federal Government, they are typically grade 4s. Their direct salary is $15 an hour. We get an incredible benefit from these hard working people and they are typically a more senior workforce.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Tom and then John.

MEMBER HARDY: Getting back to the

regional offices, I'm curious about this and you may not know or may not be authorized to answer the question, but you said you currently have 12 regional offices. You're dropping down to six.

When do you have that drop down? What six areas are you keeping? Why did you choose those and have you guys started projecting what the increased cost for training will be since you're covering a wider geographic area? How much will it go up from that $7,000 roughly? Do you know that?

MR. WEILER: We have announced and it is public information our realignment and the six regional offices that will be covering the nation when we finish our realignment will be our Atlanta, Philadelphia, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles -- I'll have to think about that. The sixth one in a moment.

As far as the time frame, we will accomplish -- this is a very aggressive time frame that we have established for ourselves. This is a self-directed realignment.

Whenever we do a census, we always look at ourselves afterwards and say what can we learn from that census? How can we better organize ourselves? And we recognize that in the survey environment, the survey data collection environment, we need to be more dramatic in being more cost conscious.

As an organization, we are very, very expensive. The quality that we provide the sponsors do pay for, but we need to continue the work that we get and to encourage new work. That's why we're going through the realignment.

We will complete the realignment by the beginning of January in 2013.

As far as the costs, really what we're doing is we're changing our supervision. Right now, our supervision primarily comes from the 12 regional offices out to the geography that they cover.

We recognize that in terms of the dynamics of supervision, the dynamics of survey data collection, we need to put our supervision much closer to the ground. So, we are actually taking our supervisors that are in the regional offices and we are taking some of them and they will move to be field survey statisticians.

Each of our six offices will take, and they've already taken, their geography and they will have eight survey statisticians, professional survey statisticians, working in the field and they will have an area of geography that they will be responsible for all the surveys that the Census Bureau conducts.

And then we're taking -- for the field representatives right now where they are reporting to usually multiple supervisors in the regional office, we are establishing a field supervisor in the field that will supervise typically a group of 10 to 12 field representatives.

What we're doing is really modeling directly our supervisory chain and are really putting more supervision on the ground as we do it during the Census.

And so, from that standpoint, we're

really not envisioning, you know, very much change at all in terms of our training costs because we're really moving our supervisors more into the field and then as part of our regional office, our new regional office structure, we will be taking other supervisors and their focus will be really shifting more towards the monitoring of the data quality, the paradata, the daily performance. They will be taking more of the lead in terms of actually providing the training and we will typically be going out more.

They will also have a much stronger role in terms of being the data collection representative to the sponsor. The sponsors will have in each one of the regional offices a survey statistician that will be working and be focusing on their surveys.

So, we're really not seeing a lot in terms of the -- you know, changes in terms of the cost.

As far as our -- the big part of our staff, the field representatives, their job is not changing. Those of the supervisors, yes, that is changing. We're developing two specific types of supervisors, moving some supervisors out into the field.

And if I can just take a moment, let me go through my cheat sheet real quick.

I'll have to think a little bit more. I'm trying to remember that sixth regional office. I apologize. I should know that off the top of my head.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Go ahead, John.

MR. WEILER: Someone mentioned a city and they just reminded me. Someone said New York and I missed it. So, let me go through the list again.

It is Atlanta, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Denver and Los Angeles and I heard someone say New York and I appreciate that prompting.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Yes, I'd like to build on David's earlier question. You may recall he was talking about a collaborative relationship between SSA and the Census Bureau.

I want to return to those 12 to 15 surveys that others ask you to conduct, that you're commissioned to conduct and I want to find out a little bit more about the unit of analysis that has been used in these surveys.

You've mentioned here about addresses as a point of contact, individuals, households.

Have you ever had industries in a stratified sampling approach as your first point of contact? Industries?

MR. WEILER: Not from a household demographic standpoint, but we do an extensive number of economic surveys where the point of contact is a business, is an industry.

Most of our economic surveys though are actually gathering financial information and employment information and we have found over time really, we started back in the '80s, where we really moved from where we had some sort surveys that we did where we had personal visits to business and industry, but we recognized that the types of data that we are collecting can be best and in terms of respondent burden most easily collected through mail-out/mail-back and now, we're moving into the Internet.

But, in terms of having sampling frames, we are very experienced and the we is the Census Bureau. Our economic directorate are, you know, very, very experienced with working with our business register which is covered by Title 13 and doing both the economic census and a wide variety of economic surveys where the point of contact is at the business or industry level.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Then in a stratified sampling approach, the next phase could be to contact individuals in different occupations within those industries I assume.

MR. WEILER: I think that would be very, very largely new work for us. Because we really have -- you know, our points of contact with -- our direct points of contact with the public is usually through our household demographic surveys and we're contacting them not in the role that they play as a -- you know, in terms of their occupation, but we're contacting them because their address has been selected for one of our household demographic sample surveys.

We really only have two surveys that we are doing and they're both in the health area where our contacts are with doctors' offices and with hospitals. But, that's really our -- right now, our primary experience where our points of contact are other than individuals and households addresses that have been selected for sampling.

MEMBER CRESWELL: But, I assume then you're open to that possibility of a stratified approach from industry down to occupations.

Let me go to one other aspect which is a survey sampling question.

While 80 percent return rate is very good as we all know, in sampling methodology, we check for nonresponse rates. So, that 20 percent who did not respond, are there any follow ups with that group in the surveys that you've worked on?

MR. WEILER: Usually there's not a

follow up in terms of the nonrespondents. It's not typically one of the requirements that our sponsors are asking for.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: I just want to check in with you. We're a little bit out of time. However, this is too important and so, I want to continue to ask questions if you're okay to keep on going.

Are you okay to keep on going over time?

MR. WEILER: This is fine with me. This is important. The work that I've got that I go back to will still be there. This is important, you know, for us to -- we always value the opportunity to talk with people about the work that we do.

Because we recognize that at some point or another, we're all respondents at the Decennial level and, you know, as someone said, you know, where we can share information, it makes our job a little bit easier.

It'll make the job of a field

representative in the future if they contact one of you a little bit easier because hopefully you know what they're about and why they're there.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. We have I think a little bit of flexibility. So, maybe what we'll do is take one question. If it's okay to take a break and then come back and continue to ask some questions. Would that be okay? Okay. Then, Andy, go ahead.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: This has been great. So, thank you.

How frequently have you been able to take on completely new surveys and what's your capacity to handle new business of that nature?

MR. WEILER: In terms of a survey of any size, it's been awhile since we've taken on new surveys, but I think we're always trying to position ourselves and I think it's a lot of our director's desires and what guidance and where he's leading us is really to better position ourselves to take on new work. But, to be candid, it's been awhile since we've taken on new surveys.

But, that doesn't mean that we don't have the capability to flex and to expand.

Let me, to respond more specifically to your question, talk a little bit about the housing survey that we're doing for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Because this, I think will give you, you know, some insights to our ability to ramp up and to expand.

The American Housing Survey we do every two years for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and it actually has two sample components to it. It has a national sample that was around 55,000 housing units and then we would do five or six metropolitan areas in addition to that in the same time frame and this is in about a six-month data collection window.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development had requested and receive a very, very large increase in their funding to enable them to increase the national sample. They were able to boost that up to about 65,000. Which is closer to the level that it had been in the past and this year, we are doing -- where we usually do five or six metropolitan areas and some of our regional offices may have one, occasionally they have two, several would not have any, we have 29. So, our total sample that we're doing is on the order 190,000 housing units.

To kind of put that in our perspective, the Current Population Survey that we do the national unemployment for, that is basically three times the size and the boost that I've talked about going from 6,000 to 9,000 field representatives, a lot of that is because of the boost in our workload.

The Census Bureau at the same time had also receive additional funding for our American Community Survey.

So, simultaneously, we launched about a 12 or 15 percent increase in work on our American Community Survey and added about 600 field representatives and in the same month, launched the American Housing Survey where, you know, we added 2600/2700 field representatives and then we will wind that down.

Many of our sponsors are seeing where they're having opportunities to expand samples. We're going to have a lot of sample expansions next year.

So, I think we're very, very well poised to flex and to expand. Our whole regional design, data collection design is to expand and flex and with a little bit of pride, I say that, you know, as we move from taking the -- doing our surveys which we do on an ongoing basis to taking the census, we literally explode. For every field representative, we have well over 100 people doing the same type of work.

In the field, we go from 12 regional offices. We open a regional census center and we open 500 local census offices. So, we do have the capabilities.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. What I'd like to do is maybe have a summative question that we'll leave on the table and take a break and I don't know how much you know about the project and what SSA is trying to do and so, there were a variety of questions that I saw my colleagues asking that I want to kind of bring together.

And part of what we listened to yesterday was a presentation on some research through BPA that SSA has done in terms of the recruitment training and certification of job analysts for data collection.

Janine had a question that alluded to recruitment. Shanan had a question in terms of training and we had Dave and a follow up by Allan also about, you know, how might this be done and John to be able to gather the kind of data that is anticipated and so, I know that you do some surveys where you have currently 9400, but you typically have 6,000, because you're doing a survey that requires that kind of manpower. You've mentioned it a variety of different times and you mention that in terms of the basic qualifications for some of the field representatives they're about a GS-4.

If it is determined that the kind of qualifications that might be needed for data gathering, the kind of data that is needed requires a higher skill set, then maybe the basic skill set that you currently employ given the resources that you have at Census whether it be through training modification, whether it be the recruitment or some sort of approach such as what David was recommending, what kinds of options might be available to SSA within the Census structure to be able to gather the kind of data that is needed?

And so, I will leave it there and then secondary to that, what processes are used and criteria are applied when Census is determining whether it would agree to administer a survey for another agency? So, what would you look at on your end?

So, I'll leave that kind of dual question on the table and if we could go ahead and take a 15-minute and then come back, that would be great. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:34 a.m., a recess was taken until 10:52 a.m.)

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you all for your flexibility and I talked to Pam because here presentation's next and we have flexibility to go on with Mike and Mike, thank you for your willingness to answer questions. So, I will turn it over to you.

MR. WEILER: Thank you and again, thank you for the opportunity to spend time with you and describe what we do.

I really can't from my level give you direct answers to your questions, but what I'd like to do -- and I'm sure that we at the Census Bureau would be very, very interested in exploring possibilities for collaboration on survey data collection and, you know, what I'd like to, you know, suggest is I know the people within the Census Bureau and I work with them that really, you know, are our primary contacts with our external agencies and I'd like to suggest perhaps an exploratory meeting with Members of the Panel, people from the Social Security Administration, with Census Bureau staff -- senior staff and executives that work in our Demographic Surveys Division, that work in our Demographic Statistical Methods Division.

Those are our sampling people as well as perhaps with a couple of our senior executives to explore possibilities because clearly the direction that our director is wanting us to pursue is, you know, when there may be the opportunity for us to further our mission in terms of being the fact finder for the nation, the data collector for the nation. Then working through other Federal Agencies to explore what might be usually beneficial and advantageous.

So, if we could perhaps, you know, explore the possibility in the very, very near future of, you know, getting a small group of people together to, you know, really start to talk about the thoughts, the perspective, the data needs from the Social Security Administration side as well as for us to respond and really, you know, take into account those requirements and see what we may be able to do.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Abigail, did you have a question? Okay. Pam.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I wanted to clarify. The field representatives, are they Federal employees or are they contractors?

MR. WEILER: They are Federal employees. They work for the Census Bureau. We really require all of our data collectors to be Census Bureau employees really for two reasons. Because we are responsible for the direct administration of the survey, but really the most important reason is because of the confidentiality requirements.

For us to, you know, fully fulfill and enforce all of the requirements, they do have to be Federal employees and we typically, you know, get the question can others do this job or can people do it on a voluntary basis and largely because of our confidentiality requirements and our business model, they are Federal employees.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Juan.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Yes. I wanted to share with you that I think the presentations we have had from the Census Bureau, at least in my case, have been most impressive. So, I congratulate you for that.

And I was going to ask you. It looks to me like your infrastructure lends itself to household surveys which is really your specialty and even like I was thinking well, this ability to survey people in weekends really lends itself to household surveys. It seems to me that it will be less suitable to surveys that deal with establishments or other kinds of sample units.

Am I correct?

MR. WEILER: We do have two surveys that we -- you know, there is our National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey where we do work at doctors' offices and our National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey where we do work with hospitals. These are largely surveys that were due for the National Center for Health

Statistics where we're doing abstractions of medical records.

So, we do have a little bit of experience there, but really thinking somewhat from, if I could, a very selfish standpoint, a survey that would require direct contact with business, with industry may fit very, very well in terms of our repertoire because it wouldn't directly conflict with the most productive times in which we do our household surveys and it may offer us an opportunity to provide additional work and expand the capabilities of our field staff while at the same time meeting the sponsors requirements.

So, you know, where we don't have extensive experience, I see the possibility of a good fit from both the -- if this would be the Social Security Administration's survey from their perspective as well as ours because there wouldn't be any direct conflict.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: More questions from the Panel?

I have another question. In terms of the training that you've talked about quite extensively, you've also talked about going to laptops and some technology introduction over time, it seems that all of your training is done in the classroom. Have you explored distance training, e-learning and if so, is there any movement toward that in the future or what have you found with it if you've explored it at all?

MR. WEILER: With our current generation of laptops that we just acquired about two years ago and a change in our telecommunications technology where we're going to wireless, it's just beginning to afford us the opportunity to start to explore distance learning, e-learning, but we're very, very much just, you know, taking some first baby steps on that.

We do have, you know, I think a fairly strong view of the importance of classroom training from a couple of perspectives. Really being able to see and be able to get some reaction, responses from people who are working for us in a person-to-person basis really fits in with how they do their work. I mean a lot of their work, a lot of the success is on the basis of personal interaction and so, we have found that, you know, that's one of the reason why the classroom training works so well.

Even on an operation that is just so very massive as the Decennial Census when we train hundreds of thousands of people that go out into the field, we do start with classroom training.

We've just found that, you know, since the work is person-to-person being able to see and interact is important.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you, Mike. We really appreciate your time and your information. Okay.

At this point, we are going to have a presentation from the Department of Labor. Pam's going to take her Panel hat off and present her position as the O*NET/Competency Assessment Team Lead with the Department of Labor and also with her is Dr. Rivkin who we remember from the May presentation from the O*NET Center. He is the Technical Representative. So, thank you.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Okay. Thank you.

Actually, in advance of this meeting, I was given a series of questions and so, the presentation will try and focus on that even though I sort of reordered and regrouped them in the way that made sense to me.

As Mary said, I'm the Federal Project Officer for the O*NET Project which at the Department of Labor is operated through a grant. For those of you somewhat familiar with the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, originally the Department of Labor had job analysis field centers throughout the country and when the decision was made to move from the DOT to O*NET, there was a competition among the existing field centers and North Carolina was one of them and they got the grant to do the O*NET data collection which is centralized now.

So, actually, the slides I have are

mostly the steps of the data collection which was one of the questions, but there were other questions about the data collectors and so, I don't have slides for that. So, if I'm not changing slides, I'll try and make sure it's intentional.

So, the first thing I was asked about the factors or criteria that served as the basis for selection of data collection modes for O*NET and the two main sources for the criteria for the O*NET system were the recommendations of the Advisory Panel on the Dictionary of Occupational Titles and then subsequent research conducted for DOL under contract by the American Institutes for Research and then the actual subsequent development and implementation work that was done by the grantee in North Carolina.

So, there were many factors that sort of interacted and at this point, you know, I wasn't the project lead at that time and I'm not even sure anyone could have given you a breakdown of, you know, what percentage was, you know, burden considerations and what percentage was cost considerations and what percentage were feasibility. You know, all those things came into play.

But, the three, I think, main design points from the ACA report were that the Department of Labor should use sampling techniques in the collection of data for the DOT that insure the representativeness of occupations and the accuracy and consistency of information, the sampling design should make use of existing empirical information on employment by occupations and on the location and industry of employers.

And even though these aren't slides, these notes are in the package after the tab. So, you have all of this.

The Department of Labor should rely on the use of structured job analysis questionnaires as the primary strategy for data collection. Alternative methods may be used to supplement data collection when warranted. So, that was recommendation nine from the ACA.

And recommendation ten was the Department of Labor should collect occupational information using automated technology to facilitate quality control and to achieve currency and accuracy in a cost effective manner and, of course, obviously over time with the advent of Internet, that's become even more possible.

And then there's also a report called the O*NET Final Technical Report that was completed in September 1997 by the American Institutes for Research which is only available in hardcopy, but that did a lot of the work on the selection of incumbent workers as the primary source and also on the development of the scales.

So, you know, if there are really specific questions there, I could develop responses, you know, in the future on that. But, I'm not going to cover all of that.

There's a lot of technical material that goes into O*NET. So, we only have about an hour.

So, then you did ask about the steps of

the O*NET data collection process. Oops. Oh. Oops. I should have checked it. This is the short version. There was a long version also. But, hold on.

Again, these PowerPoints -- the longer PowerPoints are in the package. So, I'll just work from those.

So, the overview of the data collection is that it's a national sample of job incumbents supplemented by occupational experts for certain occupations. We have very strong business participation of 76 percent plus response rate and strong employee participation around 65 percent response rate and the occupational expert participation is approximately 82 percent and yes, we know that OMB's goal is 80 percent response rates, but we have, you know, received approval for our approach I think four times now. So, you know, they're satisfied with these very high response rates.

Then we have a web-based case management system that's used to control all sampling and data collection systems including the business liaison contacts with business establishments, the questionnaire and informational mailings, the processing of questionnaires as they're returned, control of inventory and so forth.

So, actually, we have a process of continuous improvement, these things, these procedures, systems and infrastructure so that we're capable of surveying multiple occupations simultaneously and this has been sort of a find over the 11 years that we've been doing this.

So, there's three main sources of occupational data, job incumbency and occupational experts and they're used -- from them we collect the education, the job titles, knowledge, tasks, work activities, work context, work experience and work styles.

Occupation analysts are used to do the ratings of abilities and skills.

Then web-based research by other staff are used for developing the detailed work activities, identifying green occupations and green tasks. The initial development of the task inventories which are then validated through the survey. Responses from incumbents and the tools and technology or T2.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Sorry, Pam. I think the Panel is a little confused because I think some materials didn't get to us.

I have a copy of what you're talking about. You're talking about the O*NET presentation. Okay.

Does everybody have a copy of what Pam -- in terms of the handout? It's not in my folder. Yes. Okay. There are two PowerPoints back-to-back.

Go to the end of page 4 and start again.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I submitted one PowerPoint as sort of an overview handout and then the next one was the one I was going to use and I don't know if that's loaded up here also. Then I could have -- the second one, but I apologize for that. I should have looked at it.

And Leola did offer me the opportunity to look at it and I said oh, I'm sure it's fine. So, sorry about that.

Okay. So, now, is everyone able to follow at least in the binder? Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So, the establishment method uses a two-stage sample where our business liaisons in a call center contacted business establishments and established a point of contact. Then in turn, the point of contact in the business helps to select the job incumbents who then receive the survey questionnaires. So, they're within the business establishment.

And we don't actually -- you know, talking about confidentiality, the business liaison does not have the name of these individuals. The business internally knows who they are, but we don't have that. So, we know what business we're contacting.

Then these job incumbents complete one of three survey questionnaires and it takes about

25 to 30 minutes. The three questionnaires are generalized work activities, knowledge, work styles or work context, the task list and background information.

I guess the task list and background information are on every questionnaire and then they're broken out into -- they receive one of those three.

And actually, I think, Juan, this came up yesterday that it's 20 respondents per questionnaire type. So, we had this minimum threshold. We have to receive at least 15 responses per questionnaire type for an occupation. Our goal is 20 and we often for many occupations have more than 20. So, it would actually be 60 people per occupation because there are three questionnaire types.

It's slightly different for the occupational experts. They get all three of the questionnaires. Then incumbents -- oh.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: Just before you go any further because I missed some of the math. It's 60 per occupation, but it's not 60 for every questionnaire. So, it's really only 20 for every questionnaire. There's 60 total because they're filling out different questionnaires?

If you needed a whole data set, an entire set of questionnaires per occupation, how many total people plus the sample size for a full set of data per job?

MEMBER FRUGOLI: It's a minimum of 60 and the reason that questionnaires were split up was a burden consideration. It's the time for the incumbent to respond. That's one of the reason like for the occupational experts, then they fill out all three, but we don't -- you know, we're asking the incumbent workers to do this on their own time.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: I think 60, but every item is rated by 20.

MR. RIVKIN: Because everybody -- every questionnaire includes the task list, the task lists are more. You know, because there's 60 respondents for the task list.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Okay. So, every incumbent receives a survey packet. I mean every selected incumbent receives a survey packet and then they have the option of filling it out in paper and pencil and mailing it back in a prepaid envelope or they can go on the web because they're given an address and they're given a password.

So, about 25 percent do respond directly via the Internet and once they've done that, you know, it's locked. So, they can't also then mail in or, you know, enter it twice or, you know, it's recorded in that inventory system that they have responded and so, even if then they mailed back the survey, it wouldn't be double counted.

And basically, that rate has increased over time, you know. But, we know not -- because we do ask incumbents to respond on their own time, we know not everyone has a computer at home and so, we don't -- we can't move totally to that because, you know, it would eliminate people.

Okay. So, then we also collect the

data in waves. As you know, occupations really vary in size. You know, there's like -- something like three million or four million registered nurses. So, they're pretty easy to find and, you know, we know where they work, too. They work in hospitals and doctors' offices and things like that. Other occupations are much smaller and they're scattered or, you know, off-shore oil rig workers are not that easy to get to, you know. So, that's one of the reasons we've developed the collection in waves.

So, we have a primary wave that has approximately 50 occupations and it's designed in three waves with sort of a clean-up wave. So, it's designed to get about a third of the sample in each wave. But, as I said, it varies by occupation. So, you may actually get more than 34 percent after you send out the first subwave.

So, then what will be sent out in the second subwave is adjusted accordingly and for really hard to find occupations, then we have a fourth subwave that's called the sample residual and at each stage we can target. You know, if we're not finding them in certain places because it's one of those occupations that's harder to find, then we adjust based on where we're finding them in the first responses in the first wave.

Because we're going to an establishment, each wave is a cluster of similar occupations in the sense of where they're found in industries. Okay. Because, you know, basically the business liaison contacts the business and they're looking for certain occupations, but if they say no, we don't employ any workers in that occupation, but if they've agreed to cooperate, you don't want to sort of waste that. So, you say well, then do you have these?

So, there's, I think, a list of ten occupations that they'll ask for. Up to ten. If they don't find any of them, then they say thank you, but, you know, we have the primary occupations and then secondary occupations that are also associated with those industries.

So, the multiple subwaves do allow for

greater precision in locating occupations and in controlling both the public burden and the project resources.

Okay. So, stage one of the sampling as you've heard in the May presentation, we use data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Occupational Employment Statistics Survey. Because of the way they collect their data, they sample business establishments also and they find out which occupations are employed in which industries and they can actually -- they create this matrix of industry occupations which they can then sort the other way and show us the distribution of occupations across industries and so, we use that information to help us know what establishments to sample when we are looking for specific occupations and then we actually select the business establishments from a database of business locations.

Now, the thing is what BLS provides us with is sort of a cross. It's for the industry, but, you know, there's different sizes of firms in industries and so, their staffing patterns may vary, you know. A hospital, in general, might employ 10 percent of doctors, but a small regional hospital might have a slightly different percentage and a large, you know, surgical hospital might have more.

So, it's always -- when we actually go out in the field, you know, we have this general guideline, but that's another reason for the subwaves because, you know, we may not find as many as we would expect. You know, it's not just -- you can't just multiple. Well, they employ a hundred people and OES tells us it's 10 percent. So, there's going to be exactly 10 there. You know, it's not that scientific. But, it's very, very good, useful in targeting and starting to target and finding people.

But, the data we get from BLS does not include the establishment data.

Okay. So, basically, the O*NET Center staff refine the industry information based a lot on their experience with collecting this data over time.

Sometimes there's anomalies in the data. I mean this example is sort of weird, but, you know, like -- another example is hospitals may employ certain maintenance staff, you know, to keep up the building. But, that's really not their primary purpose and so, we don't try and sample them there, you know.

Okay. Like bricklayers, sometimes they show up on the staffing pattern for hospitals, you know. So, we -- but, if we go to a hospital and ask them if they have any bricklayers, they'd laugh us out of the room and so, we don't want to lose credibility. So, you know, so, even though it's shows up, we have to adjust some of that.

So, we determine the industry's sample based on the overall distribution and population coverage goals. I cover a little bit more later and as I said, we refine it and target what we ask for from establishments based on, you know, prior experience.

Okay. So, in terms of population

coverage, the survey gathers data on the core of the occupation. Some occupations, you know, occur everywhere, accountants, and you'd have to, you know, go to all kinds of establishments and ask for one accountant and it would be, you know, very burdensome and expensive. So, the average coverage level is 85 percent because we look for -- you know, we start where they're most concentrated and then go down to other industries up to a certain level.

And actually, the slide on population coverage, the graph, shows you by -- if I say this correctly, Dave is my expert. So, I've told him if I really say something wrong, he has to correct me.

That 90 to 100 percent of the occupations or no, 56 percent of the occupations have a coverage of 90 to 100 percent of employment based on the industries that are selected. Another 9 percent of occupations are in the 80 to 90 percent coverage level, 9.7 in 70 to 80 percent, just under 9 percent 60 to 70 percent and

15 percent in the 50 to 60 percent coverage. Those are the ones that are really dispersed. Okay.

MEMBER HARDY: Occupations, when you say occupations, can you define what you mean by occupations for me? Thanks.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Okay. So, these would be O*NET-SOC occupations. Okay. So, O*NET classification is based on the Standard Occupational Classification because otherwise we couldn't use the OES data for our sampling frame. We wouldn't have industry staffing patterns and the reverse, but O*NET does have permission from the Office of Management and Budget which does require the Standard Occupational Classification for collection of occupational information by Federal agencies.

They have allowed us to collect detail within the SOC. So, for example, there's that .00 and .01 and .02. If it's .00, it means that the O*NET occupation is identical to the SOC occupation and where it's a number, .01, 2, 3, there's additional detail.

So, yes, this isn't again employment distribution. This is the occupations. All right. Okay. I'm saying that correctly.

Okay. So, that's the sampling that is done by the statisticians just to determine where the sample is going to go to, but there is a stage two sampling and this is where the contact is made. So, these are qualified and trained business liaisons.

So, if you ever see BL throughout here, it's not a sandwich or a part of a sandwich. It stands for business liaison.

So, these are full-time staff that are working in a dedicated call center and they do have education and work experience criteria higher than the typical telephone interviewer.

So, they contact the establishment and I'll go through that a little bit more and hold on one second. Yes.

So, they contact the establishment and identify a point of contact and then work with them to identify the list of eligible employees and I'll go through the steps of that in a little bit more detail.

When they're talking to their point of contact, they use identification profiles to determine whether the occupations are present and that was one of the handouts also. The ID profile in the handouts include -- it says Standard Occupational Code 113071.02. So, that is actually an example of an O*NET breakout. Storage and distribution managers.

So, it's got the description. It has some alternate titles because we know that, you know, employers don't call things what the SOC calls them and over time -- I forget how many titles we have in the lay title file. Do you know? That's another number I don't -- I'm going to start having all kinds of O*NET information tattooed on my arm so I know all of these facts at my fingertips. But, I can find that out.

But, that's something we augment over time. You know, the lay titles. What people really call these. What employers really call these in the world of work.

But, then we also have titles that it is not. Because, you know, there are some things that sound similar and so, we want to make sure we're not serving the wrong occupation. So, you know, we discuss that. This title includes these things. It does not include those things and then to double check, we go over the tasks even with this point of contact. These people do this kind of work and they're like yes, that's what they do here. So, we've got the right people. So, we verify all of that before we start to sample the incumbent workers.

Okay. So, once the business liaison finds out that they do, in fact, this establishment does have workers in certain occupations, what we ask them to do, it's usually someone in the HR office or something similar to that, is make up a list, you know, like an Excel. I mean they usually have something like that or a database and tell us how many there are.

And so, then they go to the -- what's the C stand for in Management System? Control Management System. I keep wanting to call it content and put in that number and then to keep it a random sample that is generated by, you know, statistical software to say all right, we don't know their names. You've told us there's a hundred people. So, we're going to sample person 15, person 38 and person 90. Okay. And we want you to mark that in your records and we're going to send you -- you know, we'll give you the number, an identification number, and you put it next to that record and you know who this goes to, but we don't ask for their names.

We know how big it is. So, we generate the sample based on the size and what we're looking for there. But, the point of contact hands the survey questionnaire package, which is sealed, they don't see it, to the selected incumbent worker.

So, we do have limits placed on the burden of what we ask each establishment's point of contact to do. So, we never sample more than five occupations from an establishment. We never select more than 20 employees from a single establishment and they can only be included within the data collection once each year.

Now, many establishments wouldn't be in once each year, but there are some really huge employers that, you know, employee so many workers nationally that they may end up, you know, not the same occupations every year, but some occupation will occur at their establishment in a year.

So, then the employees are asked to complete the questionnaire on their own time and that's one of the reasons we offer an incentive. Partly to persuade the incumbent workers to participate. It's an incentive for them, but also to know -- when we tell the employer yes, we're asking you to hand them the questionnaire, but we're asking them not to do it on your time that you're paying for. But, you know, on their own time and that we're paying, you know, compensating them for that and that's another reason why we split out the questionnaire so that it's, you know, not so burdensome. It's about -- around half an hour give or take.

So, the questionnaire is coded so that we know, you know, what industry and occupation it is and where it's coming from so we can make sure we log it in as being responded to, but again, we don't ask for anyone's name. So, the responses are anonymous and confidential and they're mailed back directly to the center in North Carolina.

They aren't given back to the employer. You know, they're sealed. They're postage paid. So, you know, the employees don't have to have any pressure to impress their employer in their responses. Okay. And can be honest in that sense and also, that might inhibit them even from responding if they thought their employer was going to look at it.

So, all individual identifiers are removed and they either mail it back or complete it on the web.

I'm not sure I can even talk about

this. I have a slide from Model-Aided Sampling. We have a bunch of statisticians that work on this stuff and I don't pretend to be a statisticians.

But, we do have a sampling approach that reduces the data collection cost and burden by preventing occupations from greatly exceeding their targeted sample.

I've got to say almost all of this comes from our OMB clearance package. We document this very extensively. So, if anyone wants more detail, they can read the package. The current package that is posted on the O*NET Center site right now is the 2008 package. You're getting ready to renew it. So, there's going to be a 2011 package coming out very soon.

We have to publish the 60-day Federal Register notice asking for public comment. So, when that gets published, the new one will go up.

So, you might just want to wait. I think it should be coming up October. So, I wouldn't go read the whole thing now. I'd read the new one unless you have a burning question. I guess you can ask me.

And actually, in the notes that I'm working from, a lot of that is excerpted from the OMB package. The current one. The new one.

So, if you want to know more about Model-Aided Sampling, it's covered there.

But, for each occupation, the targeted sample size for specific demographic domains is modeled by census region, establishment size and industry division and so, then when the targeted respondent sample size is projected to be achieved, then we can close off the sampling so that we don't get too many responses which again that just increases burden and cost.

Okay. So, now, I'm actually to a slide. Sorry.

You asked about the steps and there's tree different methods: The establishment method, the occupational expert method and the association method and I'm going to focus mostly on the establishment method.

So, this first slide is the sample selection process of the establishment method where we create the establishment sampling frame, determine the industries to target for each occupation in the subwaves and then select an initial sample of establishments from the frame. Then that's refined to select a final set of establishments for each subwave of the frame.

Then in step five, occupations are assigned to selected establishments and then the employee-selection algorithm is established. You know, that's the random number generator I believe. Well, step seven I guess. That's the occupation-specific algorithm for random assignment of questionnaire types of sampled employees.

So, again, we also make sure that three different questionnaire types are sent out in appropriate numbers so that we get the right -- you know, a balance. We don't want 60 of one questionnaire and none of the others obviously. We want 20 of each at a minimum and then we randomly assign the selected the establishments two business liaisons for data collection.

Okay. So, then this is the data collection protocol. This is the part that the business liaisons do. So, this is also covered -- even though this is an overview of all 13 steps, this is covered in the written handout.

So, step one is a verification call usually to a receptionist. You know, we have a main number for the business establishment from our sampling frame and so, we call them and they're trained to explain, you know, what the survey's about and who they need. So, usually, they're given someone, like I said, in human resources.

But, first, they determine whether the business is eligible. I think there's been some discussion of, you know, sometimes businesses change or sometimes you've got the headquarters when you really meant to, you know, sample the factory. So, all that's verified first. That we've got what we -- you know, the establishment we think we need or we don't have their accounting firm that just sends in their payroll records or something and we make sure that the POC is the right person who will be able to develop the list of incumbent workers.

So, step two, well, is when you talk to the Point of Contact to ascertain whether they have at least one employee in at least one of the occupations. So, that means, you know, it's going to be worth surveying them. Otherwise, if they don't have any people that we're looking for, then we say thank you and that's the end of it.

But, if we're going to send them surveys, they get then the name and title of the Point of Contact, their mailing address, their telephone number and email address if available and a fax number so that they can contact them in multiple ways.

Now, we don't use a script for our business liaisons. They have talking points to guide their interaction with the POCs, but they're trained to listen and interact effectively and in, you know, a comfortable manner so that they don't sound like they're reading to the person which is sort of -- can be very off putting, you know.

Which is probably how I sound right now. Right? No.

Anyway, so, they don't read off of computer screen even though they are interacting with the computer screen because they enter information into the Control Management System.

Okay. So, then once they establish the occupation through there and the Point of Contact is willing to cooperate, they send this information package. Actually, this is to encourage cooperation because, you know, you don't want to take too much time up on the phone.

So, we send them information about what the O*NET survey is, what is it for. There's a letter from the Department of Labor, you know, explaining why we're doing this and there's a brochure on O*NET. Who, what and how?

We give them a list of occupations we've selected and I think we send them the ID profile to double check what we said to them on the phone.

Often we have professional organizations that have endorsed the survey because it provides information on the skills of workers in their profession. So, we sent those -- the list of which professional associations endorse.

Then we have a brochure because we send out incentives, too, for the business, for the point of contact and for the employee. So, we make sure they know what those are. For example, the point of contact gets an O*NET desk clock and a certificate thanking them for their cooperation.

The business gets a tool kit telling them how they can use O*NET information. For example, writing position descriptions or doing other HR functions, talent development, training, things like that. Especially that's sometimes a big sell with smaller businesses that don't have a big HR office. You know, it's a resource for them.

They get copies of the survey questionnaires on disk. We send out a little mini -- do we still send the mini disk?

So, I don't know if I mentioned, but what we do is -- I think it's a money order. It's in the survey questionnaire package that's $10 to those who are filling out a single questionnaire and we have approval from OMB to do that, to provide incentives.

And we do sometimes get questions about that. Particularly, when we're serving Federal agencies. You know, they want to know. They're calling me up and check to see if it's ethical and so forth and we have to tell them that there's actually a court decision that GSA said that you can, you know -- they were providing incentives to their own employees, but because it helps increase response rates, it's been approved to do that, you know.

Because sometimes we even find someone will, you know, take the package throw it on their desk and find it a little bit later and then they go oh, they gave me $10. I better do this now and mail it back. It is very effective.

So, step four is the then actual recruiting call to the point of contact. So, we wait approximately seven days after we send in the information material so that they can receive it, read it and process it and then so, the business liaison calls up and verifies that, you know, they received the materials, that the POC is the right person, that they're qualified to do this. They go over the titles and description of the selected occupations to determine, you know, whether they absolutely have employees in those occupations and if they're then present, they go on and explain what we're going to do in greater detail to get them to commit to cooperate.

And then at that point once they've committed to cooperate, well, we explain what they'll need to do then is to make this roster: A numbered list of employees' names and each occupation and then they don't do the sample at that time. They let them, you know, go ahead and prepare that list and then they set up an appointment for the sampling call.

For smaller businesses, the sampling call may be at the same time as the recruiting call because they can just pull it up, you know.

So, step five is the sampling call. Get the number of names. They enter that number into the Control Management System and then that system runs the sample according to the preprogrammed random sampling algorithm.

So, the BL then says okay, that's -- these are the rows that we selected, the numbers that we selected.

Then the point of contact asks. You know, so, they are suppose to note on their list which numbers were selected so that when we send them the questionnaires they can give it out to those people.

In certain occupations we've experienced that many of the workers may be Hispanic and may be more comfortable responding in

Spanish. So, we've developed the questionnaires in Spanish also and we ask the point of contact if that would be the case that they think we should send a Spanish questionnaire.

I think on every questionnaire we have a little note. You know, whichever language we send it in, we say if you prefer it in Spanish. You know, if it's in English, we say if you prefer it in Spanish, let us know. If you prefer it in English, let us know. You know, so that they can get what would be best for them.

So, then in step six, we actually mail the questionnaire packages.

Okay. I think I had done most of the slides already unfortunately, but so right now, I'm on the notes.

We send the questionnaire package and the POC hands them out to the sample incumbent. When they receive the packets, they also get a thank you letter and that's when they receive the certificate of appreciation from DOL which has their name on it and is signed by someone from

DOL.

So, the questionnaire packets themselves contain also a letter to the sample incumbent, the professional associations that have endorsed the O*NET survey, the task list, a post-paid return envelope, information on instructions for completing the questionnaire and the $10 incentive.

And for obtaining the questionnaire in another language, there's a toll free number they can call to obtain that.

Step seven is sending them the toolkit. So, approximately three days after we've mailed the questionnaire package, we mail the point of contact that O*NET toolkit for business that I described that explains how you can use O*NET information and so, they can give that to their manager in case their manager gets any questions about why are we doing this. You know, what do we get out of it.

So, then seven days later, in step eight, there's a follow-up call to the point of contact and you'll see a lot of the rest of this is follow-up calls. Again, this is done to insure the response rates.

So, we call the point of contact to make sure that they got the survey questionnaires, that they've distributed them to the selected employees and that we're going to follow-up by sending them thank you or reminder postcards and ask them to distribute those also. So, we ask the POC to make the follow-up contacts with the incumbent workers.

So, seven days after the follow-up call, we send those thank you reminder postcards that they hand out. So, since we don't know who has responded and who hasn't, it's -- you know, the card they get -- the sampled employees get is if you've already sent it in, thank you. If you haven't, please still do so.

Is that right? Okay.

Then 21 days later, there's another follow up. We again thank the point of contact for their ongoing participation. We sort of let them know, you know, that we've received -- how many we received and ask them to follow up with those who haven't.

Then there's also a 31-day follow-up call to the point of contact. The same process.

And then we say as an additional incentive and reminder that we're going to follow that up with a replacement questionnaires because someone may have lost theirs, misplaced it. They don't know where it is, you know. We give them the reminder card and they're like oh, yes, but I don't know where I put it. So, step 12 is sending replacement questionnaires, but that's not to everybody I believe. Right.

These packages are ordered for any employees who have not yet responded. It's a slightly different cover letter because they've already, you know, heard from us and we don't give them another $10. Okay. So, it doesn't have the incentive in it.

And again, all this then is generated by that inventory system. So, you know, the

Control Management System tracks it and generates the right package.

So, using that roster line information, the point of contact knows who to give it to.

Then step 13, I believe this is the final one, is the follow-up call to the -- 45-day call to the point of contact. We make one final contact thanking them for their assistance, provide a status report on the responses. You know, if we've received all the questionnaires, we say thank you. We ask for one last follow up if there are any nonrespondents, but then we say, you know, we're not going to contact you after that. You know, thank you for everything that you've done.

So, really one of the questions was about closeout procedures, but that really is the closeout procedure. I imagine though that if we've gotten all of them back before 45 days we don't keep calling them. Right. We thank them once it's all done. This is just the entire process.

So, in this establishment method, there are like up to 13 separate contacts, telephone and mail contacts with the point of contact.

The Occupational Expert Method consists of up to ten contacts with occupation experts. Let's see if that's -- so, the Occupational Expert Method is used when occupations are difficult to locate in establishments. For example, because of small employment size, because job incumbents are inaccessible due to work in remote locations or they travel a lot and so they're not in one fixed place or for new and emerging occupations. Because again, when we have an O*NET breakout, we don't have data from BLS on exactly where those breakouts are.

Supplemental contacts may also be made via email and fax as appropriate.

And the multiple contacts, it's sort of like what Census was describing about the in person. You know, it's partly to establish rapport with the point of contact and to facilitate their participation. You know, help answer any questions or concerns so that we get the best possible response rate and completion rate.

So, then a number of your questions focused on the data collectors themselves and the training and so forth. I don't have slides for this, but it's covered in the notes. This is on page 6 of the numbered notes.

So, I've talked a lot -- I mean you can see the importance of the role of the business liaison. So, because, you know, they do unscripted calls and they do these multiple calls and they're really asking quite a bit of the business establishment, they are carefully screened and evaluated by what we call the Operations Center management.

So, candidates are selected on the basis of a track record of successful work experience like a minimum of two years of work experience in a call center. Customer service is a very important attribute. Maybe perhaps previous work in a human resources setting.

Education attainment is actually fairly high. So, the majority have college degrees. Several have advance degrees. They have to be proficient with computers and have research skills.

They receive competitive salaries. Attrition is extremely low and they are full-time staff that work in this dedicated call center.

So, as far as training goes, newly hired business liaisons must participate in and successfully complete a four-day intensive training program which is onsite. So, that includes presentations by key management staff on the data collection steps. They do role play for different situations. There's hands on practice using the Control Management System and there's coaching on overcoming objections. You know, how to handle that. Not to take it personally. You know, how to be persuasive.

And once they're hired, they routinely participate in ongoing training on topics to enhance their skills, to convert refusals from businesses, briefings on the occupations they're covering and refreshing, going over the protocol, the steps and what's involved in the different steps and their importance.

And I also in one of the handouts provided you the job description for the business liaisons. It says -- the heading is job description O*NET business liaison. So, it's the summary of the position, their duties and responsibilities, a little explanation of the project and then the qualifications that we're looking for.

So, it says Bachelor's Degree or equivalent work experience. At least two years of successful work experience in a call center or customer services or human resources. Excellent written and oral communication skills and good telephone voice. Excellent interpersonal and listening skills. Availability to work the schedule agreed upon at the time of hiring.

Because we're doing a national sample from North Carolina, some of them don't work a 9:00 to 5:00 day because they're calling

California and so forth. You know, they're calling the West Coast.

And they have to have positive background and reference checks.

You also asked about the process used to evaluate the performance of the individuals. So, there is -- the business liaisons are supervised closely by the Operations Center supervisors and they actually use silent monitoring equipment to monitor their calls at random. So, they're not listening in on every call, but, you know, the BL doesn't know when they might be listened to and they provide on-going training and coaching to the BLs as needed and also, if a business liaison is having difficulty with a particular business, they can then refer it to a senior person or a supervisor to try and do the conversion if they're not having success.

So, the items that they monitor include phone time, the calls per hour, the response rate that they get from the establishments they contact, the employee response rate for each business liaison and quality which includes monitoring each of those stages of the POC contact. The initial interview, the verification, recruiting sampling and the four sets of follow-up calls.

And a lot of it -- so, information's recorded at each stage in the Control Management System. So, it's sort of like what Census said about the laptops. You know, the supervisor can see what kind of results they're getting and look at that and so, in addition to listening into the calls, they see the results they're getting and also the BLs know they can go and ask for assistance and help if they are experiencing difficulty.

So, the supervisors' examine that data to determine the cooperation rate that each business liaison gets from the business and whether or not they're meeting their goals in terms of contacting a certain number of businesses per week.

However, they don't evaluate them in

terms of how long each call takes or the total number of calls they make in a week because we have found that that really varies across occupations and certain business POCs and some may take longer and we don't want to, you know, make them feel rushed. Like oh, I have to do it in a certain amount of time. We want success and so, we've learned that it make longer for certain things, you know, and so, that's permissible.

The process used to record, transmit and store collective data, that's the Case Management System. At least that's what I have here.

So, it is web-based, but it's an Intranet. Okay. It's not on the Internet. It's inside the firewall, but it allows everyone on the project to have access.

So, the telephone operations, the mailings, the questionnaire receipt operations are all supported by this Case Management System.

So, you know, the BLs record information and then it actually signals like the warehouse operations to create, you know, customized questionnaires with the right task list on it and everything and mail it to the right address and so forth and put the right number on it and then it also logs in the receipt of completed paper and web questionnaires and there is data entry software to support the keying and verification of the paper-based survey data.

So, some of the enhancements that have been made to the system over the years, there are visual cues to allow the business liaisons to prioritize and customize the approach for certain types of establishments that may require special procedures. They have the ability to do ad hoc package modifications such as the inclusion of special endorsement letters based on what occupations are being surveyed and because, you know, things do vary by occupation, the point of contact can receive targeted materials that help communicate the data collection mission which may be a slightly different aspect that would be persuasive for occupations.

There are also tools in the system to help manage and balance the load, the number of cases assigned across the team of BLs because you may not end up surveying as many occupations in one establishment and you may sample more in another. So, then you could assign new cases to that BL because they're not managing as many.

Sometimes if there are multi-site organizations, we actually have the capability then to send to multiple locations. So, more than one POC in an establishment. So, if we get cooperation from headquarters, we may still be able to sample workers from specific sites.

So, there's this integrated inventory tracking system to manage the supplies associated with data collection to make sure we have enough envelopes, brochures, questionnaires. So, that way we keep -- we reconcile the physical and expected inventory and improve the efficiency of ordering, storing and shipping data collection materials.

So, it's more like a just in time. We

don't have tons and tons of printed stuff. Well, we have lots of envelopes because we know those are pretty standard, but the questionnaires are generated on an as needed basis.

So, there's an automated order fulfillment system for that. It picks up the domain, one of the three domains, the occupations and prints the complete package with the customized label and gets it ready to pack and ship.

Okay. There's also something called Adaptive Total Design that was developed by the contractor who handles this portion of it. That's been integrated into the Case Management System to provide real-time graphical updates of paradata. There's that term again that Census also used. Paradata.

So, that's captured during the execution of day-to-day operations. So, managers can notice if something unusual is happening and intervene and take necessary steps.

So, the Case Management System also

automatically assigns the questionnaire domain type sequentially as new respondents are added to the sample and adjusts the subsequent waves depending on how many of each type are actually returned by respondents.

So, I think I've already covered it, but you did ask a specific question about making assignments to data collectors about a specific position. So, that's really part of the sampling design.

The business liaison is assigned a specific business establishment to contact and then they're given that list of occupations to look for within each business which include the primary ones and the secondary occupations and their goal is to identify several occupations in which the establishment employs workers with those -- the limits I said previously. No more than five occupations. No more than 20 employees.

And sometimes if BLs have background or experience or they're performance indicates they have particular success with certain kinds of establishment, they may be assigned those they're particularly good with.

You asked about the method for verifying the position is, in fact, the one that we're looking for. That ID profile is part of it. You know, the business liaison goes over with the point of contact what we're looking for, what we're not looking for. That ID profile is sent to the point of contact and I've given you a copy of that.

In addition, I mean there is a check when the surveys are returned. Employees -- I mean incumbent workers are asked to check the tasks that they do or do not perform and they can insert additional tasks and, you know, their responses are checked. So, it's actually checked to see if we think the person who responded isn't actually doing the work of that job. Then it can be pulled out and not included in the aggregated total.

Go ahead.

MR. RIVKIN: There's also actually a

global match question where they're asked -- where they're given the description of the job and they're asked whether or not that description matches the job that they're in. So, actually, on the questionnaire, we address it as well.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: So, basically, that's handled in two ways. We verify when we sample and then we also verify once the survey questionnaire is returned. Have other procedures to verify.

Some of the follow-up issues that we encounter and the way we address them are sometimes businesses actually want to verify that the survey's being conducted on behalf of the Department of Labor even though they receive those letters, you know. So, sometimes they actually will contact me. Very rarely though. I mean considering the level of the survey that doesn't happen very often. But, I mean, you know, you still have to be prepared to do that I think.

Some groups say that it's against their policy to accept incentive payments and if that's the case, then we can remove the incentive payments from it even though it might affect our response rate or sometimes, you know, like in the case of Federal agencies, I can explain yes, it is legal. It's okay for them to accept it, you know.

I actually had someone refer me to their general counsel, you know. But, we were able to resolve it. You know, that they were able to do it.

Sometimes they need to be reassured that the responses are confidential. You know, we never -- well, first of all, we don't even know who the job incumbents are, but also the business establishments are never identified. That information isn't shared with us. It's just used for purposes of the mailing and by the time the data are published, you know, it's aggregated across different establishments.

So, actually, that was one sort of point that I made feedback to the ICF study. It said that the data security of O*NET was low level because it's public. Well, yes, the final aggregated data is public, but the raw data is not public, you know, and no establishments are identified or individuals in the data. It's by occupation, you know, for the nation. So, anyway, I may provide some input on that.

And sometimes, of course, people say they're too busy to do this. So, you know, we try and work at ways of explaining, you know, the -- you know, how it works and how other people have done it before and, you know, that's just one of the issues.

So, I think some of the questions were -- we do not use -- you know, our business liaisons are recruiting people to participate in the survey. They're not doing job analysis and they're not actually collecting data other than -- yes, they're not. Other than the number of workers in the occupation, they're not collecting data. The data is received through the survey questionnaire.

You asked about the lessons learned with doing the OMB Paperwork Reduction Act clearance process. You know, obviously, one of the big issues is that the goal for response rates is very high. There is a great emphasis on the quality of the method for statistical sampling and, in fact, we have to document or the contractor documents the statistical methods and it's actually reviewed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics before it goes to OMB.

Nonresponse bias, I know you asked earlier and the way that the data are analyzed and cleaned and validated. Those all need to be covered and there's obviously a large concern about minimizing the burden on respondents in terms of both time and costs and, of course, that was one of the reasons for our decision to ask job incumbents to respond on their own time.

I mean I know I'm going to be on the group. So, you can ask me questions, you know, in the future.

But, there was also question about the supporting documentation to get complete information and really the OMB package, I mean, is very detailed. Even more detailed than I have been today and I've given you the address for that, but like I said, you should probably wait until we post the 2011 package.

There are also a number of other research and technical reports that are -- these are all posted on the O*NET Center site, www.o*netcenter.org.

And then well, there were some questions. I've talked mostly about the business liaisons and the establishment method because that's the primary method, but there were some questions about the analyst method. Let me see if I -- there. Okay.

Oh, am I running out of time yet? Is it lunch? Is everyone staring? Yes, it is. I only have a few slides left I believe.

So, the analysts rate the ability and the skill domains and research was done, you know, to determine -- there's research to show that ability ratings are not that easy for incumbents to do and we did other research to show that analyst ratings and incumbent ratings were very comparable on skills and it was one less survey. So, it was less expensive. So, that was a cost saving issue there to have the analysts do the skill ratings.

But, they also have extensive training and quality assurance procedures for the analysts.

This is an overview of the process. So, they receive data as it's -- you know, the aggregate data as it's -- well, not aggregate. They receive incumbent data as it's collected in a new wave and stimulus materials are prepared for them. So, it's the standardized presentation and the stimulus materials are distributed to the analysts who do their rating on a form and they're collected and then, you know, there may be feedback provided, but the data then aggregated across the analyst and analyzed and used to create the final database and, of course, before the analysts do their rating, they're selected and trained.

So, the stimulus materials that they

review are occupational title and definition. It would be job zone of the occupation. Just like one of these five categories sort of about where it falls in terms of the amount of education and training preparation time, the important knowledge, the mean importance of core supplementary tasks, the mean importance of generalized work activities and the mean rating on work context statements.

So, there are two groups of eight analysts. Both groups are first given the same ten occupations to rate. They rate the importance and the level of 52 abilities and 35 skills and this is all covered on a slide.

The ratings are compared and discussed if that's warranted. They get batches of about five occupations per week and then different occupations go to each group of eight. So, you know, they work on inter-rater reliability and then so the agreement among the raters is evaluated to make sure that they're trained -- they're all trained and operating in the same wave.

So, there are 16 trained analysts with 5-plus years of work experience. They work for diverse organizations. So, they're basically under contract to one of our subcontractors. So, I guess these are examples of where some of them work: Marriot, FedEx, DDI.

They're not -- it's not an internship, an assistantship or a summer job.

They either have a Master's or a Doctorial Degree in IO Psychology, Industrial Organizational Psychology, Vocational Psychology, Human Resources or Industrial Relations and they've had a graduate-level job analysis course or something similar and a graduate-level research methods course of something comparable.

So, this actually corresponds more to job analysis except for they aren't doing it in person. They're doing it from stimulus materials and it is a very small part, you know. There's only 16 of them.

The analyst training is one and a half

days. It includes hands-on exercises, quizzes and rating practice. The main modules are a history of O*NET, an overview of the stimulus materials, making their ratings, training on that and how do they record their ratings and then there's refresher training.

Because, you know, the data comes in waves, so, they always get refresher training before they're going to start doing them again.

And then as I mentioned before, some of the pieces of information that actually go in before we send out the surveys are done through web-based research. So, they're also trained analysts who collect and process this information. You know, they do Internet research, collect task and detailed information, literature review, compile data, analyze data, do expert review. Often they're classifying data into standardized taxonomies. For example, the tools and technology is organized into a taxonomy of -- I forget the name of it, but it's a product and services taxonomy and then they generate -- yes, then they generate the final output.

So, I believe -- let me see if I had any other -- and so, if you want to know about the analyst ratings, there are reports -- that's done by HUMRRO and so, they have prepared a report that I believe is on -- yes, you can download from the O*NET website and I've put the name and the download link in the notes and it's from March of -- one of them is from March of 2010.

If you want, we can do questions after lunch or can you stay? Or I don't know if you want to do them now. We're okay with that also.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thanks, Pam. If you are okay with doing questions after lunch, we could go ahead and break for lunch now.

David, are you going to be around? Okay.

Let's go ahead and break for lunch now. We'll come back and do questions and then finish up our meeting.

Let me look at the -- okay. So, we're running about 25 minutes late. So, let's go ahead and come back here at 1:20 and Leola, if you would adjourned the morning session and then we will come back on the record at 1:20.

MS. BROOKS: If there are no objections, we will adjourn. Hearing no objections, we are adjourned until after lunch at 1:20 p.m. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:12 p.m., the meeting was recessed to reconvene this same day at 1:20 p.m.)

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

1:20 p.m.

MS. BROOKS: Good afternoon. My name is Leola Brooks, the Designated Federal Officer and I'd like to call the meeting to order.

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

Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Leola and thank you for coming back so promptly and Pam and David for being willing to do this.

And Pam and I talked over lunch and we're going to go for about 10 - maybe 15 minutes of questions to then move through the rest of the agenda this afternoon.

So, I will open up the questions to the Panel. Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: Thanks, Mary.

I've studied O*NET a lot and you've presented before. So, I'm pretty clear on process and procedure. So, I don't have a lot of questions, but I have two things that sort of -- I was curious about.

One was not the business liaisons, but the analyst position. Can you tell me what they're getting per hour or what pay level they're at if you're allowed to?

And the other thing was you said something about you recognize that some calls to certain industries take longer than others. Do you track which industries are more difficult and why?

I was just curious about those two things.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Okay. You might have to take this. I don't know.

MR. RIVKIN: The HUMRRO analysts, I'm not exactly sure what they're getting paid down. I know about five years ago they were getting about $25 an hour. So, they're paid, you know, as hourly employees, temporary hourly employees.

In terms of particular industries being more difficult, it's really more like -- I think it's clearer to say it's particular occupations.

So, occupations for, for instance, these new and emerging occupations. They're probably harder to find. The POCs are probably less familiar with them. So, I think those occupations are more difficult to find.

Interestingly, we are now in the second stage of our data collection. Where we've collected most occupations one time, now we're collecting for the second time. So, really using that experience to help us find the occupation.

So, when you're talking about keeping track and which occupations were difficult to use, yes, I mean they did keep track of that and now, they have more information. They know better where to go, et cetera.

MEMBER HARDY: I'm sorry. I know we're limited on time for questions, but you are tracking information on those occupations that were difficult and now, they're becoming easier to get information on as you know what you're looking for is what you're saying?

MR. RIVKIN: Yes.

MEMBER HARDY: If that's the case, then as the next wave comes through and you're looking at a new set of new emerging occupations, what are you changing based on the knowledge of how this worked the first time with the new and emerging occupations?

MR. RIVKIN: It really depends on the particular occupation. So, I don't think we're really changing the protocol because they're new occupations so we haven't been to those before. But, I think in terms of let's say it's within a certain industry so, if it's a health -- a new and emerging health occupation and we had success finding information about new and emerging health occupations at particular websites from particular associations and now, we have a new new and emerging health occupation, we're going to go back to those resources.

So, we've hit those resources the first time for other new and emerging occupations within that industry. We can go back to them and frequently, they're familiar with these new and emerging occupations compared to other folks.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Other questions? Shanan.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: First, I just wanted to kind of send you the same question that I sent out earlier although I think I got the dollar figure at lunch when we were talking.

Obviously, the Department of Labor has multiple primary functions, but the O*NET Center has one which is to conduct this. So, can you put for us or anyone listening in a dollar figure on your total annual budget? What is your operating?

And also talk to us in terms of how many people does it take to make this work? How many business liaisons do you have in addition to the 16 analysts in addition to the members of management you have? You know, how big of an operation is this in order to carry out your major -- your job?

And then I have a follow-up question and I noticed on the slide that you indicate that when it comes to quality checking the data provided by the analyst, you follow-up and look at their agreement on the importance scale, but not the level scale and I'd like for you to speak to why you look at the importance scale and not the level scale. Although I'm guessing it has something to do with the scales, but beyond that, what might be the difficulties inherent in that? Because obviously, within a disability adjudicative framework for occupational information, level is a very important factor. The level, the complexity, the degree to which individuals perform things.

So, what should we be aware of as we create scale? So, look at that. That might be reflected in your current reasons for doing things the way you do them.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: Let me just speak to the amount that we funded each year. It's about 6 million a year for the entire operation.

MR. RIVKIN: And then again, just so you know, that includes the data collection, dissemination. You know, many different facets of the O*NET project not just collecting data. There are multiple websites. There's training and et cetera. So, it's not just collecting data.

In terms of business liaisons, the number of business liaisons we had, it ranges from eight to 20 over the years depending on the workload.

For instance, right now, we're collecting more occupations than usual because of ARRA findings. We've got more occupations in the pipeline. So, we're full staff now. Up to 20.

In terms of the overall project staffing, I can't really give you a solid number. At the O*NET Center, we have about six full-time people. We have about I think four staff members from NC State University who are on site and then RTI has, you know, off the top of my head, I would say they had, you know, ten to 15 people working on this project at some level, but in terms of, you know, hard numbers, I can't really give you, you know, like the big picture.

What I will say is it's far fewer than

I expected. Over time especially. Because a lot of it is mechanized. Like I am amazed how much work business liaison can get done and how many occupations that they can deal with at a given time.

So, to your question about -- you're talking about the analyst ratings and using the importance scale for the reliability issues. We used the importance scales because it was meaningful to us.

If you actually look at the reliability information, initially, when we developed the information and developed the training and developed these evaluation features, if you actually -- if you look at the reliability of the level compared to the importance, there really wasn't that much of a difference. So, it wasn't like we went for one because they were very similar as opposed to being different, so, in our work.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: I guess I could say well maybe some of that's common method variance or common -- there's only 16 people doing it. So, there's probably some correlation being built in there from that. There's a possibility.

Speaking to the last part of my -- well, actually, one more -- two questions. You're right. I never ask one. Somebody's asked that.

What should we learn from that then? I guess was my -- what should SSA learn from what you've learned in this regard for collecting data that's important to us?

And my second question is why to date does O*NET Center still not release their raw data to academic researchers for study?

MR. RIVKIN: What I think we've learned is that training is critical. It really matters that you train well, that you train thoroughly. I heard people talking about doing e-learning and things and we kind of do a combination with our different -- with different staff, but we do find because it is a small group and we only have 16 analysts it was really important for us to do face-to-face training especially initially.

These people have been with us, most of them, for a number of years. So, over time, we do more types of e-learning. But, we do have refresher training where we do do face-to-face training and I think it really depends on the content and what you're doing and I think what you guys are planning to do, especially if you do onsite job observations, I think that's going to be, you know, quite a task for people to take on and to really make sure that, you know, you train people and that you evaluate the performance before they get out there in the field and refresher training is really -- you know, that's really important.

I also think it's kind of interesting that -- the types of people that you select obviously is really important, but that for us at least, in terms of the business liaisons, we were surprised about the different types of people that can be successful.

So, in terms, you kind of have to expand your view about who could, you know, possibly, you know, do this kind of work.

And what was your other question? Oh.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: Releasing data for research.

MR. RIVKIN: Again, that's really not a decision that's made at the O*NET Center.

A couple of things. One, OMB would not allow us to do that. BLS would not allow us to do that and then also, it turns out that at RTI they have an internal group that reviews the data collections and their internal group also did not recommend us releasing that -- the individual level data and it's interesting because, you know, this has been an issue for a long time and, you know, truthfully, from our perspective at the O*NET Center, you know, in my mind, well, it would be really hard to track back, you know, to these individuals and we don't have any of that information. But, you know, OMB says no and BLS says no.

And, in fact, we write -- in our OMB package the last time around they came back to us again and they wanted more assurances about the confidentiality of the data and so, it's not just us. I mean I think there are a lot of surveys out there that probably have faced, you know, similar issues.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. I think we have time for one more question. Well, let's do two. We have Juan and we have Allan and I think we need to cut it off. Thank you.

MEMBER SANCHEZ: Well, I know O*NET relatively well. Right. And I think I probably asked this question before. A follow-up to Shanan's question on the confidentiality. I'm sending an email to Pam and I remember asking the same question to David in a different forum.

The email to Pam has three articles that appear in places that are not really obscure. Journals. The Journal of Applied Psychology, Personnel Psychology. These are three articles that report using the individual level data. Right.

And I know they -- he's a friend of

mine and he tells me he thinks he was authorized to publish this because he is part of the O*NET Development Center. Right.

I remember asking this question. I've been told that you guys didn't know anything about it.

Is it the same deal or I guess, you know, I'd like to know what the rules are. Okay. I'm sorry.

MR. RIVKIN: Yes, I know you've been asking this question for many years.

He should not have published that information. We had conversations with him, but the data is not for publication and that was an error.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. No more. Pam is on the panel. I know there are a variety of other questions that you will have over time and so, thank you for the opportunity to present in terms of points of contact and I appreciate your time.

Okay. Now, we're moving in kind of the

business end of the meeting and we have the subcommittees that are going to be presenting their reports and I'll turn it over to our Chair for the Job Analysts Subcommittee. Go ahead, Deb.

MEMBER LECHNER: Thanks, Mary.

A copy of the Job Analysts Subcommittee Report has been passed around and just to summarize our past activities, we conducted job analysis of a cashier's position in August of 2010. Yes, that's not exactly -- 1010 is not exactly right. That's a typo and the whole purpose of this activity was to compare and contrast and sample job analysis methodologies that are used by different fields. Physical therapy being one, vocational experts being another and IO psychologists being another and so, we conducted that analysis.

We provided a report and a presentation to the Panel on the comparative approaches to job analysis and then our immediate upcoming activity is to provide written feedback, comments and recommendations on ICF's final report on calls 001 and 002 and we are looking to Social Security for some guidelines on deadlines for that submission.

And in the future, we anticipate participating and/or providing feedback on the two roundtables that are being facilitated by ICF. One on the work taxonomy after SSA has the draft taxonomy in early to mid-February 2012 and then the other on data collection procedures for information on the draft taxonomy is typically scheduled for March and then SSA also has scheduled us to have two additional calls in Fiscal Year 2012 and these calls will address the development of recruitment training and certification and then the development of a web-based tracking training website.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any questions of Deb for the Job Analysts Subcommittee?

All right. Allan, if you would provide a report in terms of the Sampling Subcommittee.

MEMBER HUNT: Thank you. This is our inaugural report and we had our inaugural meeting on Tuesday and it always feels funny when half the people here are members of the subcommittee, but anyway.

Just so you all know, the members are myself, Abigail, David, John Juan and Pam.

I would like to think in terms of incorporating some of the things that the Research Subcommittee did previously as part of this because we were building towards thinking about sampling methodologies really for a little over a year now starting with the earlier visits to BLS and Census which at least since I got to go were very, very significant and very meaningful and then the follow-up that Mark and some other staff got to do at Census to get a better feel for the level of detail of the occupational information that they are currently collecting.

So, acquiring some familiarity with the OES and the ACS as a starter, invited testimony from those two organizations obviously was a direct result of that activity and now, we've had two presentations in a sense with the field analysis or field data collection being described in this meeting.

I think the review of SSA's own data was also motivated by those activities. So, I think I would like to incorporate all that as to the credit of the Sampling Subcommittee in the past even though it didn't exist.

So, we are now looking at the Phase 1 document in draft form which we just saw this week and feedback will be forthcoming from that. It was presented to the subcommittee Tuesday and we are talking about a way to incorporate expertise from sampling experts into our consideration of different strategies with the possibility of a roundtable with some national experts.

The biggest challenge in my mind for that is to get a short, brief, but succinct and meaningful description of this project that's something you could send out to people and say here's what we want you to think about. So, we'll be working on that.

And, of course, we always need to

remind ourselves while we're going towards a recommendation for a sampling strategy or a sampling plan that could be tested next fiscal year, we have to carefully follow the deliberations with the Work Taxonomy and Instrumentation Committee and also the Field Job Analysts Subcommittee because obviously these things have to all come together at the same point in time and be prepared to be implemented on the test bed, the prototype OIS sampling plan next year.

So, I think we have our work cut out for us and we are just starting, but we're promising great things.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Allan. Are there any questions for Allan or the subcommittee?

And it's a good thing we're only half because we couldn't get -- more than half would be over quorum and that would be illegal under FACA.

So, anyway, let's go ahead and go to

the Taxonomy/Instrumentation and Shanan.

Sorry. I missed User Needs. I'm looking at my checks. Go ahead. It's User Needs. Janine, you're on.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Thank you. You've received our written report.

The User Needs & Relations Subcommittee includes myself as Chair with Members Thomas Hardy, Robert Fraser and Andrew Wakshul.

We held a telephonic meeting on May 25th and an in-person meeting on September 20 while we were here.

Activity since the last report include Panel presentations at several conferences including the National Association of Disability Representatives and the National Association of Disability Examiners.

At our meeting September 20th, we received a policy and procedure statement regarding acknowledgement of email comments to both the Panel and the project websites. We also began a discussion of the use of electronic and social media to insure information on the project is clear, concise and limits the possibility of misinformation.

Upcoming activities for the next period include presentations that are being scheduled for three different regional IARP Conferences and we'll also be reviewing the upcoming, I have lost my space here, the upcoming Phase 1 Communications Strategy Report of Ms. Debra Tidwell-Peters and then we do have our upcoming -- we have two State IARP Conferences that two of us will be presenting at and Mary and Sylvia will be presented at the fall IARP Full Forensic Conference.

Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any questions of Janine? Okay.

I think I do want to clarify something on the record in terms of conference presentations by Panel Members.

We are presenting because we are there or we are being reimbursed by funds. Not SSA funds.

So, when I presented at NADE, I paid my way to NADE. NADE did not pay my way and SSA did not pay my way.

So, I think we need to clarify that on the record that we are being requested to present and some of us are already going to be at these conferences and in those instances where we are not, the requesting organization is providing funding for travel and those are going through ethics reviews at SSA whenever there's a question in terms of reimbursement.

So, now, if we would have our Chair for Taxonomy and Instrumentation. Shanan.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: Okay. I'm sorry if you don't have a copy. I apparently didn't get it to our Federally Designated Officer quite early enough for everyone to have a copy and have them distributed.

But, the new membership or the current membership for the Taxonomy and Instrumentation Subcommittee includes myself as Chair as well as Abigail Panter, Andrew Wakshul, David Schretlen, Deborah Lechner and Timothy Key.

Since the July 2011 quarterly meeting which is basically when we were rearranged, we have not had terribly many activities that have occurred that included all members up until September 20th when we had our first face-to-face meeting the other day.

However, individual members have been contributing on an as-needed basis to the efforts of the OVRD staff. Specifically, members have provided feedback regarding the various ICF works in progress and future ICF activities.

At our meeting on September 20th, the subcommittee was briefed by OVRD staff regarding their ongoing efforts as they relate to the development of the OIS taxonomy and the work analysis instrument.

So, between now and the next quarterly OIDAP meeting, the Taxonomy and Instrumentation Subcommittee is looking forward to the following activities.

One, we look forward to reviewing and

working in consultation regarding the products which result from the efforts of the two industrial organizational psychology consultants who are currently with OVRD.

We also look forward to providing feedback on any research plan documents crafted within OVRD as they relate to the ongoing -- the EC sorting activity. We hope to provide input toward the development with future calls to the contractors.

And we very much look forward to working with the newly hired lead research psychologist whenever he or she comes on staff and the entire OVRD's team in any manner that facilitates their efforts.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any questions of Shanan in terms of the activities of the Taxonomy/Instrumentation Subcommittee?

Okay. And guess what? We are directly on time and now, it's time for a bit of deliberation before we formally go into public comment and I thought we might be running at time zones.

So, I'm going to invite Sylvia again to come at the very beginning of the deliberation to see if there are any questions of her in terms of anything we heard today as it relates to SSA before we go into deliberation and then public comment.

Thank you, Sylvia. Are there any questions of Sylvia? Anything that came up in today's discussions that we particularly want to address?

Pam, are you looking like you want to ask a question? Okay.

I have a question and I think yesterday and today, we've -- and the day before, we've been very cognizant of the fact that this is moving into a different stage. The project is.

Shanan just mentioned that they're looking forward to working with the lead scientist. We're all looking forward to meeting this lead scientist when this person is hired.

Besides the lead scientist, what's the

size of the staff right now and how has it changed within the last year and what do you anticipate it to look like over the next year as SSA moves into some very important stages of this project?

MS. KARMAN: Okay. Well, currently, we have ten employees not including myself. So, with me, that would be 11. With the senior research psychologist, that would add one more person full-time. That would be 12 including me.

Two of our individuals on our staff are students which means that in both cases they are not full-time permanent in other words. So, in one case, the individual is not full-time every week. In the other case, the individual is full-time but not beyond a year.

So, in other words, really, there are eight people on the staff that are full-time.

So, I guess what has changed over the last year, a couple of people have moved off the staff and moved on to other areas within Social Security and we did also obtain -- one of the staff was -- worked for us under an intergovernmental personnel agreement. That individual's no longer with us through that agreement. That agreement came to an end.

The intergovernmental personnel agreements by the way are a wonderful way to bring expertise onto the staff. One of the drawbacks is or at least one of the limitations is that an intergovernmental personnel agreement really can only last maximum two years and also one needs funding just as one would need funding for certainly full-time or even part-time staff.

It's funded in a different way. We actually pay directly for it as opposed to it coming out of our personnel allotment, but nonetheless, one needs to have funding in order to do it.

So, I'm hesitant to say what I anticipate the year to come to look like in terms of change with regard to additional staff. Because, you know, the funding circumstances for not only our project, but frankly all of Social Security is -- you know, it's not an easy circumstance right now.

So, in addition to the senior research psychologist, we do not have any other hiring authority. So.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And of your staff, so, eight of them are full-time. Four of those are leads to the subcommittees and so, part of the work they do is help support the activities of the subcommittees. Is that correct?

MS. KARMAN: Yes, that is correct. So, a fair amount of our work is, you know, of course, split up among the two different branches.

We've got a Program Integration Branch and a Design and Development Branch. A lot of the technical work, research design occurs in the Design Development. A lot of the usability and communications and how do we integrate with SSA's existing disability process and programs is with the other branch. So, pretty much the two areas are pretty taken up what we're doing right now.

So, even to bring on contractors, I mean honestly you really would need -- you know, someone has to really be able to monitor that and work with the contractors. Those of you who work with Debra Tidwell-Peters and Elizabeth Kennedy and some of the other staff on the ICF call orders this last year can certainly -- you know, may have a sense of that. That there's a lot of interaction that goes on between our staff and the contractors so that they can really have a good sense of what we're needing.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: But, the two consultants are not included in that number. Is that correct?

MS. KARMAN: No, the two consultants are not included in that number.

Again, we don't pay for staffing in that way and because they -- what we do when we have a contract especially a consultant contract you have so many hours put towards a -- through the contract for a particular individual's time and so, we do not have them on board as if they were staff. They do not report to me. For example, they don't report in essence to the managers.

There is a contracting officer and they must work with the contracting officer technical representative. It's like a project officer which -- similar to the position that Pam was describing for oversight for the contract. So, they, in essence, go through that individual and then we work with them on a variety of assignments.

So, but we do not include them in our staffing per se. I mean they are considered resource.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Andy.

MEMBER WAKSHUL: What is the impact of a potential Government shutdown next week if the Congress doesn't come to terms with that? If you know. For this group.

MS. KARMAN: For the FACA group? You mean for the Panel?

The Designated Federal Officer would be in a position to provide you with information about that, but I can tell you that when we were confronted with that last spring, if the agency shuts down, the Panel Members are not to email each other or us or do any kind of work.

But, we can provide you through our DFO additional information about that.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Actually, we did address that for the April 8th potential shutdown and we had a conference that Sylvia was suppose to speak at NADE and we addressed that very early on, very directly and we got some feedback from OGC and if somebody had emailed me about the OIS or OIDAP while we were on Government shutdown and I answered that email, it would be an illegal act.

So, we are literally to do nothing.

Go ahead, John.

MEMBER CRESWELL: Others may know the answer to this question, but when roundtables are put together, is there a cost for that and does that mean bringing in people, external specialists that are then given an honorarium of some kind?

MS. KARMAN: Okay. Good question. Yes, we do include in our budget estimates around the need for roundtables and we, when possible, do pay -- include the cost estimates also for honorarium or in the case of Panel Members because we pay the Panel Members a fee, you know, at the rate that's assigned for FACA work, that gets included, too. So, yes.

And I can't tell you what the cost necessarily might be because it depends on the number of people, the number of days, how much we anticipate they may need to be reviewing materials in advance or even responding.

Like sometimes, we've -- for example, Dr. Schretlen will remember this. Dave, when we had the Mental Cognitive Roundtable and also the Skills Roundtable. I think you will remember that, too, Tom.

We came to the table with a four-square document. Well, people had to read things in advance and then had the discussion and then, you know, they went home and the chairs of both subcommittees asked people to respond back with, you know, answers to questions.

So, depending on what the circumstances

are, it's -- but that also has a cost. Yes.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Allan and then Bob.

MEMBER HUNT: I suppose I should know this, but, Sylvia, are there other contracts outstanding other than the ICF one. Do we have more helpers out there that I'm forgetting?

MS. KARMAN: No, I think the only ones that we have at this point is we have the business purchase agreement with ICF International and then we have the two consultant contracts with Dr. Morgesen and Dr. Harvey and that's it. That's all I know about.

MEMBER FRASER: Sylvia, do we have ongoing studies on claimants' occupational history both receiving SSDI or being rejected in terms of application?

MS. KARMAN: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? I didn't follow it.

MEMBER FRASER: I'm just wondering are we continuing to do ongoing research or analysis of the occupational profiles for claimants receiving and being rejected in their application for SSDI?

MS. KARMAN: Okay. So, at this stage, we're making a valiant attempt to wrap up the occupational medical vocational study and so, your question would be beyond that. How much would we be continuing to keep up with that and I think it's a good question.

Certainly, as the agency moves more of its claims over time into an electronic case analysis tool, that might make the review or the investigation of information about work history for individuals who've applied for disability a lot easier for us to do than to develop, you know, an instrument, data collection instrument and then actually, you know, find reviewers and get them to go through actual case files. Albeit, they're electronic. But, the data are not collected at that point electronically.

But, we do have electronic case analysis tools, in effect, ECAT throughout the nation and as more claims are done and entered into that tool at least at the initial level, we'll be in a better position to do that. So, I do think that that's certainly information we could continue to take a look at.

I certainly could see where that would be valuable for ongoing maintenance and research. Absolutely. Because then, you know, as you begin to see trends or changes in what applicants are reporting as their work, that should give you some suggestion about what possible changes or trends in general.

But, probably, I think I'm going to be pretty safe in saying we may not be doing that until at least we get through the first pilot. You know, at which point, when we have some data, then we'd probably want to do some comparisons.

MEMBER FRASER: Thanks.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: David.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Sylvia, when I look at the number of tasks that are included in the time line of upcoming activities over the next year or two, it's a very, very long list and the staffing now has either not increased or effectively slightly decreased and I'm just wondering how realistic is it to be able to continue all the activities required for this project with this level of staffing and if it's not adequate, is that something that this Panel needs to take a stand on or communicate to the Commissioner about?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: At this point, I think we have more people on the Panel than they have on staff.

MS. KARMAN: I certainly think that when we bring on board the senior research psychologist and we begin to see, you know, what the effective division of labor will be among our managers and the staff with that individual in place and how we can move things forward because that person hopefully will be in a very good position to kind of help us address a number of questions and issues, you know, we may be needing to take several weeks to go hunt down and that person may already know, you know, the answers to some of those things.

So, right there, I think, you know, before I could really fully answer your question, I would need to have that person on board and see how that's working.

But, even with that, I do think that as we are mapping out the dependencies for the activities that we know we need to conduct this coming fiscal year in 2012 I think within the next few weeks, we're going to know pretty well just how difficult it would be for us to meet, you know, all of those goals at least on paper.

I mean that would not count things that come up that you cannot predict. You know, like being shutdown for a couple of weeks or whatever which I am not expecting to have happen, but you never know.

But, I do think that in a few weeks we should really be in a better position to be able to gauge that better.

We did the best we could in terms of trying to map out a strategy that would show the public as well as our monitoring authorities and others, you know, within the agency that we have in mind, you know, significant tasks to accomplish in the next 18 months that could really make -- give this work an enormous amount of momentum and I think to be able to do that in the next 18 months would be I think a success for us even if we don't finish everything that we've outlined.

You know, the idea was to have enough of momentum moving forward that people could really see that, you know, we had a plan. We've been listening to what the Panel has been recommending and, you know, we're trying to take all of that information together and operationalize it. But, you raise a good point and I'm concerned, but we'll -- it remains to be seen yet. So.

MEMBER SCHRETLEN: Well, I'm concerned as well. Because I mean I think that part of why I as one panelist signed on was the thought that what SSA was going to create here would be a model of its kind. Would be the best occupational information system and it concerns me that if this is starved for the resources that not only would we lose momentum but that we might not be able to help Social Security come up with a very usable and dependable product.

And so, I think the sooner we can get some information from you about how realistically you can move forward with all the things that are planned with this staffing or what you'd need, it seems to me that that would be important for us as a Panel to be aware of.

MS. KARMAN: I would like to sort of add onto that that I really don't see it as a like all or nothing. You know, I do think that even if we are -- because we are not fully staffed as many in Federal Government today, Federal agencies are probably not seeing the kind of staffing that they need to get their work done in total, I don't see that as well, that means that the entire project would necessarily fail. I just think that it may be that some aspects of it won't move as quickly as others.

Certainly, you know, for example, before we can make some major decisions with sampling, we've got some decisions that we need to make with taxonomy and with the number of people that we have that we can put toward it even with the contractors. It may be that, you know, we will need to take those questions up first and so, finish that before you get to something else. Whereas, right now, we're trying to move as much as we can along concurrently.

So, you know, I just think that it -- that's kind of how I'm seeing it. That it is not so much that it wouldn't represent an effort where you're still trying to -- the agency I think is very dedicated to having this work or we would not have gotten the authority to hire a lead scientist which I'm really happy about. So, nice.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I think that was a great endorsement from the Commissioner on the project to lift the hiring freeze to hire that lead scientist for the project. So, I think that's wonderful.

Are there any other areas? Anything else anybody wants to ask Sylvia?

Okay. Thank you, Sylvia.

I think Shanan said it well yesterday when I started this process in terms of deliberation, but we have nine minutes before we have to break.

Definitely when we have a public comment period, we try to respect that time period and we have two public commenters set up.

So, we have a few minutes before we definitely need to break the deliberation process for that part of our meeting, but are there areas of deliberation anybody wants to take up now and then we'll break for the public comment.

Are we deliberated out? Is that what I'm hearing? I'm getting a lot of acknowledgement on that.

So, I know that Leola spoke with the two public commenters to see if we did run early if they would be willing to come on and provide their public comment early and got an affirmation of that.

So, I would like to welcome Dr. Amy Vercillo. She is the representative from the International Association of Rehabilitation Providers.

She is representing an organization. Therefore, she will have ten minutes.

Welcome, Dr. Vercillo.

DR. VERCILLO: Good afternoon.

As Mary said, I am representing the International Association Rehabilitation Providers who we are ultimately going to be one of the major end users of this new Occupational Information System.

I also happen to be the National Chair of the Social Security Vocational Experts Association within IARP. So, that is the 1200 Social Security Vocational Experts that will use this system within the adjudication process.

So, certainly, the organization as a whole who works in a variety of disability adjudication processes, long-term disability, ERISA, personal injury and other settings where we use currently the DOT in combination with other occupational information systems to comment on the impact disability has on individuals' abilities to work, to do past work, to do other work, to engage in work on a sustained basis in the labor market is something that we as a stakeholder use on a daily basis and so, we are very excited and interested and waiting with baited breath regarding the new OIS.

So, I did want to say thank you again for the Panel and for all of your work.

And to just be able to comment a little bit about, you know, one issue that was brought up really in the prior meeting about the -- to be able to have a look at some of the duplicated list of the factors and I understand that that has not been all those 500 factors that some of the stakeholders had commented that are being used to take a look at what is going to be analyzed and what is going to be included. That I think for many of the stakeholders it will be -- it would be helpful to get an idea -- to take a look at some of -- to take a look at the duplicated list with a caveat that this is not a final list.

So, that the information process is the factors are coming out, feedback is going in and then that stays a dynamic process because I think that and the job analysis whether it is from a piling standpoint or when we're actually at the point of looking at hiring the job analysts, taking a look at how that -- being able to give feedback on that process.

In the other issues, as far as the strategies for the training and the certifying and the recruiting of the job analysts, I do think one comment I had certainly and in listening to both OIS -- the Department of Labor and Census' presentations that it is very often -- I know even for us where we have business liaisons and we have job -- it's a very different set of skills business liaisons and job analysts. So, that individuals that can convince businesses to let individuals come in and do job analysis, many times that's a different set of skills than individuals who can rigorously conduct a job analysis and meet scientific criteria or specific guidelines in analyzing jobs.

So, that for us where we regularly have to use job analysis in disability adjudication processes and we're in a different situation because when we're contacting the employer, they have a vested reason to be willing to cooperate with us. It's either they have an employee that's out of work and they want to take a look at well, what was the job? Can the person do the job? Can we modify the job?

But, in situations where we are doing larger scale job analysis for research gathering reasons, it's a very different set of skills doing the job analysis and the business liaison part of it.

So, I think that the model that OES speaks of may be something -- that those sets of skills to try to combine them it's going to be difficult to get people that can do both of those.

You know, the other issue is certainly looking at some of the -- in both the taxonomy and the scaling, I think, you know, making sure that these issues are measurable. I mean I can tell you certainly in a hearing that is the biggest -- one of the biggest issues that we are always dealing with is the manner, the scaling on this and how it is measured and often, it is not just in given -- when Social Security vocational experts are given hypotheticals.

You're combining a variety of factors that are not certainly now addressed with the DOT and even if we included all 500 of these other factors, they're not all going to be included because in a hearing you're dealing with an n of one. You're dealing with that individual in that particular occupation and whether it is in comparing their prior work or in looking at other work they may be able to do, part of the reason that you have a vocational expert there is that the DOT is not going to be able to answer the question. Is not going to be able to answer all those questions.

And the new OIS is not going to be able to answer all of those questions because you have to be able to combine some aspects of -- well, if a person -- you know, how often does a person have to interact with coworkers, with others. Are they working in tandem? If they can't get along with supervisors, if they can't -- and the degree to which anybody has to get along with a supervisor is not going to be part of an occupational information system.

But, it is part of a disability adjudication system when you have 65 percent of current hearings that are nonphysical disabilities. That they are -- you know, that they are psychiatric disabilities.

So, a lot of these types of factors I think, you know, they are certainly -- are going to be -- have to be addressed in hearings on a regular basis, but I think we can't expect that the OI System is going to be able to address all of them.

But, for those that can be measured, it's very important that they are not just surveyed, not just estimated, but that they are actually measured, lifting, carrying distances, because that will drive how these are used in other areas. Again, in disability, retirement, worker's comp, long-term disability. Let alone this huge disability adjudication system within Social Security.

So, again, I wanted to just thank the Panel for all of these work and thank -- we certainly are encouraged regarding the continuing funding for the project and for the Department. We are very encouraged about the addition of the lead scientist. That coming and somebody from the Department of Labor being on the Panel is very interesting and exciting. Welcome.

So, thank you and that was it. That was all my comments.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any questions from the Panel to Amy?

And I just wanted to clarify. Pam is

on the Panel as Pam and not as a representative of the Department of Labor. So, I wanted to make sure that was clear.

Okay. Thank you, Amy, for your presentation.

Oh, wait a minute. There is a question from Allan.

MEMBER HUNT: It may not be a question that I should ask you, but weren't we promised some additional analysis of the IARP data on the occupations?

DR. VERCILLO: To my knowledge, that -- I don't know. I know that the other two people that were working on that had it combined, but I don't know that they have written up the narrative. Is my understanding.

So, they did have from the survey done last spring where they had the Social Security VEs comment on not only what was the complainant's past work as reported in the record and what was their past work as reported in the hearing. So, that's -- it's my understanding they have that data set, but I don't know that they have completed the analysis.

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

Okay. Amy, thank you. Appreciate it.

And we have another public comment. This is Dr. Rick Wickstron and Rick has provided public comment to us before and I just want to point out that there's a doctor before his name now. So, congratulations.

You are representing an organization. So, you'll have ten minutes.

DR. WICKSTRON: Thank you for this opportunity to speak before you and I do represent the American Physical Therapy Association. I'm the Chair of the Practice and Payment Policy Section for Occupational Health and one of my projects is, of course, staying involved and tracking this important initiative, but also leading a task force for updating our ergonomics guideline as well which is quite relevant to much of the work and presentations that went on today.

Again, I'm very impressed with the accomplishments during the past year given the staffing constraints and I just want to express appreciation for that continued work. This is so important and vital to the work that we do in occupational health.

I appreciate the presentations by ICF and look forward to the opportunity to review the full report and thank you for letting us that it's going to be available on their website to download.

It's understandable in hearing some of the questions about that report that meaningful recommendations were limited by not having a work taxonomy identified in the constructs that are to be measured. So, it's good due diligence from my perspective, but we really need to have the duplicated list to provide further feedback on as I think the critical next or very early high priority in the process.

Consideration of the data collection tools certainly needs to balance the need for a cost deficiency with the critical need for accurate and meaningful data that improves the process and, therefore, inclusion of the factors needs really to be justified based on whether they're measurable, whether they're functional and served and we provided a number of recommendations related to that in our written commentary in January of 2010.

During this meeting, we had quite a bit of discussion about scaling issues and I think this discussion about scaling even though we've provided a lot of input on that a year or so ago might be premature. I think really we first need to determine how they constructs are best measure and then to group the constructs into similar kinds of measurements.

And, you know, if you just take the DOT strength factor, for example, that factor was developed before really there was any good evidence related to materials handling tasks and many of the linking of occasional versus frequent versus constant doesn't relate anywhere close to how work -- how materials handling tasks are looked at now. Anything above 70 pounds now is considered to be a hazard. So, the term heavy and very heavy needs to be applied to our current evidence and so, that needs to be tied into that factor.

But, perhaps a simpler solution would be to have the pilot actually measure the materials handling requirements on those tasks and then to look at that data, that hard measurable data, whether it's pounds and force or whether it's minutes.

If it's an amount of time that's required and I think if you think of a construct like crouching, for example, any of us crouching more than a half hour a day would be probably screaming in our knees, but if you measure the number of minutes that a person crouches at any one time or the number of minutes total the person crouches during the day and then you bring that data back after a pilot study, then I think you can use that to develop more useful level kinds of distinctions.

So, perhaps engaging in too much debate over levels might be premature. We should probably just look at well, what can we actually measure and quantitate and just get that information and use that information to justify our levels.

So, collecting quantifiable data is really the priority and then making sure on those factors that we can ask questions so that the factors kind of drive what happens. For example, is standing required on your job and if so, how long do you have to stand at one time and how long do you have to stand in total during your entire work day and the same approach can be applied to lifting.

Finally, I think we need to emphasize the importance for the Social Security Administration to also consider the needs of other disability benefit systems and occupational health professionals that have to evaluate claimants to provide information that relates to the job demands and this important because failure of OIS to be translated to other systems will create much confusion and burden on all those who participate in those systems and ultimately, you know, affect probably a larger portion of a people that might apply for Social Security benefits.

The approach to functional job analysis, you know, that was done by the DOT was a functional -- it was a functional job analysis method and that's been worldwide in terms of acceptance and it had both components of structured interview as well as measurable observations and, therefore, it really is needed. This is a useful tool that can benefit employers.

Employers are one customer for having a properly constructed analysis in that the employer has a functional job description that helps them address job placement decisions.

It's ultimately going to benefit Social Security Administration as well because it will drive job specific rehab and return to work decisions.

Again, thank you very much for all of your good work and I appreciate the opportunity to provide testimony to you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, Rick.

I will open up questions to the panel. Okay.

Thank you. I appreciate your time. Okay.

We are now moving into the portion of our meeting where we're going into administrative business and everybody got a copy of the minutes, both the May minutes and the July minutes. So, let's take them separately.

Let's go ahead and take a look at the May minutes. You have received them. Are there any corrections to the minutes?

Tom.

MEMBER HARDY: As usual. Sorry. First off, I wanted to say that the quality of these minutes was superb. I truly congratulate the work that went into this. It was a wonderful reflection of our discussions. Very nicely done. So, thank you for that.

I literally only have three comments or suggestions.

On page 5, second paragraph, full paragraph, last sentence, also noted timeliness of the Executive Branch's memo on scientific integrity. I'd like to see a cite for that. Either date or a site so down the road we would know what that was referring to. As a suggestion. That's one.

Page 8, overview of O*NET data collection activities, it looks like the third full paragraph. It said "During time, the National Research Council began reviewing functional DOT and their findings included." I think that should be concluded. Would make a difference.

And then on page 10, fourth full paragraph, "Dr. Sanchez asked if they were considering ways to make data collection more cost." I think we're missing the word effective.

And then in the same paragraph, three sentences down, there is a current number of 52T. I'm not sure what the T is for.

Those are the only corrections or additions I'd suggestion.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: To page 5, I wasn't clear. You'd like a cite. What do you mean by a cite?

MEMBER HARDY: It just says "Note timeliness of the Executive Branch's memo on scientific integrity." Could we have a date of publication or something like that so that in the future if someone wants to go back and refer to that memo, we can -- it would be easier to find.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: This isn't a paper. It's a copy of our minutes and if we didn't have that as part of our deliberation. It isn't a paper and so, I just wanted to clarify that.

The other thing I wanted to say is that we are beyond the minutes also putting the actual transcript of these meetings on our website. So, if anybody wants to go back and read actually what was said and wants to go through about 500 pages a day, the information's there. So, this is a summary of what was said there.

So, since there are some recommended changes to the minutes and they're not -- there are corrections to them, if I can have a motion.

MEMBER HARDY: Could I make a motion that the minutes are accepted with the suggested inclusions?

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: I'll second.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

And now, to the July minutes. Janine.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: I have a change. On page 3 under administrative meeting, the second paragraph, Mr. Hardy indicated he had sent corrections to the minutes and Ms. Frugoli said that she planned to send corrections.

I believe that was me that had corrections to the User Needs Report, but Pam, if you remember saying you were going to send corrections, I'll defer to you. But.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I did send corrections to the May minutes. You may as well. Not to the User Needs portion, but to the presentation that we gave.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: So, then it would just need to reflect that both she and I agreed to send corrections.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, I will entertain a motion on these minutes.

MEMBER HARDY: I'd like to make a motion to accept the minutes of the July 27th meeting with the addition suggested by Ms. Holloman.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: I second.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Okay.

And I want to also comment on the minutes. They are very good quality. Great job to the staff who put those together.

Now, we're moving on to the review of future OIDAP meeting dates. As I had mentioned yesterday, over the next fiscal year, we're anticipating face-to-face meetings. One around March or so. The other one around August/September. Those dates are still being finalized.

So, our next meeting will be a telephone conference that has been confirmed. That will be December 7th from noon to 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time. That's a Wednesday and so, that is a confirmed date.

And once we get -- and we do have the June teleconference also date confirmed and that's June 6th from noon to 2:00 p.m. Also a Wednesday and that is Eastern Time.

Unless the Government shuts down at any point along those lines, at least those two dates are set.

So, I would like now to turn to the operating procedures. We had -- whenever we make any changes to the operating procedures during a telephone conference, we have to ratify those changes in our face-to-face meeting and so, in July, we had a vote and it passed unanimously to make three main changes to the operating procedures. They included our charter date since we were rechartered. They included the inclusion of the teleconferences. So, that correctly reflected what we were doing and also a change in absentee voting.

And so, at this time, I would like to see if there are any corrections to that.

If not, if I can have a motion in a second to ratify those changes.

MEMBER FRUGOLI: I move to ratify the changes to the policies and procedures.

MEMBER HUNT: Do you need a second? I second the motion.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor? Okay. Passes unanimously.

Now, there's another issue in terms of the operating procedures and Janine.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Well, as I explained yesterday, in Boston last year, changes were approved to the committee report of the User Needs & Relations Subcommittee.

There was, however, not a vote to incorporate those changes into these operating procedures. So, the sheet you were given yesterday is exactly the wording that was approved in Boston incorporated into the operating procedure.

So, this is not new information. It's the same information you approved, but now, this is the incorporation into the operating procedures.

So, am I all right to make the motion? Okay.

On behalf of the User Needs & Relations Subcommittee, I would like to make a motion to incorporate the previously approved edits to Appendix C of the User Needs & Relations Subcommittee report of September 2010 into the OIDAP Operating Procedures Section 5, Appendix C titled Public Comment.

MEMBER HARDY: I second the motion.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: And I would like to read into the record what that motion actually says so we have a record of this.

The motion says in terms of what you disseminated yesterday: "Members of the public may provide comment to the Panel on issues relating to the development of the OIS through in-person testimony at quarterly or teleconference meetings. They may also submit written testimony no longer than five pages at any time by mail to the Official Information Advisory Panel, 6401 Security Boulevard, Operations 3E25, Baltimore, Maryland 21235, by fax to 410-597-4825 or by email at its website oidapssa.gov.

"They will register meeting notices in the Panel's website to provide advance information about upcoming activities, to notify individuals and organizations about opportunities for public comment during Panel meetings and to solicit additional online responses for Panel consideration.

"On occasion, the Panel may request comments on special issue reports that include recommendations, advice and findings on matters associated with its charter. These include formal advice on project activities or response to an agency request to examine or review specific reports or literature.

"Findings or conclusions reached after examination or investigation of other documents, a findings report is a document that contains statements about authoritative decisions and conclusions. Findings do not necessarily rise to the level of resulting in a recommendation, but may reinforce, clarify or expand existing recommendations.

"Recommendations are advisory counsel on a course of action. Under FACA, recommendations are recorded and tracked under GSA for response by SSA. Recommendations may be on technical, administrative, procedural or other issues related to the development of the OIS and as a result of examinations from findings.

"When reports include specific recommendations to SSA under the Panel's FACA designation, the Panel will notify external stakeholders by all means available including by Federal Register notices, email and the OIS project and OIDAP websites of the opportunity to comment on its draft report. The Panel will allow sufficient time to receive and process comments before deliberating and voting on the recommendation."

So, that is what is being proposed by User Needs. I will entertain any discussion on this.

The only comment I have on it as I was reading through it, I didn't catch it when I read it before, I don't think the Panel can say that we will disseminate the information through the OIS project website. I think we can only disseminate it through our own.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: Can that wording be changed to indicate that the Panel would recommend that the information be disseminated through OIS as well as our website?

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: A recommendation is a recommendation. Somebody doesn't have to take it.

So, then the wording would change to including by Federal Register, email and OIDAP websites. Recommendations to distribute through OIS project website. I don't know how you would change that.

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: We could add a sentence at the very end of the paragraph that said we would also recommend the information be posted on the OIS project website.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, then it would read email and OIDAP websites and then at the very end, it is recommended -- the Panel would recommend that this information also be disseminated through the OIS project website. Is that what I just heard?

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: Correct.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: So, are you

amending your motion?

MEMBER HOLLOMAN: I am amending my motion to accept the new document into the operating procedures with the change as noted.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Does a person have a second and agree with that amendment?

MEMBER HUNT: I agree with the amendment.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Are there any further discussions?

Okay. I will call the vote. All those in favor? Anybody opposed? And I will record that that was a unanimous vote by the Panel. Okay.

We are now onto agenda items for the next quarterly meeting. As I indicated, the next quarterly meeting will be a teleconference and so, I wanted to see some of the areas for discussion that the Panel would like to see addressed at that particular meeting that we should consider.

I'll open up the mike.

MEMBER GWALTNEY GIBSON: I believe that

the Panel will certainly want to be briefed on any products that have resulted from the consultation with the IO psychologist consultant and the advice they're currently working with the staff on.

So, I think briefing on that area would be very important to us.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Allan.

MEMBER HUNT: I'm still eager to see the results of the occ med voc study. So, I really want to see that on the agenda.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Other areas? That might cover the two hours.

Okay. I think we've come to a point in our agenda where we are ready to conclude. We're 12 minutes to the hour. Right on it.

Before I turn this meeting over to Leola, I have a request from staff to make sure we turn in our badges, that we make sure we put our names in the front pocket -- not our badges but our names in the front pocket of our folders and that we turn in our time sheets.

So, with those details aside and

hearing no additional business, I'll turn the meeting over to our Designated Federal Officer Leola Brooks for adjournment.

MS. BROOKS: If there are no objections, the meeting will adjourn. Hearing no objections, we are adjourned until our teleconference scheduled December 7th, 2011. Thank you.

CHAIR BARROS-BAILEY: Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon, at 2:39 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)