Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel
Quarterly Meeting Minutes

Social Security Administration
Double Tree Hotel Memphis Downtown
Memphis, TN
June 9-10, 2010

This document contains the minutes for the quarterly meeting of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel (the "Panel"). This discretionary Panel, established under the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "the FACA"), will report to the Commissioner of the Social Security ("Commissioner"). The Panel will provide independent advice and recommendations on plans and activities to create an occupational information system (OIS) tailored specifically for the adjudicative needs of SSA's disability programs. Specific areas include medical and vocational analysis of disability claims; occupational analysis, including definitions, ratings, capture of physical and mental/cognitive demands of work, and other occupational information critical to SSA's disability programs; data collection; use of occupational information in SSA's disability programs; and other related area(s).

Wednesday, June 9, 2010

Panel Members Present:

> Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D. (*Chair*)
> Gunnar Andersson, M.D., Ph.D.
> Robert T. Fraser, Ph.D.
> Shanan Gwaltney Gibson, Ph.D.
> Thomas A. Hardy, J.D.
> H. Allan Hunt, Ph.D.
> Sylvia E. Karman
> Deborah E. Lechner
> Abigail T. Panter, Ph.D.
> David J. Schretlen, Ph.D.
> Mark A. Wilson, Ph.D.

Call to Order:

Debra Tidwell-Peters, the Designated Federal Officer, called the meeting to order and recognized the Panel's Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey.

Review of Agenda

Mary Barros-Bailey, *OIDAP Chair*

Dr. Barros-Bailey greeted the attendees and noted Nancy Shor, who was the Chair of the User Needs and Relations Subcommittee, resigned from the Panel effective June 1, 2010. Dr. Barros-Bailey explained to telephonic listeners how to access the agenda. She encouraged stakeholders and the public to submit comments and feedback on the Panel's report by the June 30, 2010 deadline.

Dr. Barros-Bailey provided a review of conference events for June 6, 2010 and noted the resignation of Nancy Shor from the OIDAP.

Status on SSA Occupational Information Development Project (Project) Work Plan and Integration with Panel Activities

Sylvia Karman, *Project Director and OIDAP Panel Member*

Ms. Karman provided an overview of project activities since the March 2010 Panel meeting. SSA staff is conducting the Occupational Medical-Vocational Study that will identify occupational, functional, and vocational characteristics of Title II and Title XVI adult disability claimants. The Office of Medical Vocational Expertise reviewed 1,400 initial cases and will soon begin a review of cases at the hearings level. SSA expects to complete the full review by September 2010.

OID staff is close to completing their work on the International Classification System Review. They expect to deliver a draft report in late August.

Due to the Research Subcommittee's excellent feedback on a very early draft of Design Study I, the project staff is reconsidering how to test the feasibility of conducting job analyses using trained job analysts. SSA plans to conduct the study, with the revised study design, in FY 2011.

Project staff and the inter-agency workgroup are drafting a content model for the new OIS. They analyzed the physical elements and are currently developing a list of mental-cognitive data elements they believe most critical to disability evaluation. SSA published a Request for Information and will publish a Request for Proposal this summer. SSA will design a prototype person-side instrument, for use by adjudicators and medical staff participating in testing. Focus groups will provide feedback on the usefulness of the data elements and attendant measures and scales. Information gathered by this study may also inform the development of a work analysis instrument, planned for January 2011. The Ad Hoc group will develop a business process for the recruitment, training, and certification of job analysts.

Project staff is working with the Chief Information Officer to develop web-based methods to promote exchange of information and further interaction with the public. Panel members recorded webinars on frequently asked questions for posting on www.socialsecurity.gov website. Mark Wilson recorded a webinar on relevant definitions and Shanan Gwaltney Gibson presented

an overview of the OIDAP recommendations submitted in its September 2009 report. The User Needs and Relations Subcommittee will review the comments received since January and the agency will respond.

Ms. Karman said the next major step for SSA is bringing on board experts in work measurement and job analysis. She anticipated hiring consultants in vocational rehabilitation and industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology, or a related field. These experts will assist the project staff in developing the prototype person-side instrument and a work analysis instrument.

In response to questions from Dr. Schretlen, Ms. Karman explained that Occupational Medical-Vocational Study reviewers completed a training protocol and pilot study before participating. Reviewers determine job titles by coding the information in file and associating that information with a DOT title. In response to Dr. Fraser's question, she explained that early findings of the International Classification System Review indicate that no classification system exists in other countries acceptable for our purposes. In response to Mr. Hardy's question, Ms. Karman anticipated that staff would complete the draft content model and prototype person-side instrument by end of summer.

Mary Barros-Bailey, Chair

Dr. Barros-Bailey reminded the Panel of Commissioner Astrue's January 19, 2010 letter requesting recommendations in the following areas: (1) development of sampling and data collection plans for research and development; (2) creation of a job analyst recruitment, training, and certification process; (3) establishment of associations or linkages between human functions and requirements for work, and; (4) review of relevant documents or reports that may affect or inform SSA's development of the OIS.

Dr. Barros-Bailey reviewed the Panel's 2010 roadmap activities. The User Needs and Relations Subcommittee, charged with ensuring effective communication and outreach to stakeholders, developed the webinars and a FAQ sheet on the seven general recommendations used in presentations and available on the website. User Needs expanded the use of Federal Register notice and comment procedures and is using SSA's web presence to develop outreach to engage the scientific, research community and the public. Dr. Wilson will present on instrument development and testing, prototypes, the focus groups, and the work analysis instrument. The OIDAP agreed to modify their response to the National Academies of Science report.

In response to Mr. Hardy's question on how the Roadmap addresses the linkages, Ms. Karman said the Panel might address this issue by hosting a Roundtable. Dr. Barros-Bailey said this issue is not scheduled for FY 2010 and responded to a question from Dr. Schretlen by saying the subcommittees would review any public comments that affected their work or recommendations.

Subcommittee Reports

User Needs and Relations Subcommittee

Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *OIDAP Chair*

Dr. Barros-Bailey presented the subcommittee report submitted by Nancy Shor before she resigned. The Subcommittee's identified goals are to ensure the Panel disseminates information on its work and activities through effective lines of communication to potential users and the interested public. It is also responsible for ensuring an open process for soliciting and processing feedback and comments. This is a key component of the Panel's determination to work in a transparent fashion.

Project staff performs outreach activities using an e-mail sign-up list, postings to the OIDAP website, and meeting notices in the Federal Register. Dr. Barros-Bailey thanked Panel members and staff who traveled to give presentations on the development of the new OIS at conferences and organizational meetings. She distributed a list of conferences that members attended and forms developed for speakers to record feedback for planning future presentations. She shared a list of upcoming confirmed speaking commitments and said we have speaking requests thorough FY 2011. Due to time involved in travel, User Needs recommended the Panel develop a protocol for future invitations. Dr. Barros-Bailey suggested that a Panel or staff member would present at national conferences but a web event or webinar may meet the needs of state or local chapters.

Panel members and staff recorded webinars on the Panel and the OIS project. Dr. Gibson will record a future closed-caption webinar entitled "Glossary." User Needs recommended that the OIDAP website be the Panel's Internet home, with links to regulations.gov and other sites. They proposed each subcommittee prepare a FAQ sheet to be posted on the website, and that additional webinars be recorded as needed. The Panel extended the comment period on the recommendations report through June 30, 2010 to accommodate use of the internet site www.regulations.gov for posting comments and feedback. Project staff prepared a synthesis of contents of all comments received before January 1, 2010 and contacted all who previously submitted comments by email or fax to give them the opportunity to post their comments to the regulations.gov website.

Dr. Barros-Bailey noted that by the September 2010 Panel meeting, a synthesis of the contents of all comments received by June 30, 2010 would be complete. Due to overlapping activities, the Research and Taxonomy Subcommittees merged. Sylvia Karman is no longer a member of the Research Subcommittee.

Research Subcommittee

Mark Wilson, *Subcommittee Chair*

The Research Committee provides advice and recommendations in three areas of research planning and methodology issues. In their work, they: 1) suggest research models on the fundamental research questions and their appropriate sequence; 2) plan research-related

roundtables and professional development, and 3) review and comment on research-oriented documents. The subcommittee provided comment and feedback on OIS Design Study I and the NAS report. They are currently broadening and adapting a scientifically oriented research proposal framework to be able to communicate the basic facts of the research in a relatively small but straightforward document.

Ad Hoc Group Report

Deborah Lechner, *Ad Hoc Chair*

The purpose of the Ad Hoc group is to identify issues for SSA that they should keep in mind as they recruit and train job analysts. The Ad Hoc group considered the types of professional disciplines and backgrounds that would be appropriate for job analysts; the optimal geographic distribution of these analysts; recruitment methods; training content; training techniques and their associated costs, and certification requirements. Finally, they discussed job analyst operations and management and employer participation.

The Ad Hoc group identified professions and backgrounds which currently do job analysis and others that may be appropriate for job analysis, including: vocational evaluators, physical and occupational therapists and licensed or certified assistants, human resource professionals, ergonomists, occupational health nurses and physicians, safety professionals, industrial and neuro-psychologists, exercise physiologists, athletic trainers, case managers, and insurance adjusters. Because each of these disciplines approaches job analysis a little differently, analysts may need to be cross-trained in areas outside their primary background.

The initial geographic distribution of job analysts will depend on the requirements of SSA's pilot studies. A variety of recruitment methods are available; they include exhibiting at professional conferences, providing notice in professional newsletters, doing mass emails to professional organizations, publishing on list serves, and mailing directly to members of professional associations or their license boards. SSA may want to pilot test a few strategies to see which methods are more effective. Costs associated with each method differ, with electronic methods the most cost effective.

There are many options for training venues. Live or face-to-face training is the most traditional. Other options include written home study, teleconference or audio training, and synchronous and asynchronous web based training. In synchronous training, a live instructor is online with students. Asynchronous training is a stand-alone course, done independently. Flexibility is a great advantage in this method but there should be parameters for completion and testing completed within a set period. Another training consideration is the ease of updating course materials.

Any training method chosen will probably include video demonstrations of jobs as performed and demonstrations of job analysis techniques. The certification and recertification processes will include identifying the frequency and duration of generalized work activities and observing, videotaping, quantifying, and classifying the physical, cognitive, and environmental job demands. The certification testing should touch on all those areas, both in a written and a

practical exam. The practical, hands-on portion of certification examinations may also use video recording. Training content should include official operational definitions and an understanding of the job analysis process. To ensure reliability and validity, training should also include preferred interview techniques, force and distance measures, and classification of data using the chosen software. Pilot studies, initial training sessions, feedback from attendees, and training scores may inform the Agency's ultimate training choices.

SSA must train and certify job analysts. After the analysts complete the job analysis and prepare a report, SSA must be able to retrieve and archive data and perform either systematic or random quality reviews.

The Ad Hoc group discussed balancing learning effectiveness with cost effectiveness. There are costs associated with training, including salary and travel costs for trainers and mentors, whether live, audio, or web based. There will be costs associated with software purchase or development, after considering using open source versus proprietary learning management systems. MIT's in-depth comparison of learning management systems may be a good resource.

Considerations for employers include the effect of job analysis on productivity, employer sensitivity about trade secrets, employer concerns about safety of visitors to industrial environments, and Unions' concerns about job analysis. Analysts going to work places may need insurance or affect employers' workers compensation insurance, private sector general liability insurance, and errors and omission insurance. In light of employer concerns, SSA may need to provide incentives for participation. This could be company access to anonymous benchmarking information that allows them to compare their jobs from a physical and cognitive demands standpoint to others in their industry.

The Ad Hoc group stressed that the Agency should have a clear idea of the purpose and use of the data before developing the database so that information will be easy to access. Finally, in data management there is always an issue of the ownership, confidentiality, and maintenance and protection of the data and the database.

Ms. Lechner explained that universities use learning management software to manage the syllabus, PowerPoint presentations, and tests for distance education classes. This software, which may be by fee or free, essentially replaces the classroom. There are about 90 learning management systems but the four major systems are Moodle, Sakai, WebCT, and Blackboard.

Dr. Andersson asked whether the temporary job analyst position should be limited to the professions Ms. Lechner named or if could someone with reasonable intelligence, such as unemployed engineers, teachers, and nurses, could learn how to do this. Dr. Andersson also asked whether the same people who collect the data would also have to analyze it. Ms. Lechner responded most people that historically performed job analysis had some sort of college degree ranging from a BS degree to an M.D. or Ph.D. level. She uses two training courses, for 8-10 hours each to train folks to analyze only physical job components. She did not think it was necessary that the same people collect and analyze the data. In the process she uses, computer algorithms do a lot of the data analysis. Ms. Lechner felt they could recruit less highly trained people if they trained to the level of audience with the least background, or provided additional

6

training for students to understand the nuances of the operational definition. In that case, SSA would design training to compensate for their limited knowledge base.

Dr. Hunt asked why athletic trainers are included in the list of potential job analysts. She explained that there are sub-groups of athletic trainers involved in job analysis by working in physical therapy clinics or in clinics that focus on rehabilitation of the injured worker. In some states, trainers can independently charge for physical therapy. She agreed with Dr. Andersson that SSA should expand the opportunity as widely as possible because physical and occupational therapists are so busy with their traditional rehab work that it would be difficult to recruit them on a wide scale. In many cases, athletic trainers and exercise physiologists have migrated to fill that role.

Based on her experience chairing a credentialing organization, Dr. Barros-Bailey felt the discussion was really about the scope of practice for the field job analysts and stated that the scope of practice will come from the instrument, which dictates information that analysts will collect. For example, a certified rehab counselor could go to the certification commission and look at the 12 domain levels that all the accredited programs have to teach so that the training is in line with the credentialing.

Mr. Hardy found an SSA report (dated August 2007) on functional vocational expertise. The report discussed basic professional education levels and subsequent preparation and estimated how many people were available in each discipline to do this work for Social Security. Dr. Panter felt the most important element is a good description of the analyst characteristics. Ms. Lechner agreed there must be a careful balance of the practical advantages in casting a wide net and SSA's need to maintain the perception of competency by using individuals or professions that would be respected.

Ms. Lechner clarified for Dr. Wilson that data management is a separate issue that SSA will have to deal with once the data is collected; she did not intend that the trainees should learn that. Dr. Wilson felt it would be useful for the group to make recommendations on the fidelity of the training and on appropriate training evaluation metrics to evaluate the success of the training program. Fidelity in the training literature generally refers to the extent to which it is realistic. An example of a high fidelity training environment is a flight simulation. Low fidelity has two components: physical and psychological. Physical is the flight mechanism and psychological fidelity is the environment where the work is performed. The training environment and the actual performance environment should be as close as possible physically and psychologically. He noted there are various training evaluation models, such as Kirkpatrick. Reliability becomes an issue in terms of analysts' performance. When two analysts go to two different organizations to look at the same title, one explanation of any differences might be that the analysts are unreliable. However, another could be that two workers with the same title are doing different things.

Ms. Lechner said in the past one could measure accuracy by looking at the trainees' interrater reliability. She agreed they could also consider using test/re-test reliability, which is another area where SSA may need to balance cost effectiveness with the effectiveness of the training.

Dr. Fraser asked if the subcommittee considered how the analysts would finesse the access to businesses, which will increase the training time and probably the sophistication of personnel. You want them to be able to hit the ground running and have some appreciation of cognitive, emotional, and personal issues. In our last phone meeting, we discussed having a resource site to help the job analysts when they have difficulties. Ms. Lechner agreed we should have a help desk that is available to answer questions because analysts will definitely have them.

Ms. Karman explained that SSA published a Request for Information for an upcoming RFP to have an entity help us develop a business process. She anticipates a job analyst business process will be developed over the next nine months. All of these issues discussed will be good starting points for SSA to provide direction and guidance to the contractor. Some of the points on the scope of practice might be addressed by not only having the work analysis instrument mapped out, but also by having a sense of the kind of expertise are we looking for. It also suggests we could have a variety of different training modules. For example, several levels of training might be available to help people who already have certification in another area, to learn how to do our job analysis more quickly than somebody who has no background.

Mr. Hardy was concerned about SSA's legal defensibility and vulnerability at the data collection step. He urged using a more restrictive approach to the people we hire as job analysts. A person with a college degree may be proficient at evaluating negotiating skills and other esoteric cognitive behaviors. Limiting choices to people with experience, credentials, and possibly higher education may be the gold standard, which should always be the goal. Ms. Lechner agreed that SSA should be careful in this area. One of the challenges is that it is more difficult to assess cognitive functions than physical functions. That may result in requiring job analysts to have qualifications that would eliminate some folks.

Ms. Karman said a prototype work analysis instrument will guide the skill set, training, and certification needed to be sure that the applicant can use that instrument and gather the data appropriately. She assumed that using the instrument would require looking at tasks or activities that are done in the job which are associated with certain mental-cognitive abilities. Having the work analysis instrument will clarify many of the concerns about mental-cognitive issues.

Dr. Andersson said the quality of the product should be evaluated, not the qualification of the person producing it. Dr. Panter thinks qualifications are somewhat relevant, because when we look at other systems that exist, one issue is who are the analysts and how were they sampled. She suggested that a deliberative process should be used to figure out whether the selection pool is broader or narrower, what is the sampling of the analyst group, and who the analyst group is, what are their years of experience and how they performed on the certification.

Ms. Lechner observed that it is interesting to go back and look at who does well on training and scores the highest or who cannot pass the certification exams. There is a lot of rivalry between physical and occupational therapists about who can do this the best. However, historically, what seems to make a good analyst or a good evaluator is not always proved. In her experience, the age of the therapist was a higher predictor. Because the process is software driven and very analytical, the older therapists were more likely to fail the test and not achieve certification.

8

Dr. Gibson noted that once there is a tool and an intended business process, the same things that drive good education will drive good training. The types of knowledge, whether declarative, procedural, or contextual, that are sought should identify the criteria for the job. They will drive the nature of how you train people. It is also important to have a good idea of the learners' backgrounds because they dictate how you address these training issues. A private outside group will develop most of this; until then a lot of this is hypothetical.

Dr. Wilson said he spoke earlier about fidelity and evaluation issues because if a source were impeached, their general qualifications would not be as relevant as their specific qualifications relative to the training. There is a concept in training called positive and negative transfer. If you are used to doing job analysis, which we now know means different things with different techniques and different approaches, there might actually be some negative transfer. It may be more difficult for people who are used to a particular approach to learn something that is slightly different. On the other hand, there is a face validity component. To the extent that you are making any kind of professional inference here, which would be kept at a minimum, having prior training and expertise that is relevant to whatever the task is might be very relevant. This is especially pertinent in some of these more abstract cognitive interpersonal domains. It is also very important to determine how the legal community might perceive the training process.

Mr. Hardy recognized that this process is iterative. As we see what these products look like, we will be able to determine the areas of concern. There is a cost associated with everything that we are talking about doing. If you have a job analyst with a BA in English lit, or you have a job analyst with a Masters degree in counseling who's a CRC, NCC, and has 10 years of experience, the candidate with a BA is going to cost a little bit less than the one with a Masters. A cost benefit analysis may show that the BA analyst can do the job. We should keep in mind that the legal community will look at how these decisions were made. At that time, the higher credentials might be in the SSA's best interest.

Dr. Schretlen said he has seen studies and has direct experience with a remarkable phenomenon that when you train physicians and Ph.D. level people to do rating scales, they are usually less effective and they have less reliability and validly than do people with fewer years of training. This may be because they override the rating criteria and interpose their own judgment to the detriment of the instrument. On the other hand, he agrees with Tom Hardy that this whole project is under an intense level of scrutiny and the appearance matters. At the end of the day, the appearance will win out over scientific integrity in a courtroom. Therefore, we need to pay close attention to the appearances. We want highly qualified people who are also well trained and competent. When I saw athletic trainer, I thought, that is just not going to play well looking back. He stressed that he was not saying they could not do a fine job. In fact, they might do a better job. However, the question is really how it looks. Ms. Lechner clarified that she should have said certified athletic trainers (ATCs). Dr. Andersson said that if we can find the highest qualified people and we can find them in sufficient numbers to do this that is what we should do. His fear is that we are going to have a hard time finding people and that is why he wanted to make sure that, if we have that hard time, we are willing to broaden the search.

Ms. Karman noted that the results of the certification process, the training and certification, should also speak volumes to what process we intend to have in place to ensure that the data are collected in a quality manner. The basic skill sets individuals need is still to be determined.

Ms. Lechner felt the estimates given in the study found by Mr. Hardy: occupational therapists (15,000 of 90,000 certified), physical therapists (30,000 of 150,000), and voc rehab counselors (131,000) were very optimistic. A sub-section of the American Physical Therapy Association devoted to therapists who are interested in work related issues and industrial rehabilitation has 500 to 600 members.

Dr. Barros-Bailey agreed that the number of rehab counselors is highly aggregated data, including para-professionals and job coaches. That number is not accurate in terms of rehab counselors. It shows 1,100 in Idaho but there are only about 150. She suggested medical informatics might show other sources or models that have already been explored where data quality of that database is incredibly important and there is already a certification process. What are the methods that have been considered and are ongoing for not just the initial training but also the ongoing training and certification to maintain that database quality? We all think about this as the initial data collection. However, if it is going to be an organic process, it is an ongoing process.

Dr. Gibson said until we have a sampling model for how much data has to be collected, it is hard to figure how many analysts we need and geographically how they have to be dispersed. That is actually part of that bigger sampling question. Dr. Fraser said the available number would be further reduced to those in private practice with flexibility. Ms. Lechner agreed that many health professionals are not comfortable being in an industrial environment.

Dr. Barros-Bailey thanked the Ad Hoc group for tackling this important aspect of the process.

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m. (CDT).

Thursday, June 10, 2010

Panel Members Present:

> Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D. (Chair)
> Robert T. Fraser, Ph.D.
> Shanan Gwaltney Gibson, Ph.D.
> Thomas A. Hardy, J.D.
> H. Allan Hunt, Ph.D.
> Sylvia E. Karman
> Deborah E. Lechner
> Abigail T. Panter, Ph.D.
> David J. Schretlen, Ph.D.
> Mark A. Wilson, Ph.D.

Call to Order:

Debra Tidwell-Peters, the Designated Federal Officer, called the meeting to order and recognized the Panel's Interim Chair, Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey.

Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *OIDAP Chair*

Dr. Barros-Bailey welcomed the attendees. She informed new telephonic listeners of materials available on the OIDAP website and restated the purpose of the Panel.

Dr. Barros-Bailey announced that the formal public comment period would end June 30, 2010 but stated that the Panel always accepted public feedback.

Dr. Barros-Bailey stated that the meeting included a review of the Panel's draft report of feedback regarding the National Academies of Science (NAS) Report on O*NET and the Research Subcommittee's summary of recent activities between SSA and the Department of Labor (DOL).

Research Subcommittee Briefing of Recent Activities between SSA and DOL

Sylvia Karman and Allan Hunt, Ph.D., *OIDAP Members*

Ms. Karman stated that the Research Subcommittee first met with the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) in May. The initial meeting provided an opportunity to address ways in which SSA could sample for jobs across the nation and gain access to the entities.

Dr. Hunt provided a brief description of the BLS and its significance towards the development of a new occupational information system (OIS); in particular, the BLS's experience regarding sampling of occupational employment statistics and the possibility of BLS providing data that could be utilized as a test bed to supplement the sampling approach for OIS. Dr. Hunt discussed the advantages and disadvantages of BLS data collection as it pertained to SSA.

Dr. Hunt stated that the meeting was very productive. Dr. Hunt reiterated the BLS suggestion of SSA communicating with the Census Bureau. He stated that the next step was to make connections with analogous people at the Census Bureau regarding their collection and process of data.

Ms. Karman stated that the BLS suggested SSA request to retrieve raw Census Bureau data (i.e. data coded according to the Standard Occupational Classification). She stated that the BLS inquired about relevant data available through SSA. Ms. Karman stated that SSA was reviewing the inventory of relevant primary and secondary data that might be of interest.

Panel's Review of the NAS Report and Deliberations

Dr. Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *OIDAP Chair*

Dr. Barros-Bailey briefly reviewed Commissioner Astrue's requests regarding the Panel's assistance; in particular, its role in reviewing relevant documents or reports identified by SSA as influential to the development of a new OIS. Dr. Barros-Bailey reiterated that the Panel was asked to review the prepublication copy and corrected proofs of the National Academy of Science's (NAS) report on the O*NET.

Dr. Barros-Bailey stated that an Executive Summary of the Panel's review of the NAS report was updated based on a review conducted by the Executive Subcommittee. Dr. Barros-Bailey discussed the process for reviewing and the findings presented in the Panel's report.
The findings included:

- NAS produced its report five months before the Panel's report. The timing of the NAS report placed their recommendations into context;
- NAS's conclusion regarding the usage of O*NET was consistent with findings from other groups. NAS reported that O*NET's design as a general database did not particularly meet SSA's needs for disability adjudication;
- The NAS Panel did not include a member with a disability background; therefore they acknowledged that there needed to be more in-depth discussions addressing the appropriateness of O*NET's design for SSA;
- NAS Panel reported that the O*NET was frequently used by many different users as a starting point for the assessment of workforce development;
- The evaluation criteria for work activities that comprise the O*NET occupations differed significantly from those required for the OIS;
- The NAS and OID reports reached common conclusions that O*NET would need significant changes in order to become suitable for disability adjudication;
- The application of the term "skills" varied, thus making it difficult to apply the concept to transferability models and appropriate designs. The inconsistency in usage often produced varied conclusions.

12

- The need for the new OIS to be legally defensible was not strongly considered nor processed by NAS; and,
- NAS and OIDAP shared similar recommendations and conclusions in several instances such as focusing on collecting, maintaining and publishing high quality data and including the input of scientific and user communities into research and usability processes (e.g. OIDAP's Research Subcommittee and User Needs and Relations Subcommittee).

Dr. Barros-Bailey opened the floor for deliberation. Dr. Panter suggested rearranging and categorizing the findings in terms of priority. Dr. Schretlen suggested reframing the sentence structure of the first finding. It was further suggested that finding number one be incorporated into the introductory paragraph. Dr. Hardy suggested that the report reflect the Panel's goal of addressing technical aspects of the NAS report in a future review. Panel members made additional word-smithing recommendations but agreed to provide Dr. Barros-Bailey and Ms. Tidwell-Peters with an electronic version of their suggested changes. Dr. Barros-Bailey stated that the final document be approved verbally during a brief Panel teleconference.

Administrative Meeting

Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D., *OIDAP Chair*

The Panel approved the minutes from the previous quarterly meeting held in March. The Panel came to the consensus that the next meeting would be held the second week of November 2010. The Panel raised the following issues for discussion for the next Panel meeting:

1) allocate additional time for deliberations;
2) discuss skills and transferability as a general topic, beginning with the definition of "skills;"
3) provide update of the International OIS Study and the Occupational Medical-Vocational Study case reviews;
4) designate at least half a day towards the discussion of labor market activities;
5) provide copies or a synopsis of the feedback from public comment; and,
6) Review final prototype of person-side instrument (if available).

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 a.m. (CDT).

Certification:

I, Deborah Tidwell-Peters, Designated federal Officer for the Occupational Development Advisory Panel, hereby certify that the above minutes accurately describe the Quarterly Meeting of the Panel held on June 9, 2010 through June 10, 2010, at the Doubletree Hotel Memphis Downtown, 185 Union Ave, Memphis, TN.

Deborah Tidwell-Peters
Designated Federal Officer