## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES





Refer to: SJH-7

Baltimore MD 21235

NOV 0 6 1927

Mr. George Watters
President
Ability Information Systems, Inc.
N. 2721 Van Marter #3
Spokane, Washington 99206

Dear Mr. Watters:

I am providing you with a copy of the final report on the test of the Computer-Assisted Vocational Evaluation System, as I agreed in our meeting of April 3, 1987. A copy of the report has also been sent to United States Representative Jerry Lewis, (R-CA), in response to his recent inquiry about the results of this project.

I hope this report is responsive to your concerns. After you have reviewed the report, we can meet to discuss the results if this would be of assistance to you. If you have any technical questions about the findings, you may call the Director of the Division of Disability Program Information and Studies, Malcolm H. Morrison, Ph.D., at (301) 965-0091.

Sincerely

David A. Rust

Associate Commissioner

for Disability

Enclosure

RECEIVED
NOV 1 0 1987

Computer-Assisted Vocational Evaluation System:
Final Report of Study in Three Disability
Determination Services,
November 1985 - October 1986

Division of Disability Program Information and Studies Office of Disability September 1987

## SYNOPSIS

- O A Computer-Assisted Vocational Evaluation System (CAVES) is an automated job-matching system that was tested in the Kansas, Texas, and Washington State Disability Determination Services for a period of about 1 year.
- O A CAVES system developed by Ability Information Systems,
  Inc., was tested in the adjudication of initial disability
  claims to find out whether an automated occupational data
  base would increase the adjudicator's efficiency in
  evaluating a disability claimant's ability to work.
- o Information about disability decisions, accuracy, and processing time was collected for a test and control group of cases to determine what differences in these variables, if any, might be attributed to CAVES.
- o There was little difference in the tested variables between the test and the control groups, and the gross findings showed that there was no aggregate saving of processing time.
- The data showed that CAVES was used in only 25 percent of the test cases, because it was not needed in cases that could be decided on the basis of the medical evidence or the vocational information that was provided by the claimant.

- o Further analysis to determine if the use of CAVES saved time in vocational evaluation produced a mixed result. Some complex cases were evaluated very quickly, but in other cases the evaluation took much longer. It was concluded that the CAVES system tested does not definitely increase the overall efficiency of case evaluation, but may be more efficient in some circumstances, depending on the facts of the case and the experience and proficiency of the adjudicator.
- o It is not recommended that SSA pursue CAVES further at this time. SSA should develop a comprehensive plan for an automated system that considers all segments of the disability adjudication process, including case development, medical and vocational evaluation, and decision processing.

o 1.--Number of study decisions by type and basis of decision and study group status

		All cases			Allowances	Torque de la companya		Denials	
y group	Total	Vocational	Medical and other	Total	Vocational only	Medical and Other	Total	Vocational only	Medical and other
Total	7,608	4,078	3,530	3,015	721	2,294	4,593	3,357	1,236
cases	3,807 3,801	2,033 2,045	1,774	1,518	364 357	1,154	2,289	1,669	620 616

Table 2.--Number and percentage distribution of study cases where CAVES s used by type of vocational decision

Type of vocational decision	Number	Percent
Total decisions based on CAVES	798	(100%)
th Step in Sequential Process		
AllowanceArduous unskilled work	1	
DenialCapacity for past work	246	(31%)
th Step in Sequential Process		
AllowanceCapacity for other work	180	(23%)
DenialCapacity for other work	371	(46%)

Table 3.--Number and percent of all study decisions by type of decision and study group status

	Tot	tal	Alla	wances	Dei	nials
Study group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	7,608	(100%)	3,015	(40%)	4,593	(60%)
Test cases Control cases	3,807 3,801	(100%) (100%)	1,518 1,497	(40%) (39%)	2,289 2,304	(60%) (61%)

'able 4.--Number and percent of "vocational only" decisions by type of decision an tudy group status

	То	tal	Allo	wances	De	nials
tudy group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	4,078	(100%)	721	(18%)	3,357	(82%)
est cases	2,033 2,045	(100%) (100%)	364 357	(18%) (17%)	1,669 1,688	(82%) (83%)

able 5.--Number and percent of all study decisions decided at the 4th (capacity fast work) and 5th (capacity for other work) steps of the sequential evaluation rocess by type of decision and status of study group

	Total		Allo	wances	Den	ials
tudy group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
otal 4th Step Test cases Control cases	2,026 990 1,036	(100%) (100%) (100%)	3 1 2		2,023 989 1,034	(100%) (100%) (100%)
otal 5th Step Test cases Control cases	2,050 1,043 1,007	(100%) (100%) (100%)	716 363 353	(35%) (35%) (35%)	1,334 680 654	(65%) (65%) (65%)

Table 6.--Disability Quality Branch Review (SSA-3094) (Vocational Decisions Only)

		e with aluation	Disac case c	gree with evaluation
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Test	1,269	(90%)	142	(10%)
Control	871	(90%)	95	(10%)

Table 7.--Disability Quality Branch Review - Type of disagreement (SSA-3094) (Vocational Decisions Only)

	med	ree with Bical tion only	voc	ree with ational	Disagree with medical and vocational evaluation		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Test	70	(49%)	55	(39%)	17	(12%)	
Control	34	(36%)	50	(53%)	11	(11%)	

ble 8.--Calendar days processing time--vocational cases percent stribution, by test and control groups (Disability Examiner Case occassing Form)

lendar lys, intake clearance	1-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	Over 120
est cases	20%	38%	23%	12%	078
ontrol cases	23%	37%	22%	12%	06%

Table 9.--Time spent in vocational evaluation (Disability Examiner Case Processing Form)\*

	30 a	r less	31-	-60	<u>. al</u>	-90	Ox	er 30	
Minutes	Number	Percent.	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Test	n	(18%)	25	(42€)	20	(33%)	4	(6%)	
Cantrol	24	(40%)	21	(35%)	12	(20%)	3	(5%)	

<sup>\*</sup>Subsample of vocational decision cases.