

The Process of NAS Panels

David Betson

Presentation at CE Workshop

October 16, 2012

Initiation of the Project

- *Projects undertaken by the NRC are initiated by federal agencies to pursue a question they have or have been directed by Congress to answer*
- *The importance of the “Charge to the Panel”*
- *Selection of Study Director*

Selection of the Panel of Experts

- *Nomination of Chair*
- *Nomination of Panel Members to create diversity of expertise and perspective*
- *Confirmation and Appointment of Chair and Panel Members*

The Panel on Redesigning of the CE

The Panel was composed of 13 members representing a variety of disciplines and skills

- Sample design*
- Data collection and technology*
- Survey measurement and cognitive design*
- Economics and Public Policy*
- Past direct involvement with the CE's design and implementation*
- Users of the CE*

The CE Panel on Redesigning the BLS Consumer Expenditure Surveys

- *Don Dillman, Department of Sociology, Washington State University (Chair)*
- *David Betson, College of Arts and Letters, University of Notre Dame*
- *Mick Couper, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan*
- *Robert Gillingham, Independent Consultant, Potomac Falls, VA*
- *Michael Link, The Nielsen Company, Marietta, GA*
- *Bruce Meyer, Harris School of Public Policy Studies, University of Chicago*
- *Sarah Nusser, Department of Statistics, Iowa State University*
- *Andy Peytchev, RTI International, Research Triangle Park, NC*
- *Mark Pierzchala, Independent Consultant, Rockville, MD*
- *Robert Santos, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC*
- *Michael Schober, New School for Social Research, New York City, NY*
- *Melvin Stephens, Jr. Department of Economics, University of Michigan*
- *Clyde Tucker, Independent Consultant, Vienna, VA*
- *Carol House, Study Director, Committee on National Statistics*

Bias and Conflict of Interest

- *Once a year, Panel Members are required to complete 'Conflict of Interest Statements'*
- *At the initial meeting of the Panel, a discussion is held where Panel Members discuss any potential biases and conflicts of interest they may affect how their views on the Panel's work. At this meeting, the Panel decides whether additional Panel Members may be needed.*
- *While travel expenses are paid, the Panel Members volunteer their time and are otherwise not compensated*

Gathering Information and Evidence

- *Open Meetings – Presentations and Discussion (February 8, 2011)*
- *Workshops or Conferences*
 - *Household Survey Producer Workshop (June 1 and 2, 2011)*
 - *Redesign Options Workshop (October 26 and 27, 2011)*
- *Panel Activities*
 - *Survey of Existing Literature*
 - *Data Collection and Analysis*
 - *Outreach (attended CE User’s Workshop)*
 - *Gaining Experience (attempt to answer the CE survey)*

Arriving at a Consensus Report

Closed Meetings, Emails, Web Conferences

First Meeting – February 9, 2011

Second Meeting after first workshop – June 3, 2011

Third Meeting after second workshop – October 29, 2011

A lot of emails and phone calls, drafting of report

Fourth Meeting – January 25 and 26, 2012

Web Conference Call – March 2, 2012

Report sent to Review – June 8, 2012

What is a Consensus Report?

The set of conclusions and recommendations that address the questions posed in the Panel's charge that each Panel Member can 'live with' but don't necessarily represent their most preferred set of conclusions and recommendations.

'Live with' in the context of a NAS Panel means that in the Panel's expert judgment, the Panel's recommendations are supported by the best available evidence.

Report Review

- *NAS appoints a Review Monitor and a Review Coordinator to act as 'editors' in the review process*
- *Reviewers are selected by NAS to review the report to insure that the report is responsive to the Panel's Charge and that all conclusions and recommendations are supported by evidence*
- *The Study Director and Chair with the assistance of the Panel prepare a response to review where reviewers comments are addressed by making changes to the text or providing an explanation of why no change is needed*
- *The Review Monitor and Coordinator must sign off on the adequacy of the Response to Review prepared by the Panel*

Release of Report

- *Sponsors are provided a prepublication version of the report and are briefed by Panel Chair and Staff Director*
- *Public Release of Report*
 - *NAS Web Site*
 - *Public Briefing*