MAPAC◆ NEWS

MID-ATLANTIC PERSONNEL CORSORTIUM, INC.

SPRING/SUMMER

PRESIDENT:
Linda Dunn
Borough of Manhattan Community College
199 Chambers St., NY, NY 10007
(212) 749-2710
DUNNLND@cs.com

Past –President:
James E. Frankart
Pennsylvania State Civil Service Commission
320 Market Street
Harrisburg PA 17108-0569
(717) 783-2697, Ext. 3517
(717) 783-0838 (FAX)
Jfrankart@scsc.state.pa.us

PRESIDENT –ELECT
Elliot D. Lasson, Ph. D.
MD Dept. of Budget and Management
301 W. Preston St.
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-4928
(410) 333-7674 (FAX)
ELASSON@dbm.state.md.us

TREASURER:
S. Ann Stewart
Delaware State Personnel Office
P.O. Box 1401
Dover, Delaware 19901-1401
(302) 739-5458
(302) 739-3000 (FAX)

WEBMASTER
David Hamill
David G. Hanill@justice.USDOJ.GOV

WEBSITE:
WWW.IPMAAC.ORG/MAPAC

MEMBERS

CITIES
Baltimore, MD
Philadelphia, PA
New York, NY
Rochester, NY

COUNTIES
Baltimore, MD
Fairfax, VA
Prince George's , MD

STATES
Delaware
New York
Maryland
Ohio
New Jersey
Pennsylvania

OTHER
City University of New York
MD Department of Transportation
Metro Washington Airport Authority
NY State Unified Court System
Port Authority of N.Y. & N. J.
School District of Philadelphia
U.S. Postal Service
Immigration and Naturalization Service
N.Y. City Transit Authority

MAPAC Founder Retires

A Transition From Pennsylvania State Civil Service Commission to Consulting

Linda Dunn
President

Charles F. Sproule retired from the Pennsylvania State Civil Service Commission (PA SCSC) on 3/24/2000 with thirty-seven (37) years of service. He is the primary founder and was the first President of the Mid-Atlantic Personnel Assessment Consortium (MAPAC). He recently initiated and led a cooperative MAPAC project to improve supervisory and management assessment procedures, and has led a variety of previous MAPAC projects, including a multi-jurisdictional test item improvement project.

Charley began work in Pennsylvania as a Management Trainee in 1963 and became a manager in 1968. Charley initiated a Research and Special Projects function in the PA SCSC in 1968. Since then, Pennsylvania has been one of the few states that have continuously supported personnel research and development (R&D). He has led the Evaluation, Test Development, and Research Divisions of the PA SCSC Bureau of Personnel Assessment. His other work experiences include a part-time mobility assignment with the U.S. Civil Service Commission as a Personnel Research Psychologist; work as a consultant to a variety of federal, state and local agencies; and work as a trainer for Pennsylvania and professional organizations. He is a member of the International Personnel Management Association (IPMA), the IPMA Assessment Council (IPMAAC), the Harrisburg Area Chapter of IPMA (HAIPMA), the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC\MW), the American Psychological Association (APA) and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP).

MAPAC Founder Retires (continued)

In Pennsylvania, Charley helped develop work methods and procedures used to assure fair, job-related and valid personnel assessment. Many of these procedures are documented in the PA SCSC "Examiners Manual." He trained and managed a professional staff that has developed and validated a wide variety of assessment procedures for hundreds of occupations. Recently, he led a project that resulted in a methodology for establishing job-related physical and medical employment standards. He has managed or contributed to many Pennsylvania R&D projects that resulted in assessment innovations. Charley has received two Pennsylvania SCSC awards for outstanding performance.
Charley has been very active in the personnel profession as an author, researcher, presenter, manager, consultant, and leader. He organized, with Bill Gorham and Tom Tyler, the 1976 Selection Specialists Symposium in Chicago that led to the formation of the IPMA Assessment Council (IPMAAC). He has served IPMAAC in such capacities as President, member of the Board of Directors, Newsletter Editor, Chair of the IPMAAC Education and Training Committee, Chair of the Cooperative Research Committee, and member of the Professional Affairs Committee.

At the local level, Charley served as President of the Harrisburg Area Chapter IPMA (HAIPMA) in 1979-1980. He has been active in past personnel management reform efforts in Pennsylvania. For example, he served on the Technical Standards Unit of the Governor's Task Force on Equal Rights in 1971-1972, and helped lead a HAIPMA study which resulted in the submission of personnel management reform recommendations to Governor Thornburg in 1978.

Under his guidance, Pennsylvania published the SWAP Newsletter (Sharing With A Purpose) from 1972 to 1979. SWAP was an information exchange newsletter for public sector assessment professionals. He has authored research reports and journal articles, including a 1990 IPMAAC Monograph on **Recent Innovations in Public Sector Assessment**, and participated in preparing other IPMAAC monographs. IPMA Committees Charley has served on include the Conference Program Committee, the Legislative and Regulatory Committee, and the Publications Committee. Charley has served on all IPMA and IPMAAC committees on the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and all committees on the professional Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. He has served on the IPMA Eastern Region Program Committee.

He co-developed and co-instructed workshops and seminars for IPMA, IPMAAC, MAPAC, and Pennsylvania. These include workshops on: Improving Selection Procedures, the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, Job Analysis and Content Validation, and Examination Planning. He served as an instructor for the Great Lakes Assessment Council (GLAC). He co-developed and co-instructed a variety of training programs in Pennsylvania, including training on statistics, job analysis, calculation of final earned ratings, test score grouping, test planning, and test development. He co-developed and co-instructs training on the Development and Validation of Class Specifications that has been conducted for Pennsylvania state job classifiers by the Governor's Office of Administration from 1982 until present.

In 1986, he received the Stephen E. Bemis award for significant practical contributions to the personnel field. In 1991 he received the IPMAAC "Exemplary Service" Award, and the "Pride in Authorship Award" of the Harrisburg Area Chapter of IPMA.

Charley will continue to be active in personnel management and personnel assessment. He has established Sproule & Associates, a business to provide personnel assessment consulting services, assistance and training to the public and private sectors. Charley can be reached by email at:
sproule@worldnet.att.net
717 564-7018
Sproule & Associates, 641 Cambria Ave., Harrisburg, PA 17111.

Secretary's Report
MAPAC Business Meeting
January 20, 2000
Will Martin
Secretary

Meeting called to order by President Linda Dunn. Roll call taken and a quorum confirmed with the following member agencies reported present: City of Baltimore; Counties of Baltimore, Prince George's, Fairfax; States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania; Others, City University of New York, Immigration and Naturalization, Maryland Department of Transportation, and the NYS Unified Court System.

Linda recognized Jim Frankart and the many contributions Jim made to the MAPAC organization during his tenure as President.

Two Industrial Organizational Psychology students from George Marshall University, Karen Orvis and Giorgio Szabo, were introduced as invited guests of MAPAC. Each provided a brief description of their educational and professional interests. As reported in the New Business section of this report, there is interest among MAPAC members in reaching out to students who are currently engaged in IO studies.

Reports

Treasurer:

Jamie Rivera presented the attached report that was prepared by Ann Stewart indicating that there is a current balance of $13,429.86 in the treasury.

Communications:

It was announced that Sylvia Franklin, Prince George's County will take on responsibility for publishing the MAPAC newsletter. Sylvia indicated that she would be surveying member agencies to determine if additional information or articles in the MAPAC Newsletter would be of interest.

Training:

Robyn Talesnik reported that the MAPAC Job Analysis course is being offered during March 22 – 24 in Harrisburg, PA and that the Exam Planning IPMAAC course is currently under revision. Since our last meeting, several statistics videos were previewed by select member agencies and the decision was not to purchase the videos currently being considered.

Program Committee:

Elliot Lasson reported that his committee is planning for the next meeting to be held in the Washington area during the week of either May 3 or May 10. He is currently negotiating with the US Postal Service's Bolger Center and asked member agencies to report to him as soon as possible as to how many representatives would likely attend the May meeting so he could complete his planning in a timely manner. Elliot indicated that the Program Committee is exploring the possibility of holding the fall meeting in Princeton.

Membership Committee:

Jim Frankart indicated that Member Agency participation at meetings continues to be a concern.

Old Business

At the fall, 1999 meeting a resolution was passed to explore the possibility of MAPAC sponsoring a non-alcoholic, social break at an IPMAC conference. After investigating this matter, Robyn Talesnik recommended that MAPAC consider either 1) making a contribution to a break or 2) seek to co-sponsor a break. The matter was briefly discussed and remanded to the Executive Committee for further consideration and action as deemed appropriate.

New Business

Linda Dunn presented the concept of "Collaborative Information/Data Sharing" among member agencies to determine if there is interest among the membership for increasing MAPAC's research base via sharing of information. It was pointed out that thus far, MAPAC has not been known as a research organization, but the yet to be answered question is, why not? Discussion on this topic will likely continue at future meetings.

Linda Dunn reported that Ann Stewart has a new job and is therefore unable to continue as MAPAC Treasurer; a new Treasurer would need to be elected. Robyn Talesnik nominated Will Martin from NY State; David Hamill seconded the nomination. No further nominations were offered; Will Martin's appointment was approved by acclamation.

Linda Dunn recommended that MAPAC consider recommending individuals for the IMPAAC Stephen E. Bemis Award. After a brief discussion, Linda made a motion that the name of Paul Kaiser from NY State Department of Civil Service be nominated in recognition of his on-going commitment to personnel management and the principles of fairness and merit. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Expenditures for the purchase of Acrobat software needed to maintain the

MAPAC web site was discussed and approved. In addition, Jim Frankart discussed the need to purchase postage & post office box for regular mailings. He indicated that projected costs would be about $800 per year and offered Pennsylvania's assistance in maintaining a Post office Box in Harrisburg. Members are asked to keep Jim Frankart informed of any changes of postal or e-mail addresses. Jim can be reached at (717) 787-5974, e-mail address: JFrankart@scsc.state.pa.us. Executive Committee was authorized to expend reasonable costs for this purpose.

Linda Dunn introduced the topic of "Student Scholarships" or other stipends to cover the travel expenses for IO Student Interns attending MAPAC meetings for purpose of making presentations. The subject of a nominating process was discussed; Elliot Lasson indicated that, MAPAC should attempt to identify programs in MAPAC meeting regions that have IO students to minimize such costs. Bob Carroll indicated that the membership would need to know how much money was being considered before making an informed vote on the subject, i.e., are we talking full expenses or a flat-fee to off set expenses? Waiver of registration fees for IO Students invited to attend MAPAC meetings was discussed and approved and Elliot Lasson recommended that a $150 stipend be considered for students who would be making presentations at a MAPAC meeting. Jim Frankart seconded this suggestion. David Hamill recommended that we table the discussion to the next meeting and that someone look into the issue to make formal proposal at the Spring MAPAC Meeting.

Program interest surveys were handed out and members were asked to return them to Elliot Lasson as soon as possible for use in planning the next meeting agenda.

MAPAC Project Report

Charley Sproule presented a progress report on the MAPAC Supervisory and Management Assessment Procedure Improvement Project.

Survey Work Group: The survey report completed by JoAnn Bagshaw has been distributed to the MAPAC membership. The report contains considerable information on the needs and resources of the MAPAC membership related to supervisory assessment and should be helpful in planning future project directions.

Taxonomy Work Group: A draft task taxonomy "Job Function Taxonomy for Public Service First Line Supervisors" prepared by Brenda Snyder and Will Martin of New York State was distributed to committee members. This is one of two draft products of the taxonomy work group led by John Kraus. Comments on the draft should be sent to John Kraus, Will Martin and Brenda Snyder so that the supervisor task taxonomy can be finalized for the spring 2000 MAPAC meeting.
John Krause reviewed a copy of a draft KSAO taxonomy, which will be distributed to all work group members for subsequent review and comment. Comments on the KSAO taxonomy draft should be sent to John Krause so that the taxonomy can be finalized for the Spring MAPAC meeting.

Literature Review Work Group: Phil Ferrara's work group has prepared an extensive draft of a literature review report, which was distributed at the committee meeting. Again comments or suggestions concerning the draft should be sent to Phil Ferrara so that the report can be finalized for the Spring MAPAC meeting.

Job Analysis Tools Work Group: Bob Schneider's work group on Job Analysis Tools has prepared draft rating scales and linkage forms, as well as an outline of a "User's Guide." Comments on the draft job analysis tools and plan for the User's Guide should be directed to Bob. A draft Job Analysis Tools User's Guide for studying supervisory jobs is being prepared by this committee and is expected to be ready by the Spring MAPAC meeting.

Test Exchange Work Group: The committee on test exchange procedures has not yet submitted a report or recommendations on updating MAPAC test exchange procedures. The report and recommendations need to be completed so that a draft can be reviewed and discussed by work group members at the Spring MAPAC meeting.

Project Leadership: The MAPAC leadership was asked to recruit and select a new leader for the project. Charley Sproule currently plans to retire on March 24, 2000.

Strategic Planning Initiatives

Linda Dunn asked the membership to raise topics of interest to the member agencies toward the end of developing future MAPAC initiatives. Among the topics discussed but not resolved are the following:

What are the challenges of selection in the future?

- Retirement of personnel selection employees & turnover resulting in the need for MAPAC member agencies to focus upon the basic, nuts and bolts training of new professionals entering the field.
- Recruitment issues -- competition with private sector employers & public services.
- Computerized testing -- evolution of technology in personnel selection.
- Need for more tailored testing.
- Identification of shared problems in selection for the same occupational areas, i.e., Information Technology?

Strategic Planning

Linda Dunn

In the strategic planning session, participants identified high turnover and the need for increased use of technological innovations as the greatest challenges facing public sector selection in the next decade. The turnover issue impacts selection in three ways: 1) a need to improve recruitment, particularly for high turnover or hard-to-fill technical positions; 2) the need to administer more and frequently simplified, tests without losing predictive effectiveness or compromising security by re-administering the same test; and 3) the need to hire and train selection staff to develop and administer the needed number of tests.

MAPAC's role in these challenges is multi-fold. Robyn Talesnik has already initiated plans to develop a training curriculum for entry level selection staff with the intent of offering components of this curriculum as part of the MAPAC training schedule. The Collaborative Project Committee's work on test and information sharing will address issues related to sharing job analyses, competency taxonomies and tests to help jurisdictions meet the need to offer more and better tests. Linda Dunn and Sylvia Franklin will work to develop a benchmark recruitment survey of member organization's recruitment practices. The MAPAC newsletter will consider including a recruitment section to provide information on selection openings and outreach will be made to Mid-Atlantic graduate IO programs to stimulate student participation in MAPAC and in public sector selection.

It was agreed that in many instances the practices, tests or other producers of one jurisdiction will not work for all jurisdictions. In response to this "one size does NOT fit all," whenever feasible, information will be provided in format so that jurisdictions can pull out those components relevant to each jurisdiction.

Issues related to new technologies will continue to be addressed in regular MAPAC meeting and training sessions. Members are urged to identify their information and program needs and forward them to Elliot Lasson for use in program planning.

Winter Meeting Presentations

<u>The Multi-Faceted Role of MQ's in the Selection Process</u>

Lance Seberhagen, Ph.D.
Seberhagen & Associates

In this presentation, Lance Seberhagen discussed general standards for Minimum Qualifications (MQs) and the use of supplemental applications to screen MQs through structured questions that cover relevant, job-related areas (e.g., education, experience, self-assessment of KSAs, etc.).

Dr. Seberhagen defined MQs as pass/fail selection procedures that can be used to screen all job applicants on the basis of information obtained from application forms. The principal role of MQs in a selection process is to screen out applicants who are obviously unfit for the job. As such, MQs should be treated and developed like any other personnel test, and when feasible, validated. Often, MQs are developed by classification personnel whose primary focus is on equitable compensation in the industry, and not on the validity of the tool or on the effects of certain job requirements.

Dr. Seberhagen listed the following six common *misuses* of using MQs.

1. To identify the best qualified applicants. Since MQs may serve a variety of purposes within an organization, they should be general, and allow for broad interpretations. However, when MQs are written very specific and detailed, they will screen out the bulk of the applicant pool. Thus, an organization my get applicants qualified on "paper" but

will miss out on large numbers of other highly qualified individuals. A crude screening tool such as MQs should not be used for precise employment decisions.

2. To artificially reduce the number of applicants. Stringent MQs should not be developed for the sole purpose of reducing the administrative work of processing applications. There are far better ways to reduce the number of applicants for job openings. Dr. Seberhagen suggested that one way to fairly reduce the number of applicants would be to **randomly** select X number of qualified applicants to further consider for the position. Finally, stringent MQs are very difficult to defend under scrutiny.
3. To justify higher pay. MQs should not be used to arbitrarily justify higher compensation. For instance, arbitrarily awarding 5 points for a high school degree and 10 points for a college degree may be unjustified. All qualifications listed in the MQs should be highly job relevant. Ideally, testing personnel should validate the use of MQs in a selection process in the same way other personnel tests are validated.
4. To restrict competition for employment. MQs should never limit or restrict competition for employment decisions.
5. To enhance organizational "prestige". Dr. Seberhagen emphasized that every requirement listed in the MQs should be job related. For instance, it would be inappropriate to require that all employees in a particular classification hold a Master's degree simply because it looks good on paper. However, if certain graduate courses are essential to successful performance, then it is recommended that organizations only require that applicants have those specific courses, and not the entire degree that may include non-related credits.
6. To Discriminate against certain groups. MQs should never act as an artificial barrier that restricts certain groups from meeting the requirements. For instance, height and weight requirements are inappropriate criteria. Dr. Seberhagen recommends translating requirements into observable behaviors, like climbing ladders, standing on feet for 8 hours, etc.

Dr. Seberhagen identified several technical standards that all MQs should adhere to when they are implemented in organizations. First, MQs should be validated. MQs should only list important qualities about the job needed on day one. While content validity is the most common method for gathering validity evidence, criterion validity is also a possibility. Secondly, the verbiage in MQs should be in terms of observable behaviors, and not abstract ideas that are difficult, or impossible to quantify. MQs should also be very broad and flexible in scope, and not try to account for every specific experience. Therefore, MQs should have true minimums that can be used to screen out unfit applicants and not make an attempt to identify the best-qualified applicants. MQs should minimize adverse impact by allowing for broad interpretations and have objective scoring. Little or no judgement should be needed when determining an applicant's eligibility to continue in the selection process. Very objective MQ applications should be able to be computer scored. In addition to objective scoring methods, MQs should be applied consistently across jobs. Similar jobs should have similar MQs, while higher-level jobs should have more demanding MQs than lower-level jobs. Finally, MQs should comply with professional (i.e., APA standards, SIOP Principles) and legal (i.e., Uniform Guidelines, ADA) standards.

One method to enhance the effectiveness of using MQs for personnel selection is to develop a supplemental application or survey that is sent to all applicants in addition to the standard application form. Supplemental applications can target very specific aspects of the job, and provide applicants with a better understanding of the job. Some supplemental applications resemble willingness surveys and can act as a realistic job preview. This can be an effective tool to screen out applicants (through self-selection) who are unable or unwilling to perform certain critical aspects of the job. Dr. Seberhagen shared a supplemental application he developed for the position of Electric Traction Trainee. He emphasized that MQs and supplemental applications do not have to be limited to traditional measures like education and experience. For instance, it would be possible to include personality traits, interests and motivation levels in MQs. The key is to translate these job-related characteristics into observable behaviors useful for determining and screening individual qualifications.

Dr. Seberhagen concluded his discussion by reiterating that MQs should be used to screen out job applicants who are obviously unfit for the job and should not be used for identifying the most qualified candidates. Finally, he emphasized the importance for requirements listed in MQs to be job related.

Presentation Summarized by
***David Hamill**.*

Personality Assessment for Employee Selection

Dr. Paul M. Mastrangelo
University of Baltimore

Dr. Mastrangelo reviewed the research and history regarding personality testing for employee selection. Historically, it has been the opinion of the profession that personality measures are not valid means for making employment decisions. This stems from the fact that the items on personality inventories were traditionally trait adjectives, and therefore, not job related. Recently, however, researchers have begun to think of personality measures as alternative assessment techniques, measuring the same constructs as biodata and interviews. Recent meta-analyses have suggested that measures such as personality, integrity and conscientiousness show validity coefficients ranging from .24 to .41. Not only do these measures have encouraging validity coefficients, but they have also been shown to be independent of "g" and free of adverse impact.

Some of the reasons for the resurgence of research regarding personality measures in personnel selection are:

- the shift from writing personality statements in adjectival form to writing them in behavioral form,

- the new research into the Big Five Model of personality (specifically, Conscientiousness), and
- the interaction between personality and the job.

In the early days of research, personality items were encoded as single adjectives. Recently, however, I/O Psychologists have begun to encode personality items as full statements with a verb. These statements are also verifiable, historical, actual, and focused on external events. Another advancement in the encoding of personality statements is to make them work specific. Researchers are finding that it is possible to write personality based statements as work-related behaviors.

Research into the Big Five (Extroversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience) has shown that Conscientiousness is consistently related to multiple criteria across jobs (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Some of these criteria include Efficiency (.83), Dutifulness (.78), and Purposefulness (.81) among others. It can be argued that conscientiousness is not a good predictor for all jobs but even low levels of it may be desirable for some jobs, such as police officer and artist. As a result of these findings, the Personality-Related Position Requirements Form (PPRF) was developed by Patrick Raymark et.al. (1997) for use as a "job analysis tool for forming hypotheses about personality predictors of job performance." This form starts with the Big Five Model and then identifies characteristics that fit under it. The five characteristics that the form measures are:

1. Surgency: general leadership, interest in negotiation, and achievement striving;
2. Agreeableness: friendly disposition, sensitivity to interest of others, and cooperative or collaborative work tendency;
3. Conscientiousness: general trustworthiness, adherence to work ethic, and thoroughness and attentiveness to details;
4. Emotional Stability: emotional stability; and
5. Intellectance: desire to generate ideas, and tendency to think things through.

Unfortunately, as with most personality and integrity measures, the issue of faking arises. Dr. Mastrangelo opened our eyes to an argument in the field regarding faking. The argument stems from the fact that one camp believes that faking in personality measures does not affect the overall validity of the measure and the other camp believes that it does. There have been experiments done to test the effect that faking has on overall validity. Several studies have broken a room of people into two groups where one group was told to be honest, and the other was told to be dishonest. As assumed, the people who were dishonest received better scores on the personality measure. However, when there is a "faking" or social desirability scale included in the personality measure, it does detect the faking. Social desirability scales, though, do not correlate with performance and neither moderate nor suppress validity. Therefore, using a faking scale does not affect the validity of the measure. Also, when trying to deal with the issue of faking, there are several questions that we must be aware of. First, we do not know what causes variability in a social desirability scale besides the manipulation. We also do not know how accurately a social desirability scale classifies fake v. honest participants. We know neither how prevalent faking is among applicants nor whether the real issue is "impression management". If the issue is impression management, who is more likely to monitor his/her impression and under what conditions will impression management dramatically change selection outcomes?

The research in personality measurements for personnel assessment has come quite far in recent years; however, there are still many questions left unanswered. Dr. Mastrangelo left us with several conclusions to consider when thinking about personality measures. Theoretical and technical improvements in personality assessment are forthcoming. First, we should expect improved job analysis tools for KSAO's, and second, a call for rational development of both biodata items and interview questions. As for validity and faking issues, the debate continues and we look forward to seeing some of the outcomes.

Presentation Summarized by Christine Connelly

The Development of Training & Experience Examinations

Nancy Abrams, Ph.D.
The Partnering Group

MAPAC was very fortunate to have Dr. Nancy Abrams of The Partnering Group present a full day workshop on the development of training and experience examinations (T&E's). Dr. Abrams provided a brief overview of several types of T&E's and then focused on two of the methods that have historically evidenced good validity. She stressed that there is no best T&E method. Rather, the alternatives were presented as options. The analyst's choice of T&E method might depend upon several different situational and measurement factors concerning the project in question.

A T&E is an indirect measure of job qualifications because we do not ask people to demonstrate work behaviors. Instead, we ask them to describe their experiences performing job-related behaviors. This limits the validity we can obtain. There are several assumptions underlying T&E evaluation, some of which include:

1. Past performance is the best predictor of future performance.

2. Individuals who have more experience in an occupation demonstrate greater commitment to the occupation and are more likely to perform and advance.
3. Training and experience indicate the various types of knowledge, skills and abilities the candidate possesses in reference to the target job.
4. The more training and experience a candidate has, the better qualified the candidate is.
5. Candidates have adequate written and verbal skills to accurately portray their past experiences.

Dr. Abrams covered five methods in the workshop. The first three T&E methods were described in brief. Development of the behavioral consistency method and the self-rating method were the focus of the workshop.

Holistic Judgement - a method in which candidates are judged as a whole and then compared to one another. Those who appear to be " better" are sorted out from the rest. This method has poor validity because it is unstructured.

Traditional Point - candidates receive points based on the number of years of experience they possess and according to their job-related education and training. Sometimes, rating scales are further broken down by levels of experience and education. Variations of the traditional point method are the most widely used type of T&E. They are based on the primary assumption that more experience is better and are often developed based on limited information about the job. Reliability of the traditional point method is usually high. In contrast, validity is usually low because one is trying to make fine distinctions based on insufficient information. Meta-analyses of different variations range from -.12 to .13.

Grouping or Banding – a method of sorting candidates into broad, pre-established categories based on a simultaneous consideration of job-related experience and education. Reliability of the grouping method is usually good since one is making only gross categorizations. Validity indices are reportedly in the .20's. Validity can be maximized by using SME'S who have good knowledge about the job and available training, etc. and by using a supplemental questionnaire to ask candidates specific questions about their experience and education.

Behavioral Consistency – a supplemental questionnaire is developed to ask candidates to describe their achievements in specific competencies that have been defined by job analysis. Usually five to ten factors are assessed. Candidates can provide more than one achievement for each factor, but will be rated only on the highest achievement.

Candidate responses are rated by SMEs using behavioral anchored rating scales (BARS). BARS can be developed based on actual candidate responses by using multiple raters to assess individual responses, and by taking the mean rating and Standard Deviation to identify different anchors. A less time consuming option is to have the SMEs develop general anchors without consideration of applicant responses. Since multiple raters are employed, it was stressed that a study of inter-rater reliability should be a component of the T&E development process. The behavioral consistency method has consistently evidenced very good validity, reportedly in the high .30's. However, it is very time consuming to develop and rate. It is most appropriate for use with a small applicant pool for a job that requires high levels of writing and analytical skills. Because it requires so much of the candidate's time to complete, it may help to eliminate those who have low motivation and interest. This method was recommended for use with an internal pool of between 20 and 30 candidates.

Self-Rating – specific job-related tasks and KSAs are presented to candidates in a supplemental questionnaire. A rating scale that reflects different degrees of experience, education and/or competence follows each element. Candidates are then asked to check off the level on the rating scale that most closely reflects their experience and/or education. The method works best when job elements are clearly described and are of a specific, technical nature. Rating scales should be simple, because candidates may ignore lengthy, narrative scales. Self-rating T&E's are easy to develop if good job analysis data are available. They are easy to score, and can be machine scored. They have high applicant acceptance but there is often some concern about self-inflated ratings. Self-inflation can be minimized by asking candidates to provide references for verification, which the assessor may or may not check. In order to reduce verification time, it was suggested that references be verified for only those candidates who have a preponderance of high ratings. Validity of KSA based self-ratings were reported to be between .10 and .23, whereas task based self-ratings have evidenced validity of .34.

Presentation Summarized by
Gwendolyn Schindler

IDENTIFYING KSAs IN OLDER WORKERS

William Hager

As our burgeoning economy surges ahead, and an unheard of 4% unemployment rate wreaks havoc on employers and recruiters, innovative solutions to filling vacancies are being discovered. With an ever-shrinking talent pool, organizations are retraining essentially forgotten candidates to perform more specialized and technical jobs. For older workers, age 65 and above, this presents a unique challenge. To be certain, testing and assessment must be uniform across age lines, however, as we rate older applicants, I believe there is a value - added facet of experience which if we aren't careful might well be missed.

According to data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2.2 million men and 1.6 million women over 65 were working or actively seeking work in 1998. They constituted 2.8% of the American labor force. This year, people 65 and older are projected to represent 13% of the population but will be 20% by 2030, a total of 70 million people. In 1998, 54% of older workers were employed part – time, 48% of men and 62% of women. The older population itself is getting older: in 1998 the 65 – 74 age group was eight times larger than in 1900, but the 75 – 84 group was 16 times larger. The 85+ group was 33 times larger.

This talent pool possesses multiple transferable KSA's. When evaluating applicants who are retired, "double dippers" or who are experiencing a late career change, the analyst must give credit for life experiences that may not be elucidated in the application documentation. Work, volunteer activities, hobbies and a variety of home and family roles make these folks highly desirable to fill a variety of classes. Experience skills can be transferred from one job to another. For example: *

- *"I can motivate students to learn" may translate into "I can motivate employees to achieve".*
- *"I can persuade a community to accept a water conservation idea" may translate to "I can persuade customers to buy a specific computer".*
- *"I can edit a community newsletter" may translate to "I can edit a corporate report".*
- *"I can manage and supervise an operations center for a military installation" may translate to "I can manage and supervise the operations of a commercial building".*
- *"I can test ideas for new social services projects" may translate to "I can test ideas for new commercial projects".*
- *"I can facilitate community board meetings" may translate to "I can facilitate corporate strategic planning sessions".*

The U.S. Administration on Aging provides a directory of web sites** designed to direct workers to training programs and reference materials in many states. AARP also has a wide range of source materials in their publication and on their web site.

As we continue to do our consulting work finding the most qualified candidates, lets not forget to expand our searches to include our most experienced workers. We must capture methods to incorporate these mentoring individuals into our assessment and rating models.

* AARP web article
**
www.aoa.dhhs.gov/aoa/webres/employ.htm

www.aarp.org/working_options/home.html

Stephen E. Bemis Memorial Award

At its annual winter meeting in Baltimore, members from the various MAPAC jurisdictions voted unanimously to nominate past-president Paul Kaiser for this year's Stephen E.

Bemis Memorial Award. Paul has a nation-wide reputation as an innovative practitioner and a true leader in the field of personnel assessment. Over the years he has held a host of leadership positions at the regional and national level most recently serving as national President of IPMAAC. Those who know Paul best admire him for his warmth, energy, enthusiasm and, perhaps most of all, his sense of humor.
These qualities, combined with his dedication to sharing his ideas and insights, make him a much sought after speaker from New York to Newport Beach. MAPAC is convinced that Paul possesses those very qualities that inspired the creation of the Bemis Award and that he richly deserves this honor.

New Chairman of SMAP

Dr. Philip Ferrara, Manager of Personnel Selection for the NYS Unified Court System, has been appointed chair of the Supervisory and Management Assessment Procedures Improvement Project (SMAP) when Charley Sproule retires at the end of March. Phil's creativity, energy, and extensive knowledge of selection practices, MAPAC, MAPAC member needs make him an ideal committee chair. He has already suggested several directions for the committee including a training session on supervisory assessment practices and the use of the MAPAC website to communicate the information to a broader MAPAC audience.

Charley's imprint on this project is clear--a strategic vision of selection and a creative approach to collaboration among MAPAC members to pull together information on what jurisdictions are doing. His management style in implementing this vision is well known. Phil's vision and style are different, but equally strong. The goals of the committee are large and MAPAC is truly fortunate to benefit from the talents of these two individuals.

Thanks to all the committee members, and particularly Charley for his long support on behalf of MAPAC, whose extensive work have made this project a success.

Lance Seberhagen

Message from your Membership Chair

James Frankart

It is now official that MAPAC has its own address. The address is MAPAC, PO BOX 607, Harrisburg PA, 17108-0607. You can still reach each of the officers at the addresses listed on the letterhead. If you wish you can send it to the official address and I will forward it on to the appropriate person.

Change of Address – Just a reminder. If you change your address, either E-mail and/or regular mail, please let me know. Every mailing we get some of the newsletters and programs materials returned because the address has changed. If I cannot find your new address, you will be dropped from the mailing list and miss this valuable information.

If you are a friend of MAPAC and have decided that you no longer wish to receive our mailings, please let me know and I will remove you from the mailing list.

TO ALL MY MAPAC FRIENDS:
It is hard to find words to express my feelings upon receiving the wonderful remembrances that you have presented to me. So I will simply borrow words attributed to Cyrano and say, "Thank you, thank you thank you and again I thank you." To all-best wishes for your continuing personal and professional success. Long live MAPAC!
Pat Zarro

Special Thanks

The twenty-three participants of the *Job Analysis For Content Validation Course* would like to extend a very special thanks to our excellent instructors:
Robyn Talesnik
Christine Connelly
Bob Schneider
David Hamill

We appreciate all of the effort you put into revising, planning and presenting the March 22—24 course in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. You opened our eyes to the brave new world of job analysis

Thanks

Newsletter

Look for your newsletter survey.
The Newsletter committee will be surveying MAPAC members for suggestions on newsletter

UPCOMING EVENTS

May 20-25 American Society for Training and Development. Annual Conference. Dallas, Texas. Contact ASTD (703) 6383.

June 3-7 IPMA Assessment Council. Annual Conference, Washington ,D C. Contact IPMA (703) 549-7200.

June 8-11 American Psychological Society. Annual Conference. Miami, FL. Contact APS, (202) 783-2077.

June 13-16 Organization Development Institute. Conference. "What's New in OD." Pacific Grove, CA. Contact ODI, (440) 729-7419

June 14 PTC/MW Luncheon Meeting Pier 7 Restaurant, Washington, DC. Contact: Dr. Lance Anderson (703) 219-4448.

June 25-28 Society for Human Resource Management. Annual Conference. Las Vegas, NV. Contact SHRM, (703) 548-3440.