As Summer gives way to Fall, the IPMAAC Board of Directors is preparing for its second meeting of the year, typically held the Sunday at the beginning of the IPMA Conference as it will be on October 20th this year. Please feel free to contact me, President-Elect Harry Brull, or any other Board member (listed on page of this publication) if there is any issue you wish to be considered by the Board.

The work of the committees is always among the most prominent topics of discussion by the Board, and the upcoming meeting is likely to be no exception in this regard. The Training Committee continues to be particularly active, as the details of an IPMAAC partnership with the Justice and Safety Institute of the College of Liberal Arts at the Penn State University to provide IPMAAC training workshops as part of Penn State’s continuing education are nearly final. In addition, IPMAAC training has recently been provided to the staff of the City of Minneapolis, and providing two other training workshops is under discussion.

Work to define the role of the Professional/Scientific Affairs Committee is proceeding, with newly elected Board member Dennis Doverspike spearheading that effort. I’m sure Dennis or any other Board member would be happy to hear your comments on the role of this committee that would be of most benefit to members. You may reach Dennis at 330-688-6187.

Howard Fortson is now chair of the Bemis Nominating Committee, and he is soliciting nominations for the Bemis Award to provide to the Board for consideration at its October meeting. This process is occurring earlier than in the past to allow for discussion at a Board meeting and to maximize the time available for writing the nomination for this award. Howard would appreciate hearing your suggested nominee; he can be reached at 916-263-3600, ext. 3049.

Other Professional Concerns

The “SIOP Principles,” more formally known as the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology’s Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures, have been revised by a 12-member ad hoc committee and submitted to the SIOP Executive Committee. Upon approval, the Executive Committee will transmit the document to the American Psychological Association for final review, approval, and publication (SIOP is Division 14 of the American Psychological Association.)

This document will be the fourth version of the Principles, which was first published in 1975 and most recently revised in 1987. The express purpose of this revision is to maintain consistency with the 1999 Standards for Psychological and Educational Testing, which are sponsored by the American Educational Research Association and the National Council on Measurement in Education as well as the American Psychological Association. Whereas the Standards are broad in their coverage of all test use within the fields of psychology and education, the Principles are specific to employment testing applications.

The most notable change in the Standards (and now the Principles) is their embracing of the concept that all test validity is construct validity, thus eliminating (continued on next page)
the need to specifically refer to “the construct validity of a test.” In fact, reference to all “types” or “strategies” of test validation is eliminated in favor of citing the five “sources of validity evidence” included in the Standards (test content; internal structure of the test; relationships of test scores to other variables; evidence based on response processes; and the consequences of testing).

These Principles refer to the “validation effort” as building a logical, well-founded argument for the use of a specific test in a specific situation for a specific purpose in contrast with their predecessors’ emphasis on “conducting a validation study.” The topics of transportability, synthetic validity/job component validity, and meta-analysis comprise a segment on generalizing validity evidence. At long last, it seems, the profession is recognizing that sound employment testing practices are based on a cumulative body of knowledge.

After what has been over a two-year revision process, let’s hope the final reviews proceed expeditiously so that the final version will be in our hands to use soon!—[AACCNN]

Technical Affairs

This month’s column includes an answer to a reader’s question about terminating employees as well as a piece of HR humor.

Question

Why is it so difficult to fire an employee? It seems that our department could be so much more productive if we didn’t have to keep the “dead weight.”

Answer

There is a big difference between terminating an employee in the public sector versus the private sector. In the private sector, the employment-at-will doctrine in most states allows employers freedom to fire an employee without a reason—at will. The idea behind employment at will is that because employees are free to quit their jobs at will, so too are organizations free to terminate an employee at will. There are, however, some limitations to this doctrine.

- **State law.** Some states such as California and New York have laws that an employee can only be fired for cause—breaking a rule or an inability to perform.
- **Provisions of federal or state law.** Employees cannot be fired for reasons protected by federal or state law. For example, an employer could not fire an employee solely because she was a female, pregnant, nonwhite, or over the age of 40.
- **Public policy/interest.** Employers cannot terminate an employee for exercising a legal duty such as jury duty or refusing to violate the law or professional ethics. For example, a large savings and loan institution ordered one of its appraisers to appraise homes higher than their actual value so that its customers could qualify to finance property. Citing federal regulations and professional ethics against inflating property values, the employee refused the company order. After being terminated, the employee successfully filed a law suit claiming that he had been fired for refusing to violate the law and the ethical standards of his profession.
- **Contracts.** Obviously, if an individual employee has a signed employment contract stipulating a particular period of employment, an organization cannot fire the employee without cause. Likewise, unions enter into collective bargaining agreements (contracts) with employers that also limit or negate employment at will.
- **Implied contracts.** Employment at will is nullified if an employer implies that an employee “has a job for life” or can only be fired for certain reasons. For example, if an interviewer tells an applicant “at this company, all you have to do is keep your nose clean to keep your job,” the employer will not be able to terminate the employee for minor rules infractions or for poor performance.
- **Covenants of good faith and fair dealing.** Though employers are generally free to hire and fire at will, the courts have ruled that employers must still act in good faith and deal fairly with an employee. These rulings have been based on an item in the Uniform Commercial Code stating “Every contract...imposes an obligation of good faith in its performance or enforcement” and the fact that courts consider employment decisions to be a form of a contract.

To protect their right to use a policy of employment at will, most organizations include employment-at-will statements in their job applications and employee handbooks. These statements usually hold up in court and employees seem to not challenge them.

**Legal Reasons for Terminating Employees**

In situations not covered by employment at will, there are only four reasons that an employee can be legally terminated: probationary period, violation of company rules, inability to perform, and an economically caused reduction in force (layoff).

**Probationary Period**

In many jobs, employees are given a probationary period in which to prove that they can perform well. Though most
probationary periods last 3 to 6 months, those for police officers are usually a year (in Scotland it is 2 years) and the probationary period for professors is 6 years! Employees can be terminated more easily during the probationary period than at any other time.

**Violation of Company Rules**

Courts consider five factors in determining the legality of a decision to terminate an employee for violating company rules. The first factor is that a rule against a particular behavior must actually exist. Though this may seem obvious, organizations often have “unwritten” rules governing employee behavior. These unwritten rules, however, will not hold up in court. For example, a manufacturer fired an employee for wearing a gun under his jacket at work. The employee successfully appealed on the grounds that even though “common sense” would say that guns should not be brought to work, the company did not have a written rule against it.

If a rule exists, a company must prove that the employee knew the rule. Rules can be communicated orally during employee orientation and staff meetings and in writing in the handbooks, newsletters, bulletin boards, and paycheck stuffers. Rules communicated in handbooks are the most legally defensible. To prove that an employee knew a rule, organizations require employees to sign statements that they received information about the rule, read the rule, and understand the rule.

The third factor is the ability of the employer to prove that an employee actually violated the rule. Proof is accomplished through such means as witnesses, video recordings, and job samples. Human resource professionals almost have to be detectives because proving rule violations is often not easy. For example, two supervisors saw an employee stagger into work and could clearly smell alcohol on her breath. She was terminated for violating the company rule against drinking. During her appeal of the termination, she claimed that she staggered because she had the flu and what the supervisors smelled was cough syrup rather than alcohol. The employee won the appeal. As a result of this case, the company now has an on-site nurse and breathalyzer tests are administered to employees suspected of using alcohol at work.

The fourth factor considered by the courts is the extent to which the rule has been equally enforced. That is, if other employees violated the rule but they were not terminated, terminating an employee for a particular rule violation may not be legal. This factor poses a dilemma for many organizations. Because courts look at consistency, lawyers advise organizations to fire any employee who violates a rule. To not fire a rule breaker, sets a precedent making termination of future rule breakers more difficult. There are many times when a good employee breaks a rule, a situation that normally would result in termination. However, because the employee is highly valued, the organization does not want to fire the employee.

The fifth and final factor is the extent to which the punishment fits the crime. Employees in their probationary period (usually their first six months) can be immediately fired for a rule infraction. For more tenured employees, however, the organization must make a reasonable attempt to change the person’s behavior through progressive discipline. The longer an employee has been with an organization, the greater the number of steps that must be taken to correct her behavior. Discipline can begin with something simple such as counseling or an oral warning, progress to a written warning or probation, and end with steps such as reductions in pay, demotions, or terminations.

For violations of some rules, progressive discipline is not always necessary. It is probably safe to say that an employer can terminate an employee who steals money or shoots someone at work.

**Inability to Perform**

Employees can also be terminated for an inability to perform the job. To do so though, an organization will need to prove that the employee could not perform the job and that progressive discipline was taken to give the employee an opportunity to improve. For an employer to survive a court challenge to terminating a poor performing employee, it must first demonstrate that there was a reasonable standard of performance that was communicated to the employee.

The organization must next demonstrate that there was a documented failure to meet the standard. Such documentation can include critical incident logs and work samples (e.g., poorly typed letters for a secretary, improperly hemmed pants for a tailor).

A properly designed performance appraisal system is the key to legally terminating an employee. Legal performance appraisal systems:

- Are based on a job analysis
- Have concrete, relevant standards that have been communicated to employees
- Involve multiple behavioral measures of performance
- Include several raters, each of whom has received training
- Are standardized and formal
- Provide the opportunity for an employee to appeal

**Reduction in Force (Layoff)**

Employees can be terminated if it is in the best economic interests of a organization to do so. Reductions in force, more commonly called layoffs, have been used by the vast majority of Fortune 500 companies in the past decade. In cases of large layoffs or plant closings, the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (WARN) requires that organizations provide workers with at least 60 days notice. Though layoffs are designed to save money, research indicates that not only do force reductions have a devastating effect on employees, but they often do not result in the desired financial savings.
The following piece of HR Humor was sent in by ACN Reader Mitch Stein.

**Human Resources: Thinking Outside the Box**

The tribal wisdom of the American Indians, passed on from generation to generation, says that when you discover that you are riding a dead horse the best strategy is to dismount. In human resources, however, a whole range of far more advanced strategies are often employed, such as:

1. Buying a stronger whip
2. Changing riders
3. Threatening the horse with termination
4. Appointing a committee to study the horse
5. Arranging to visit other countries to see how others ride a dead horse
6. Lowering the minimum qualifications so that dead horses can be included
7. Reclassifying the dead horse as living impaired
8. Harnessing several dead horses together as a team to increase the speed
9. Providing additional funding and/or training to increase the dead horse’s performance
10. Doing a productivity study to see if lighter riders would improve the dead horse’s performance
11. Declaring that as the dead horse does not have to be fed, it is less costly and carries lower overhead, and therefore contributes substantially more to the bottom line of the organization than do live horses
12. Rewriting the expected performance requirements for all horses
13. Promoting the dead horse to a supervisory position
A Supervisory Test Battery for New Jersey’s Merit System
by John C. Kraus
Director of Selection Services

NJ Department of Personnel
Background
A large body of research supports the tremendous influence that supervisors have on the lives of workers and ultimately on the success of an organization. Most everyone will agree that upon promotion to supervisory positions, individuals must take on new responsibilities and learn a completely different set of job skills. It is not uncommon for the best technical workers to refuse to take supervisory responsibilities, nor is it uncommon for brilliant technicians to be less than stellar in their new supervisory roles.

For these reasons, the New Jersey Department of Personnel (DOP) undertook the development of a valid and objective selection system that could provide comprehensive, consistent measurement of supervisory skills for more than 300 distinct, professional-level, job classifications. In addition, the new system had to increase the speed and the responsiveness of the promotion process. Our goal was to cut the time it took from announcement to referral of candidates, eliminate examination backlogs, and to significantly reduce the need to appoint provisional employees to supervisory positions. Ultimately, these improvements would enable Appointing Authorities to plan more efficiently for their agencies’ program needs.

A Change in Strategy
The development of this Supervisory Test Battery (STB) by the New Jersey DOP represented a fundamental change in our human resources strategy. In the past the DOP had tested both technical knowledge and supervisory skills and had done this for each job title. Under the new system, with a few exceptions, the examination process would no longer measure technical aspects of supervisory jobs. We reasoned that, for most jobs, the employee performance appraisal system adequately assesses technical abilities. Further, by the time applicants are eligible to compete for supervisory positions, most likely, they have passed tests and demonstrated mastery of the requisite technical skills. Our new strategy was in keeping with that of our neighbor, the New York State Department of Civil Service. A few years earlier New York State had successfully implemented a similar program for supervisory, managerial, and administrative promotions.

Identification of Supervisory Competencies
We conducted an in-depth literature review to learn how academicians, researchers, and trainers describe what supervisors do and what abilities they need to possess to perform successfully. New Jersey’s own supervisory job analyses provided a starting point for our investigation. We also reviewed studies of public and private sector supervisory jobs, including supervisory job analysis information from a number of state and municipal agencies nationwide.

We discovered that despite the numerous models and taxonomies of supervisory tasks and competencies, there is a fairly consistent core of common supervisory tasks and characteristics required for successful performance of those tasks. In other words, a supervisor, is a supervisor, is a supervisor, regardless of the technical aspects of the work or the work context. The DOP’s new Supervisory Test Battery was designed to test approximately twenty of these common supervisory competencies. Examples include: developing, directing, guiding, evaluating, supporting and motivating others, conflict management, problem solving, integrity, and communication skills.

About the Supervisory Test Battery
The Supervisory Test Battery (STB) is essentially a “day-in-the-life” simulation of a supervisor in a fictitious government organization. By placing candidates in a fictitious organization, the STB puts all candidates on an equal footing. The STB consists of background information and in-basket items, which are presented in paper-and-pencil format, and a series of multiple-choice questions, which are presented and scored by computer. Through the background information, candidates learn about the organization’s history, procedures, structure, and employees. The in-basket items include memoranda, letters and other materials that supervisors would expect to find in their in-baskets. These materials provide a context for the different scenarios that are presented in the test. Candidates then respond to 120 multiple-choice questions. Most of these questions are situation-based. Candidates can refer to the background materials and documents throughout the administration of the test.

The multiple-choice questions are administered by computer. Computerized administration allows for a num-
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number of useful features. First, it increases our flexibility in configuring the test. STB items can have as few as two or as many as twelve response options. Using the software’s branching option, we can ask candidates to provide their first response to a situation, then repeat the question and ask them what other response might be appropriate. The software automatically eliminates the first response that was selected so that the candidate must choose a different response. Each response option is weighted based on its appropriateness as a response to the situation at hand. The assignment of weights increases the realism of the instrument, because in the real world more than one response may be effective and some responses are more effective than others.

The computer also makes test administration more efﬁcient. Candidates can begin to answer the questions as soon as they have completed their review of the background materials. Once candidates begin answering the multiple-choice questions they automatically engage a countdown clock that is displayed on the computer. The clock allows candidates to keep track of their time. The test automatically terminates when the test administration period has concluded. The computer immediately tallies the candidate’s score and the candidates receive their final score as soon as they complete the test. Finally, the computer-administration also allows for improved test security. Candidates cannot remove test materials from the site. Computer administration also deters “over-the-shoulder” cheating.

The test questions must be answered sequentially. Candidates cannot return to earlier questions. Nor can they skip questions. We have good reasons for controlling the response sequence. Most importantly, this enables the test to simulate critical aspects of the supervisory job. Supervisory jobs require a readiness to make and commit to decisions. The test mirrors these requirements by requiring candidates to respond to actual situations. By requiring candidates to respond to all items in a speciﬁed order, we also provide a better simulation of “real time” decision-making. Candidates must commit to an answer rather than skipping the item and returning to it later. Years of test taking has taught most of us the beneﬁts of skipping more difﬁcult questions and returning to them later. Unfortunately, this strategy undermines decision-making process that we are trying to measure. Until the introduction of computerized testing, there was no easy way to prevent candidates from revisiting earlier questions and answers.

In addition, by requiring candidates to respond sequentially, we can control the amount information presented to them during the course of the test. The STB includes include some questions that present information that would be useful in responding to earlier questions. No doubt, if given the opportunity, these candidates would opt to go back and change their initial answers. However, ability to act on hindsight is not one of our measurement objectives.

SME Involvement

We solicited volunteers to review and establish the content validity of the STB. The resulting 35 Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) represented a wide variety of backgrounds and agencies. The SMEs were divided into four groups. Two groups critiqued and edited a draft version of the test and background materials to ensure that they were appropriate, unambiguous, and accurate. The SMEs also evaluated each question for relevance and importance, assigned weights to all response options, and linked each test question and response option to the competencies being measured. Each team cross-validated the other’s ratings.

A third group conducted a sensitivity review. These SMEs identiﬁed any offensive, objectionable, or ambiguous material (e.g., certain words, phrases, stereotypes, ideas, descriptions) that might be disadvantageous to a particular candidate population. A fourth group of SMEs pre-tested the entire examination to eliminate inconsistencies and superﬂuous material. This group also helped to determine the passing score and the appropriate time allocation for test administration.

Policies Associated with the Test

STB test scores remain active and are banked for up to two years. Should a candidate apply and be determined eligible for a future announcement associated with any of the more than 300 supervisory titles tested by the STB, his or her test score for that announcement is automatically applied during the ﬁrst year. A candidate, however, has the opportunity to re-take the STB in association with a future announcement, if the test for that subsequent announcement is held 12-24 months after their ﬁrst STB test date. During this 12-24 month period, candidates also have the option to apply their previous STB test score in lieu of taking the examination again. If a candidate chooses to re-take the test after 12 months, the new test score replaces the previous score.

Summary

The STB is a good example of how technology can be used to improve the quality and efﬁciency of the examination process. New Jersey has replaced hundreds of tests of varying type and quality with one cost-effective, efﬁcient, and highly valid selection instrument. This test is used for all applicants for ﬁrst-level supervisory jobs in State, county or municipal government agencies. Since its inception, the STB has been used in association with more than 350 separate promotional and open competitive announce-

(continued on next page)
New Supervisory Test Battery continued

ments; more than 4,000 candidates have been tested. No one has challenged the test’s validity.

The STB’s realism has won a high level of acceptance among candidates. In particular, candidates appreciate the STB’s recognition that there is often more than one correct way to respond to a situation. Candidates also value the efficiency that the STB lends to the application process. They receive their test score immediately—as soon as they complete test, and their test score can be applied to multiple announcements. In addition, they appreciate the fact that all supervisory candidates are held to the same standard.

Finally, the STB has greatly improved the efficiency of the DOP. The STB has helped to eliminate the appointment of provisional employees, speeded the delivery of eligible lists and, most significantly, improved the quality of candidates on those lists.—ASCH

The IPMAAC 2003 Conference—Please Respond to the Call

By Ilene Gast, Co-Chair

IPMAAC Conference Program Committee

It’s time to start thinking about the next IPMAAC Conference in Baltimore, MD. My Co-Chair, Amy Bauer and I are very excited about the location. Baltimore is a great place to have a conference. With many wonderful attractions, there’s something for everyone to enjoy: Orioles Baseball, the National Aquarium, the Baltimore Symphony, the Inner Harbor, Little Italy, and crabs by the bushel.

However, from June 23 to June 25 the biggest attraction will be the 2003 IPMAAC Conference, of course, we’re probably a little biased! Our rapidly evolving program will include exciting invited speakers, informative workshops and tutorials, and loads of opportunities for you to interact with your colleagues. But we need your help. Traditionally, the backbone of the conference has been the presentations made by members and friends of IPMAAC. When you receive the 2003 Call for Proposals, we urge you to think about the work you are now doing. There are lots of people who want to learn from your experience. Even if you’ve never presented before, please take a few minutes to respond to the call. Encourage your co-workers and associates to do the same. We’re counting on you!

One more thing...this year we are attempting to move more fully into the electronic age. Those of you on the IPMAAC mailing list will receive the call for proposals via electronic mail. We are also posting the call for proposals on IPMAAC Online. In addition, we are encouraging you to submit your proposals electronically. Of course, if you would prefer to submit by fax or mail, the option will be available.

The Host Committee is also looking for volunteers to help make the conference memorable. Please contact Christine Parker (cparker@mdot.state.md.us or 410-767-0710) if you are interested or have any questions.

Please stay tuned for further details from the Program Committee! Meanwhile, if you have any questions or recommendations we would love to hear from you.

Amy Bauer
Maryland State Highway Administration
707 N. Calvert Street, MS602
Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: (402) 545-5609
E-Mail: Abauer@sha.state.md.us

Ilene Gast
HQHRD-R&D, Immigration and Naturalization Service
800 K Street, NW, Suite 5000
Washington, DC 20535
Phone: 202-305-0590
E-Mail: Ilene.f.gast@usdoj.gov—ASCH
I/O Solutions is focused on public safety selection. As the nation’s leading public safety human resources consulting firm, our consultants have developed, implemented and validated assessment programs for over 1,000 public safety agencies, located in over 40 of the 50 states and Canada. These programs include promotional, entry-level and physical-ability examinations for police, corrections and fire departments.

Professional I/O Solutions’ consultants work hand-in-hand with some of the largest public safety agencies in the nation to customize state-of-the-art selection systems. Our training as psychologists and psychometricians, coupled with our knowledge of the public safety human resources field, means that we come to your agency already knowing what many of our competitors have to learn on your time.

I/O Solutions brings you...

- extensive public safety selection knowledge and experience
- a dedicated team of professional, trained psychologists and psychometricians
- a comprehensive choice of up-to-date examinations and assessment vehicles
- fully customized job-analysis and selection programs

Our success is measured by our ability to enhance your performance. The reason we fulfill this promise is simple—we consistently earn our clients’ trust. We would be honored to serve your agency.

Many of our public safety clients came to us while struggling to meet the demands of the federal government. Developing solutions for them has made us keenly aware of the steps that must be taken to ensure the validity, reliability, fairness and defensibility of every examination process.

In addition to our customized examination programs, I/O Solutions also offers a full line of off-the-shelf testing, including the following:

- National Criminal Justice Officer Selection Inventory (NCJOSI)
- National Firefighter Selection Inventory (NFSI)
- Law Enforcement Supervisor I and II
- Fire Service Supervisor I and II
- And more...

Questions can be sent to us via email at the following address: info@iosolutions.org. To find out more about us, please take a look at our website, http://www.iosolutions.org.
American Psychological Association (APA)
The APA hosted its annual convention in Chicago this year on August 22-25 and it was a huge success! The 2003 Convention will be in Toronto, Ontario on August 7-10, 2003; in Honolulu, Hawaii from July 28 - August 1, 2004; in Washington, D.C. from August 18-21, 2005; in New Orleans, Louisiana from August 10-13, 2006; and San Francisco, California from August 16-19, 2007. For more information, visit their website at www.apa.org as it is updated.

Bay Area Applied Psychologists (BAAP)
On September 10th, Judy David Bloomfield spoke on Work/Life Balance in Oakland. The next meeting, which will focus on Organizational Performance, will be in San Francisco in November. The exact date, location, and the speaker will be announced at a later date. The holiday party will take place on Thursday, December 12, in East Bay. Specifics will be provided at a later date as well.

The BAAP sponsors a speaker once a quarter who delivers a presentation to its members. The location varies, but the format involves networking from 6:00 – 7:00 p.m., followed by the speaker’s presentation at 7:00 p.m. BAAP speakers are typically leaders in the field and deliver interactive presentations with plenty of group discussions. Check the website at www.baaponline.org for the most current information on upcoming events, speakers, and topics.

Chicago Industrial/Organizational Psychologists (CI/OP)
CI/OP generally has Friday afternoon sessions from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m featuring several speakers addressing a topic. Visit their website at www.iit.edu/~ciop/.

Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology (METRO)
For confirmation of the most current schedule, call the MetroLine at (212) 539-7593 or visit METRO’s website at www.metroapppsych.com.

Minnesota Professionals for Psychology Applied to Work (MPPAW)
MPPAW, an organization consisting of a broad range of practitioners, consultants and professors, has scheduled the following programs: On September 19, Joyce Bono of the University of Minnesota spoke on “Transformational Leadership”; on October 17, Karen Grabow of Land-O-Lakes, and Laurie Zaugg of United Health Care Group, will speak on “Assessment and Coaching From A Practitioner Perspective”; on November 21, Andrea Olson of the College of St. Catherine will speak on “Teams”; and on January 16, 2003, Joy Hazucha of Personnel Decisions, Inc., and Sharon Arad of Metrix Work, Inc., will speak on “Work in an International Context: Variations in Personality at Work Across Cultures.” Information regarding these programs may be obtained from Sidney Teske at Sid.Teske@co.hennepin.mn.us.

Mid-Atlantic Personnel Consortium (MAPAC)
The Fall Conference is scheduled for October 9-11 in New York, New York at Baruch College. For more details, contact Amy Bauer at (410) 545-5609, or visit their website which is accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/.

Personnel Testing Council of Arizona
August’s luncheon featured Nicholas Vasilopoulos, Ph.D of George Washington University discussing “Self Report Measures: Is it what you ask or how you ask it?” Its 25th anniversary celebration will be on Wednesday, October 9, 2002 at the Renaissance International Hotel tentatively from 2:00 - 6:00 p.m. Guest speakers will include Frank Landy, Elaine Pulakos, and Ann Marie Ryan. Rooms will be available for overnight guests at the Renaissance International Hotel, 999 9th Street NW, Washington, D.C. (202-898-9000).

For more information visit their website which is accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/.

Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC/MW)
On Friday, September 13, the Fall Conference (a half-day training program) took place in Sacramento, California. On Friday, October 11, a meeting will be held in Berkeley, California. On Friday, November 15, a meeting will be held in Sacramento, California. On Friday, December 13, the Annual PTC/MW Holiday Program will take place at a location to be announced. For more information visit their website which is accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/.

Personnel Testing Council of Northern California (PTC/NC)
The Fall Conference is scheduled for October 9-11 in New York, New York at Baruch College. For more details, contact Amy Bauer at (410) 545-5609, or visit their website which is accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/.

Personnel Testing Council of Southern California (PTC/SC)
PTC/SC serves as a forum for the discussion of current issues in personnel selection and testing; to encourage education and professional development in the field of personnel selection and testing; to advocate the understanding and the use of fair and non-discriminatory employment practices; and to encourage the use of professionally sound selection and testing practices. Upcoming meetings is scheduled on November 20. Topics and speakers will be announced. All luncheons will be at Luminarias Restaurant in Monterey Park, California from 11:30am to 2:00pm. For more information regarding luncheon meetings, workshops, or membership, please e-mail Bernadette Babasa at (continued on next page)
bbabasa@sempra.com or Liz Walker at tomliz@worldnet.att.net. For more information visit their website which is accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/.

**Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM)**

The Workplace Diversity Conference & Exposition will take place on October 21-23, 2002 in Chicago, Illinois. The 20th Annual Employment Law and Legislative Conference will be held on March 10-12, 2003 in Washington, DC. The 26th Annual Conference & Exposition of the SHRM Global Forum will be held on March 31 - April 2, 2003 in Los Angeles, CA. The 34th Annual Employment Management Association Conference & Exposition will be held on April 23-25, 2003 in Las Vegas, NV. The 55th Annual Conference & Exposition will be held on June 22-25, 2003 in Orlando, Florida. For more information visit their website at www.shrm.org/.

**Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology (SIOP)**

The 18th Annual SIOP Conference will be held in Orlando, Florida on April 11 - 13, 2003, with workshops beginning on April 10, 2003. For more information visit their website at www.siop.org/.

Request for Volunteers! SIOP is looking for volunteers to help conduct a set of membership needs and satisfaction surveys of its members for the Fall. A presentation of the survey will be made to the APS Board of Directors in early/mid December. Surveys will be used to assess how various APS services and activities are rated by its members and what new services it should provide. Results will help guide the APS Board and Staff in making decisions about future directions for the Society. Please direct inquiries to: Louis Shomette, Director of Membership & Marketing, American Psychological Society, 1010 Vermont Ave., NW Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20005-4907, e-mail lshomette@aps.washington.dc.us, telephone 202-783-2077 ext. 3026, FAX 202-783-2083.

Future SIOP conferences include April 2-4, 2004 in Chicago, Illinois; and April 15-17, 2005 in Los Angeles, California.

**Western Region Intergovernmental Personnel Assessment Council (WRIPAC)**

WRIPAC sponsored its training on September 18 - 20 in Pacific Grove, California. For more information visit their website which is accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/.

**Western Region Item Bank (WRIB)**

WRIB is a cooperative organization of public agencies using a computerized test item bank. Services include draft test questions with complete item history, preparation of “printer ready” exams, and exam scoring and item analysis. Membership includes 190 agencies nationwide. For more information, contact Kathryn Paget, (909) 387-5575.
Upcoming International, National, and Regional Conferences and Workshops

**OCTOBER 2002**

4: NCS Assessments Workshop #2 on “Effective and Responsible Use of Psychological Tests in Pre-Employment Selection, in Minneapolis, MN (Marquette Hotel). Contact http://assessments.ncs-pearson.com


9-11: MAPAC Fall Conference.

11: PTC/NC Luncheon Meeting.


17: MPPAW Program.


21-23: SHRM Conference.


**NOVEMBER 2002**


15: PTC/NC Luncheon Meeting.


20: PTC/SC Luncheon Meeting.

21: MPPAW Program.

**DECEMBER 2002**

12: BAAP Holiday Party.

13: PTC/NC Annual Holiday Program.

**JANUARY 2003**

16: MPPAW Program.

**FEBRUARY 2003**


**MARCH 2003**

7-9: IO/OB Graduate Student Conference. Akron, OH. Contact: Chris Rosen, ccr3@uakron.edu.

10-13: SHRM Conference. Washington, DC.


Apr 2: SHRM Conference. Los Angeles, CA.


(Some of the information in this calendar was reprinted with permission from the PTC/MW Newsletter which was compiled by Lance W. Seberhagen, Seberhagen & Associates.)

Karen Krauss is a Human Resources Analyst for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. If you have regional organization news or an item to add to the calendar, please contact her by e-mail at positive4ever@aol.com or by telephone at (702) 229-3978.—AACCNN
## 2002 IPMAAC Board of Directors and Committee Chairs

### IPMAAC Board of Directors

**President**

Donna L. Denning  
Personnel Research Psychologist  
City of Los Angeles  
700 East Temple Street, Rm. 320  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Tel (213) 847-9134, Fax (213) 847-9189  
ddenning@per.lacity.org

**President-Elect**

Harry Brull  
Sr. VP, Public Sector Services  
Personnel Decisions International  
2000 Plaza VII Tower, 45 S. 7th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Tel (612) 337-8233, Fax (612) 337-3695  
harry.brull@personneldecisions.com

**Past-President**

Thung-Rung (T.R.) Lin  
Assistant Superintendant  
Bassett Unified School District  
904 N. Willow Avenue  
La Puente, CA 91746  
Tel (616) 931-3007, Fax (626) 931-3097  
trlin@bassett.k12.ca.us

**IPMAAC Rep. to IPMA Executive Council**

Senior Associate  
Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc.  
8283 Greensboro Drive  
McLean, VA 22102-3838  
Tel (703) 917-2134, Fax (703) 902-3553  
dye_david@bah.com

**Board Members**

Martin Anderson (2002-2004)  
Connecticut Dept of Administrative Services  
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 404  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Tel (860) 713-5042, Fax (860) 713-7413  
martin.anderson@po.state.ct.us

Sr. Associate  
Darany and Associates  
P.O. Box 6037  
Kingman, AZ 86402-6037  
Tel (928) 757-7783, Fax (928) 757-2967  
jfrench@ctaz.com

### Committees

**Conference Program**

Michelle Collins  
Human Resources Development  
3715 Douglas Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75219  
Tel (214) 559-2599, Fax (509) 695-9275  
mcollins@hrdevelopment.org

**Conference Host**

Kirk Smith  
Louisiana Department of Civil Service  
1201 Capitol Access Road  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9111  
Tel (225) 342-2376, Fax (225) 342-2386  
smith@dscs.state.la.us

**Marketing/Publicity**

David Hamill  
Immigration and Naturalization Service  
Research & Development Branch  
800 K Street, NW, Room 5000  
Washington, DC 20536  
Tel (202) 305-1746, Fax (202) 305-3664  
david.g.hamill@usdoj.gov

**University Liaison/Student Paper Competition**

Lee Friedman  
EDS Government Consulting Service  
13900 Lincoln Park Drive — MS 405/BICS  
Herndon, VA 20171  
Tel (703) 742-2468, Fax (703) 742-2666  
lee.friedman@eds.com

**Continuity**

Harry Brull  
Sr. VP, Public Sector Services  
Personnel Decisions International  
2000 Plaza VII Tower  
45 S. 7th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Tel (612) 337-8233, Fax (612) 337-3695  
harry.brull@personneldecisions.com

**Professional/Scientific Affairs**

Martin Anderson  
Connecticut Dept of Administrative Services  
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 404  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Tel (860) 713-5042, Fax (860) 713-7413  
martin.anderson@po.state.ct.us

**Assessment Council News**

Deonda Scott  
Civil Service/Testing Manager  
City of Orlando  
400 S. Orange Avenue  
Orlando, FL 32801-3302  
Tel (407) 246-2061, Fax (407) 246-2019  
deonda.scott@cityoforlando.net

**Electronic Communications Network**

Bill Waldron  
Tampa Electric Company  
P.O. Box 111  
Tampa, FL 33601  
Tel (813) 630-6503, Fax (813) 630-6802  
bill@bwaldron.com

**Training/Workshop**

Mabel Miramon  
California State Personnel Board  
MS 37  
801 Capitol Mall  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Tel (916) 653-1401, Fax (916) 653-1353  
mmiramon@spb.ca.gov

**Innovations in Assessment Award**

Ilene Gast  
Senior Research Psychologist  
Immigration and Naturalization Service  
HQHRD-R&D  
800 K Street, NW, Suite 5000  
Washington, DC 20536  
Tel (202) 305-0590, Fax (202) 514-4200  
ilene.f.gast@usdoj.gov

**Nominations/Bylaws**

T.R. Lin  
Assistant Superintendent  
Bassett Unified School District  
904 N. Willow Avenue  
La Puente, CA 91746  
Tel (616) 931-3007, Fax (626) 931-3097  
trlin@bassett.k12.ca.us

**Bemis Award-Nomination**

TBD

**Bemis Board & Selection**

Anne Soileau  
Louisiana Department of Civil Service  
P.O. Box 94111  
Capitol Station  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
Tel (225) 342-8069, Fax (225) 342-8058  
asoileau@dscs.state.la.us
YOUR SOURCE FOR MULTI-LANGUAGE PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

16PFworld.com BRINGS YOU A WORLD OF BENEFITS:

Reliable Measurement
Comprehensive, valid, and reliable, the 16PF Questionnaire is one of the most respected measures of personality in the world.

Convenience
Online test administration, scoring, and reporting, plus access to test results when and where you need it, including downloadable data.

Language Options
Tests can be administered in the native languages of the test takers. Reports can be generated in the test languages, and translated into your language and the language of your clients.

Consistent Reports
All test translations measure the same normal personality factors and generate reports in a standard format across language versions.

PUT THESE BENEFITS TO WORK FOR YOU BY CALLING US OR BY LOGGING ON TO WWW.16PFworld.com.

1-800-225-4728, EXT. AACW
WWW.IPAT.COM
About the ACN

The ACN is the official newsletter of the International Personnel Management Association Assessment Council, an association of individuals actively engaged in or contributing to the professional, academic and practical field of personnel research and assessment. The Council has approximately 700 members.

The ACN is published six times a year during the even months of the year. It serves as a source of information about significant activities of the council, a medium of dialogue and information exchange among members, a method for dissemination of research findings and a forum for the publication of letters and articles of general interest.

Submissions for Publication: Assessment Council members and others with letters or articles of interest are encouraged to submit materials for review and publication. Submission deadlines for 2002 issues are:

December: November 1
January: December 1

Articles and information for inclusion in the sections (News of the Councils, Technical Affairs, Public Sector Practice Exchange) should be submitted directly to the Associate Editor responsible for the appropriate section. Submissions may also be made to the Editor.

If you have questions or need further information please contact the Editor, Associate Editors, or IPMA.

Editor
Deonda Scott
Civil Service/Testing Manager
City of Orlando
400 S. Orange Avenue
Orlando, FL 32801-3302
Tel: (407) 246-2061
Fax: (407) 246-2019
deaonda.scott@cityoforlando.net

Associate Editors
Assessment Council Affairs
Karen Krauss
HR Analyst
Las Vegas Metro Police Dept
101 Convention Center Drive, Suite P200
Tel: (702) 229-3978
Fax: (702) 229-3980
k3536k@lvmpd.com

Practice Exchange
Ilene Gast
HQHRD-R&D, Techworld
800 K Street, NW, Room 5000
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 305-0590
Fax: (202) 305-3664
Ilene.F.Gast@usdoj.gov

Technical Affairs
Mike Aamodt
Professor, Radford University
Department of Psychology
Box 6946, Radford University
Radford, VA 24142
Tel: (540) 831-5513
Fax: (540) 831-6113
maamodt@runet.edu

IPMA Assessment Council Affairs
Karen Krauss
HR Analyst
Las Vegas Metro Police Dept
101 Convention Center Drive, Suite P200
Tel: (702) 229-3978
Fax: (702) 229-3980
k3536k@lvmpd.com

Practice Exchange
Ilene Gast
HQHRD-R&D, Techworld
800 K Street, NW, Room 5000
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 305-0590
Fax: (202) 305-3664
Ilene.F.Gast@usdoj.gov

Technical Affairs
Mike Aamodt
Professor, Radford University
Department of Psychology
Box 6946, Radford University
Radford, VA 24142
Tel: (540) 831-5513
Fax: (540) 831-6113
maamodt@runet.edu

IPMA Staff
Julie Galli
Director of Assessment Products
jgalli@ipma-hr.org

Debbie Booze
Association Services Coordinator
dbooze@ipma-hr.org

IPMA
1617 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: (703) 549-7100
Fax: (703) 684-0948