ACN

Assessment Council News

Brull Ramblings

Not a lot new in Lake Wobegon. Summer is pretty much over, at least here in Minnesota. The good news is that the leaves are starting to turn color; the bad news is that it's already starting to get cold.

I must confess that I'm still experiencing a warm glow from this summer's conference in Baltimore. Please see the 2003 Bemis Award column for the identities and some of the accomplishments of the nominees and the recipient of the 2003 Stephen E. Bemis Memorial Award. Congratulations to all of you for having earned the respect and admiration of your peers.

It was also my pleasure, as IPMAAC's president, to hand out two discretionary awards for distinguished contributions to IPMAAC. Please join me in recognizing Karen Coffee and Mike Willihnganz for their contributions over many years to IPMAAC, as well as to other assessment organiza-tions. Karen and Mike have been there time and time again to meet whatever need happened to surface. Their good counsel, hard work, and unfailing support certainly earns them the title of "Distinguished Contributors."

A few IPMAACers made it to the IPMA national conference in Chicago. On behalf of IPMAAC, I presented a concurrent session titled "Leadership: Nature and Nurture." It was well attended (approximately 75) and hopefully of value to participants.

Stay tuned to the next issue of ACN for further clarification regarding financial contributions to IPMAAC. It's hard to believe that it's already October of 2003. I've very much enjoyed the opportunity to serve IPMAAC as its president. See you in December.

Harry Brull
Minneapolis, Minnesota

2003 Bemis Award

2003 represents the 18th year of recognizing professionals in the field who exemplify Steve Bemis' attributes. These include:

- Accomplished personnel measurement practitioners who are recognized for their ongoing commitment to the principles of merit and fairness
- Professionals who have made an impact in the field by their *practical* contribution(s) that have result-ed in an improved or new procedure
- Concerned individuals who are recognized for their commitment to assisting fellow practitioners, being available to them, and freely calling on them.

The Stephen E. Bemis Memorial Award is a unique award in that it is intended to reflect on both the tangible contributions that Steve Bemis provid-

ed to our profession AND on the open, caring attitude that characterized his personality. It was designed to serve as a perpetual reminder of the qualities that caused his colleagues to admire him.

To be nominated by one's colleagues is the highest honor. Following are this year's nominees for the Stephen E. Bemis Memorial Award.

Elizabeth Kolmstetter, Ph.D. Elizabeth has held three key positions in her recent career (at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Skills Standard Board, and the Transportation Security Administration), in which she has made significant practical contributions to the field of personnel assessment. Perhaps most impressive is Elizabeth's most recent accomplishment in developing and implementing valid and fair selection procedures for transportation security screeners and law enforcement officers at the Transportation Security Administration. She also has a long and stellar history of volunteering her time and energy to the field and other practitioners. Elizabeth is viewed by colleagues as being approachable, easily accessible, and responsive.

She has been active in professional associations such as the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology, ASTD, SHRM, Phi Beta Kappa, and is a past president of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington. She was a founding member of SIOP's Visibility Committee and provided numerous hours of personal time promoting the understanding of I/O psychology in the nation.

Mary Anne Nester has had a long and distinguished career in personnel assessment that has largely been devoted to supporting merit-based selection within public sector organizations. Her accomplishments include being the architect of the groundbreaking Logic-Based Measurement System; research and policy development on testing persons with disabilities; and management of the Entry-Level Assessment Section for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now the Department of Homeland Security).

In her joint work with Magda Colberg on Logic-Based Measurement (LBM), the two researchers followed a construct/content-based approach consisting of the selection of test measures that exemplify the actual reasoning forms used most prevalently on the job. Furthermore, these test measures were embedded in an actual job context, thereby making possible the development of tests that exhibit higher and tighter construct/content validity than traditional tests. They also exhibited a total removal of extraneous elements of measurement that might unfairly discriminate against any particular group.

Mary Anne literally wrote the book on testing individuals with disabilities. She creatively synthesized work from

rehabilitation and educational testing with the demands for job-related and non-discriminatory employment. Much of her seminal work influenced the procedures that were adopted more widely once the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) was passed five years later.

Mary Anne's concern for and commitment to fellow practitioners is one of her most outstanding features. From casual encounters to professional presentations, Mary Anne goes out of her way to encourage others to contribute and to succeed. As one of her colleagues put it, "In the course of any meeting with Mary Anne you can expect to learn new things about measurement, gain a more thorough understanding of how to meet the organization's needs, receive positive feedback, and have the opportunity to discuss your life outside of work. What more could you hope for?"

Kathryn Paget Kathryn's contributions in the field of personnel assessment are evident in the many projects she has tackled, both large and small, on a daily basis. After concerns were voiced from the sheriff's department law enforcement officers regarding the promotional testing process, Kathryn directed teams of staff in conducting a major job analysis on three of their promotional classifications. In her job as manager of the Western Region Item Bank (WRIB), Kathryn looks for opportunities to assist members with improving their test processes within the parameters of their own jurisdictional rules.

She has been instrumental in creating a countywide internship program that allows human resources to better assist departments in their searches for students with job-related education. Kathryn gives in all ways possible to those that yearn for her assistance. She strives to enhance training and to make it effective, fun, appealing, and interesting. She has conducted half-day training sessions as well as having been a presenter for WRIB, PTC/SC, MAPAC, and IPMAAC. She has been an instructor at the local community college in addition to performing consulting work. She has also served in leadership roles in several organizations. She has been co-vice president of PTC/SC, as well as its president. She served as WRIPAC president, and was the co-chair of the 2000 IPMAAC conference.

Donna Terrazas With over 30 years of experience, Donna has contributed to the field of personnel assessment through her varied employment with several notable public employers; among them are Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), UC Berkeley, Contra Costa County, Contra Costa Water District, and her current employer, East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Of particular note in the area of merit and fairness was Donna's management of a court-mandated settlement agreement at the East Bay Municipal Utility District. She

was responsible for implementing significant selection program improvements to satisfy the court order resulting from a class action lawsuit. Adverse impact was reduced from 90% to 12% over the five-year period of the agreement, and the entire employment process was found to be content-valid.

Donna's personnel assessment work has led to her involvement in other facets of human resources. At LAUSD, for example, she developed and administered the first assessment center and designed the physical agility test for campus police to include climbing chain-link fences, since that is what surrounds most schools!

Donna has become the ultimate trainer. What sets her apart from others is her willingness to always help. When topics of her expertise come up and her name is mentioned, she accepts the responsibility and then makes adjustments to fit it into her schedule.

"Excellence in networking" summarizes Donna's self-created work environment. As busy as she is, she always finds time to network with others in the field, whether it be at work, with a training opportunity, or at a conference.

And the 2003 recipient of the Stephen E. Bemis Memorial Award is…

Dennis Joiner

In a career spanning more than 25 years, Dennis has provided immeasurable support and contributions to the assessment profession. He has enthusiastically pursued sound assessment in a multitude of agencies and jurisdictions.

Dennis was instrumental in introducing assessment center technology to the public sector in the mid-1970's, which, up to that point, had been a technology utilized primarily by the private sector. Throughout his career, Dennis has been successful as a practitioner, as well as a trainer and mentor to other assessment professionals. In his day-to-day pursuit of sound assessment, Dennis strives to balance the selection needs of an organization with professional principles and standards in an effort to promote sound, job-related assessment.

Dennis is recognized as an expert in assessment center technology, manifest in part by his participation on the task force that revised the *Guidelines and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations* (1989). He also served as co-chair of the 1990 International Congress on the Assessment Center Method and has provided presentations and training sessions at the 1981, 1988, 1990, and 1994 annual meetings of the International Congress on the Assessment Center Method.

Beyond his contributions to the assessment profession as a hands-on practitioner, Dennis is a prolific contributor to professional publications – another example of his willingness to freely share his knowledge and expertise with a wide range of individuals connected to assessment.

When it comes to supporting professional organizations and professional networking, Dennis is in the forefront of such efforts. When asked to contribute or participate in professional organizations, "no" is not in Dennis' vocabulary. He was a co-founder and first president of the Personnel Testing Council of Northern California (PTC/NC). At the national level, Dennis was elected to serve for five years on IPMAAC's board of directors as well as serving as president in 1990-91. As with his dedication to PTC/NC, Dennis has been a frequent presenter at IPMAAC's annual conference, having made 12 presentations since 1981.

With respect to his support of colleagues and his willingness to make available his expertise, Dennis is in a league all his own. No matter the question or the issue, Dennis is there with a response, feedback, and more often than not, additional information to balance and clarify the initial query.

Please join us in congratulating Dennis Joiner as the deserving recipient of the 2003 Stephen E. Bemis Memorial Award.—ACN

Practice Exchange

By Ilene Gast, Associate Editor

Readers, this will be my last submission as Assistant Editor for Federal, State, and Local Affairs. Starting in January, I will have the opportunity to speak to you through the President's message in each issue of the ACN. I have truly enjoyed preparing the "Practice Exchange" and have appreciated the positive feedback that I have received from all of you over the years. However, now it is time for me to pass the torch. If you like to write, edit and live on the cutting edge, please consider taking on this job. Seriously, if you are interested, please contact me or ACN Editor, Deonda Scott for more information.

How is the Internet Being Used to Assist in Employee Selection?

Lance Anderson & Bethany Bocketti*

Based on the claims of some software developers, one might think that the Internet can do everything from administer tests to make julienne fries. In reality, the Internet is a tool for providing and gathering information, and so it has potential for assisting organizations in selecting employees. While there have been many articles and presentations on the great potential of the Internet, there has been little discussion of how organizations are actually using the Internet to aid the selection of individuals.

To address this issue, we conducted a small exploratory study to learn how each of the 50 states uses (or doesn't use) the Internet to aid in selecting employees for state jobs. Our purpose was to determine how the Internet was being used, discuss the process of converting selection systems for use on the Internet, determine issues that these organizations faced, and hopefully identify some solutions for dealing with the issues.

Our method included visiting state employment websites to determine the online services the states offer, identifying those states that use the Internet to process applications, and contacting representatives of those states' personnel departments via e-mail and phone. We asked individuals we contacted to describe:

- The services they offer or conduct online
- How they developed the Internet-based instrument(s)
- The issues they encountered and how they addressed them,
- The types comments they have from staff, management, and applicants regarding the instrument(s)

We present the results briefly below.

We discovered that visitors to most of the states' websites could perform the following activities online:

- Review job announcements and other information
- Download or print applications
- Search for jobs

Fewer than half of the states provided a way for applicants to complete and submit an application online, and of those states that did this, fewer than ten of them used the computer to assist in processing the data provided on the application. Even fewer states provided a facility for gathering data on training, experience, or other information not requested on the application. Finally, fewer than five states allowed for applicants to register online for exams or to obtain feedback on their application.

We discovered that the states' goals for providing additional online services were generally to attract more applicants, save applicants time, reduce staff burden, or respond to a statewide initiative to "do more with the Internet." Prior to implementation, the biggest concerns dealt with whether the conversion would be too costly, whether it would change the applicant pool in negative ways, or whether it would lead to loss of control over the selection process. Most states conducted their online implementation in phases, by focusing on certain jobs or certain services first.

States that offer online submission of applications generally reported:

- An increase in the number of applicants coinciding with the conversion to accepting applications online (especially in technically oriented applicants),

- That most applicants choose to apply online when given a choice,

- Apparently no changes in subgroup application rates

One or two interviewees mentioned that a small number of applicants have difficulty with the online application process.

The states providing the most services via the Internet typically provide a facility for online self-assessment of minimum qualifications. Typically, in these states, applicants respond to a series of questions meant to determine whether they have the experience or training needed to minimally qualify for a job. If the responses to the questions indicate that the individual is minimally qualified, then the applicant is automatically placed on a list with other "minimally qualified" applicants for consideration by the hiring manager. Positive outcomes included a reduction of the burden on the staff and shortening the length of time needed to refer candidates to potential hiring agencies. One negative outcome was the referral of a larger number of unqualified candidates.

It is likely that more states and other large organizations will begin using an online process of self-assessment of minimum qualifications. In response to this development, we need to be more careful than ever to ensure that the traditional advice regarding survey construction is heeded. For example, to discourage false positives, minimum qualification statements will need to be clear to employers, managers, and applicants. Each question regarding minimum qualifications will need to refer to only one type of experience or educational preparation (i.e., no double-barreled questions). The questions will need to be concrete and behaviorally oriented so that responses are more easily verified. Finally, organizations will need to conduct ongoing random checks of the procedure to ensure that it is identifying individuals in a valid and fair manner.

* The findings of this research were presented at the recent IPMAAC conference in Baltimore MD. An earlier version of this article appeared in the August 2003 issue of the newsletter for the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington. —ACN

Job Analysis in the "Real World:" Challenges and Solutions

By Jennifer Fisher, Ph.D., Caliber Associates
Cassi Fields, Ph.D., Fields Consulting Group
Karina Hui, Ph.D., State of Alabama Personnel Department
Lesley Perkins, Ph.D., Caliber Associates

This article is based on a panel discussion presented at the 2003 IPMAAC conference, entitled "Job Analysis in the Real World." Dr. Fisher, Dr. Fields, and Dr. Hui served as panelists. Dr. Perkins moderated the discussion by asking a series of questions to which the panelists responded based on their experience conducting job analysis. This article provides a summary of the panelists' comments.

Job analysis lays the foundation for legally defensible selection procedures that add value to personnel selection systems. Through job analysis, complete and accurate information is obtained about a job's work behaviors and tasks, and the characteristics needed by an individual to perform the job successfully. Professional and legal guidelines (i.e., *Standards for educational and psychological testing* [American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999]; *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* [Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., 1987]; *Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures* [Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor, & Department of Justice, 1978]) highlight the role of job analysis in the development and validation of personnel selection procedures. These guidelines, however, do not cover the range of practical issues that impact job analysis research. Therefore, job analysts are often called to handle such issues creatively, relying on professional judgment rather than concrete directives.

Here, we consider several technical and practical challenges faced by practitioners in the field when conducting job analysis studies in a variety of environments, including the private sector, government, and public safety arenas. In particular, we discuss challenges encountered in (1) job analysis planning, (2) data collection, analysis and interpretation, and (3) other challenges that are encountered throughout the job analysis study process. We then discuss the methods we have adopted for dealing with these challenges in our own job analysis experience.

Challenges Encountered in Job Analysis Planning

Job analysis planning involves determining the methodology that will be used for gathering job information, analyzing the information, and drawing conclusions based on the results of the study. Concurrently, a number of logistical items need to be addressed, such as identifying subject matter experts (SMEs), obtaining permissions from organization authorities to work with SMEs, gaining cooperation from SMEs, determining where and how the work with SMEs will be conducted, and so on. In practice, these logistical considerations can be among the most challenging aspects of conducting a job analysis study. Three contextual elements that affect the planning and conduct of job analysis studies are: the organizational environment, the status of the job analyst as an internal or external consultant, and the dispersion of SMEs throughout geographic locations.

The organizational environment. The organizational environment and culture have implications for the approach that should be taken to ensure a successful job analysis study. One implication of the organizational environment for job analysis research is that the organization structure affects patterns of communication among organization members, as well as between organization members and the job analyst. For example, in the public sector, significant effort may be spent negotiating layers of bureaucracy through which many job analysis activities must be approved. Potential roadblocks can be avoided by allotting sufficient time to talk with SMEs to ensure an understanding of the appropriate approval channels.

A second implication of the organization environment for job analysis research is that the culture may affect the willingness of SMEs to provide accurate information. For example, the public safety organizational environment can be particularly resistant to outsiders. One way to handle this resistance is to first demonstrate your expertise as a job analyst. This will enhance the job analyst's credibility and rapport with job incumbents, their supervisors, and other SMEs. It is also beneficial for the development of the working relationship with SMEs to enter this environment fully armed with knowledge about the culture, about current public safety news and politics affecting the depart-

ment or agency, and about state-of-the-art public safety tools and techniques. This information is readily available in magazines and newspapers, and can usually be provided by the department or agency in advance. Since this information is openly and frequently discussed in public safety organizations, demonstrating this knowledge will enhance the credibility of the job analyst in the eyes of SMEs and foster a productive working relationship.

Status as an internal or an external consultant. Due to the workload inherent in most job analysis projects, external consultants are often enlisted to assist organization management in the conduct of job analysis research studies. A potential challenge for external consultants, however, is that they may have less credibility to an organization's members than internal consultants because "they don't understand how we do things here." An internal organization consultant may become much more intimate with the job and the organizational culture than an external consultant. If the job analyst personally knows the incumbent and has some familiarity with the incumbent's performance history and accomplishments, this knowledge may provide a greater understanding of the job and its requirements. The insider perspective of the internal consultant can also help in planning job analysis activities. For example, as an internal consultant, the job analyst knows in advance that some people are more difficult to schedule meetings with than others, and that some require more advance notice for scheduling than others. The internal consultant also knows who is reachable by phone and who is not. As an internal consultant, it may be easier to identify the persons in the organization who need to be involved in order to get things done.

External consultants should plan to spend significant time obtaining and studying background information that relates to the job. The external consultant may also have to rely on SMEs to provide information about important details and may need to spend a good deal of time talking with them about the job and its context. This effort will help the external job analyst to develop a more intuitive understanding of the job and the environment in which it's performed. Although the external consultant has the disadvantage of a learning curve when beginning a job analysis in a new organization, the external consultant may have the benefit of being perceived as an objective third party. This can actually improve the ease of data collection and candidness of SME responses, as they may be more willing to talk to a "neutral" party.

Disperse geographic locations. Including a representative sample of SMEs in the job analysis study can be particularly difficult when the SMEs are scattered over different geographic locations. Under these circumstances, conducting workshops can be difficult, because the burden on SMEs who need to travel farther to attend them may be

considerable. In these situations, it is sometimes necessary to rely more on one-on-one telephone interviews and individual face-to-face meetings than on workshops with several SMEs in attendance.

The organizational environment, the status of the job analyst as an internal or external consultant, and the dispersion of SMEs throughout geographic locations are just some of the challenges faced when planning a comprehensive job analysis study. These and other factors are important to consider when planning the job analysis methodology.

Issues in Data Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation

To ensure that data collection activities lead to interpretable results, job analysts may need to consider the organizational environment and make appropriate adjustments in their procedures. A small number of SMEs, SME fatigue and resistance, and differences in duties within the same job classification are three common challenges to the collection, analysis and interpretation of job analysis information.

Small number of SMEs. Analyzing jobs with a small number of incumbents or no incumbents presents special challenges. In these situations, there are a limited number of SMEs to provide input during the process. Therefore, it is important to maximize the input obtained from the limited number of SMEs.

One approach that can be used when there is a small number of SMEs is to use a consensus approach to gather data and make decisions on various work behavior, task and KSA statements. The job analyst might moderate a discussion among SMEs until consensus can be reached on the definitions of work behaviors, tasks, and KSAs that comprise the job. The job analyst may also use this approach to gather numeric ratings of frequency, importance, and other criteria used to determine job elements and KSAs that will define the potential test domain. For example, during a workshop, the job analyst may ask SMEs to complete measures independently then review the ratings with them as a group. The process might be similar for a conference call, with the exception that SMEs could be asked to complete their ratings prior to the call, and then review the ratings with the facilitator during the call. Those ratings that differ by a specific, predefined amount may be targeted for a consensus discussion. This approach involves active intervention and professional judgment on the part of the job analyst during the process of data collection and interpretation. When SME disagreements arise, the job analyst may want to take steps to ensure that consensus judgments are not overly influenced by more influ-

ential SMEs, such as supervisors. At the same time, the job analyst should consider whether a given disagreement is due to SME motivations to inflate or deemphasize the importance of certain responsibilities.

It is not always possible to convene SMEs together in a workshop. In these cases, the job analyst may use individual meetings or phone interviews for data gathering. For example, an analyst may hold meetings with single SMEs to get their initial ratings, then travel to another location to have other SMEs review and revise the initial judgments. A similar process can be employed in a series of phone interviews. Whenever there is a change, the job analyst might confirm the change with other SMEs through successive iterations to ensure agreement.

SME resistance and fatigue. It is not uncommon for the job analyst to encounter situations in which SMEs are resentful, burdened with a heavy workload, or otherwise unmotivated to participate in job analysis studies. SMEs that are overtaxed by participating in several independent data collections may be frustrated when they feel they have already participated in a similar study. It's a good idea to consider whether the demands imposed on the SMEs by your data collection strategy are reasonable, and to make appropriate adjustments to avoid SME fatigue.

SMEs presented with a long, intimidating survey may be less willing to participate in the study, and may also become fatigued or demotivated to provide accurate data. A survey will provide the needed data only if the survey sample is willing and capable of completing it. It is useful to consider methods that simplify data collection in these situations. The first step in developing a survey instrument should be to consider the minimum information needed for the study, and the easiest way for the SME to provide it. The job analyst can also employ alternative methods of data collection. For example, fractional designs can be used in which subsets of SMEs are asked to complete a subset of job analysis ratings on a survey. These data may then be cross-validated with another set of SMEs. Job analysts need to be savvy in identifying how to effectively manage the burden on SMEs, how to encourage participation and motivation by emphasizing the benefits of the study, and how to best utilize the information that SMEs have provided.

Incumbent differences in job duties. There are sometimes differences in job work behaviors and tasks across agencies or departments for positions with the same job title or classification. This is often encountered in public sector jobs; while the primary responsibilities and duties of a job may be the same in different agencies, specific tasks and job knowledge used to accomplish job duties may differ according to the goals of the agency. These differences can complicate the use of job analysis

results to develop a selection procedure that is appropriate for all positions of a given job class. When possible, potential department or agency differences should be identified before the beginning of the study. Then, it is more feasible to craft the work behavior, task, and KSA statements to have the greatest applicability to all of the positions in the job. This can be accomplished by focusing on the core elements of the work behaviors, tasks, and KSAs, and by avoiding the inclusion of trivial department specific elements while including elements that are critical to the job in each department. For example, the job analyst can use a consensus approach to refine job descriptions and KSA statements until SMEs agree that they are accurate, sufficiently comprehensive, and applicable to the job in all agencies and/or departments.

Conclusions

While professional and legal guidelines provide the job analyst with a foundation for conducting a methodologically sound and legally defensible study, they do not always provide a clear roadmap for dealing with myriad practical issues or challenges that may arise during the course of the job analysis study. In this article, we discussed several challenges encountered by experienced job analysts and provided some approaches that we have used to address them. Planning a job analysis can be complicated due to many factors including the type of organizational environment, the status of the consultant and the dispersion of incumbents over various geographic locations. These factors affect how the job analyst conducts the job analysis study, selects and develops working relationships with SMEs, and develops a data collection methodology. We also recognized that many of us face small SME samples, SME resistance and fatigue, and even differences among incumbents in the job duties they perform within the same job class. The environments in which job analysis studies are conducted are often less than ideal. With persistence, creativity, and good professional judgment on the part of the job analyst, these challenges can be successfully navigated resulting in a high quality, defensible job analysis study.

References

American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor, & Department of Justice (1978). *Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures*. Federal Register, 43, 38290-38315.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (1987). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures.* (3rd ed.). College Park, MD: Author.——ACN

THE INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION ASSESSMENT COUNCIL (IPMAAC)

ANNOUNCES

THE ANNUAL STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION (2003 -2004)

IPMAAC is offering a student award that will recognize the achievements of students in the field of personnel management. Graduate, undergraduate, and former students are invited to submit research papers to be judged on the basis of their contribution to the field. The award winner will present the winning paper at IPMAAC's Annual Conference in Seattle, June 20-23, 2004. The winner will receive up to $600.00 in conference related travel expenses, free conference registration, one-year membership in IPMAAC, and recognition in the widely read IPMAAC and International Public Management Association for Human Resources newsletters. In addition, the University Department where the student's research was completed will receive a $500 grant and a plaque commemorating the student's IPMAAC award achievement.

Competition Rules

Papers must be theses, dissertations, or other student papers that describe original research conducted by the author while a student. Papers submitted must have been written within two years of the entry deadline, may not have been previously submitted to this competition, and must have been written as a student. Papers should address either substantive or methodological issues in areas such as the following:

- Personnel Selection
- Employment Tests
- Job Analysis
- Employee Performance Evaluation
- Assessment of Productivity or Organizational Effectiveness
- Assessment of Training Outcomes
- Other Related Topics

Deadline

All entries for the **2003-2004** competition must be **e-mailed** no later than **February 6, 2003** to:

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

Entry Form

An entry form can be found on our website at http://www.ipma-hr.org/index.cfm?navid=157

IPMAAC Across the Nation – News of the Councils

By Kristine Smith, Associate Editor

American Psychological Association (APA)

The 2003 Convention was held in Toronto on August 7-10, 2003. Future conventions will be 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)

The BAAP sponsors a speaker once a quarter who delivers a presentation to its members. The location varies, but the format involves networking from 6-7 p.m., followed by the speaker's presentation at 7 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 is a society of human resources professionals from the Greater Chicago area who meet to discuss current issues in I/O psychology. CI/OP generally has Friday afternoon sessions from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. featuring several speakers addressing a topic. For more information and to confirm meeting dates and topics visit their website at www.iit.edu/~ciop/

Gateway Industrial-Organizational Psychologists (GIOP)

GIOP is a group of psychologists and human resources professions in the metropolitan St. Louis area. The group consists of over 150 members and offers programs and conferences on a wide range of topics. For more information, visit the GIOP website at www.giop.org

International Personnel Management Association (IPMA)

IPMAAC is offering its Oral Examinations workshop and Examination Planning workshop in conjunction with Penn State. Dates are listed in the calender and additional information can be obtained at http://www.outreach.psu.edu/cpas

Mark your calendars for the 28th Annual IPMAAC Conference! Plans are already underway for IPMAAC 2004 at the Renaissance Seattle Hotel in Seattle, WA, June 20-23. Jeanne Makiney and Julia McElreath are the Program Committee Co-chairs and Oscar Spurlin and Carla Swander are the Host Committee Co-chairs.

Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology (METRO)

For more information, call the MetroLine at (212) 539-7593 or visit METRO's website at www.metroapppsych.com.

Mid-Atlantic Personnel Assessment Consortium (MAPAC)

MAPAC is chartered as a non-profit organization of public sector personnel agencies involved and concerned with testing and personnel selection issues. The fall meeting was held on September 17 - 19 in Washington, D.C. For details on MAPAC, contact Amy Bauer at 410-545-5609, or go to the MAPAC website at www.ipmaac.org/mapac/

Minnesota Professionals for Psychology Applied to Work (MPPAW)

MPPAW is an organization consisting of a broad range of practitioners, consultants and professors. Information on MPPAW programs may be obtained from Sidney Teske at Sid.Teske@co.hennepin.mn.us

Personnel Testing Council of Arizona (PTC/AZ)

PTC-AZ serves as a forum for the discussion of current issues on personnel selection and testing. It encourages education and professional development in the field of personnel selection and testing and advocates the understanding and use of fair and professionally sound testing practices. For more information about PTC-AZ, contact Vicki Packman, Salt River Project at 602-236-4595 or vspackma@srpnet.com or visit the PTC/AZ website accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/ptcaz

Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC/MW)

PTC/MW offers monthly luncheon programs and publishes an informative newsletter. See the 2003 calendar for scheduled luncheon speakers or visit the PTC/MW website accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org

Personnel Testing Council of Northern California (PTC/NC)

PTC/NC offers monthly training programs addressing topics and issues that are useful and relevant to personnel practitioners of all levels of expertise. The monthly programs are typically scheduled for the second Friday of each month and alternate between Sacramento and the Bay area. The monthly programs feature speakers who are active contributors to the personnel assessment field. For more information regarding PTC/NC programs, visit the PTC/NC website accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/ptcnc

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; encourages education and professional development in the field of personnel selection and testing; advocates the understanding and use of fair and non-discriminatory employment practices; and encourages the use of professionally sound selection and testing practices. For more information regarding luncheon meetings, workshops, upcoming conferences, or membership, please contact Bridget Styers bstyers@hr.co.san-bernardino.ca.us or visit the PTC/SC website accessible through the IPMAAC website at www.ipmaac.org/ptcsc

Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM)

Contact www.shrm.org/education/ for a current listing of seminars and conferences.

Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology (SIOP)

Future SIOP conferences are scheduled for April 2 - 4, 2004 in Chicago, Illinois at the Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers; and April 15 -1 7, 2005 in Los Angeles, California at The Westin Bonaventure.

Western Region Intergovernmental Personnel Assessment Council (WRIPAC)

WRIPAC is comprised of public agencies from the western region of the United States who have joined together to promote excellence in personnel selection practices. WRIPAC has three meetings each year that are typically preceded by a training offering. Additionally, WRIPAC has published a monograph series and job analysis manual. The fall meeting was held on September 4-5 in Yosemite, CA. WRIPAC is also planning a 25th Anniversary celebration for its meeting in May 2004. Additional information may be obtained by visiting WRIPAC's website accessible via the IMPAAC's 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 Singh, (909) 387-5575.

Upcoming International, National, and Regional Conferences and Workshops

OCTOBER

20-22: IPMAAC/PennState Oral Examinations course, Pittsburgh, PA. Contact IPMAAC or http://www.outreach.psu.edu/cpas

21-25: International Association of Chiefs of Police. Annual Conference. Philadelphia, PA. Contact: Theiacp.org

23-24: PTC/SC Fall Conference and 50th anniversary celebration. Long Beach, CA - Queen Mary.

27-29: SHRM Conference. "Workplace Diversity" New York, NY. Contact: shrm.org

NOVEMBER

5: BAAP Meeting. Member panel on succession planning.

5-8: American Evaluation Association. 18th Annual Conference. Reno, NV. Contact: http://eval.org

12: PTC/MW Luncheon Meeting. Speaker: Dr. Jose Cortina, George Mason University

14: PTC/NC Luncheon Meeting.

20: MPPAW Meeting. Filip Leivens, Professor, Ghent University & Visiting Fulbright Scholar. "Competency Modeling and European Perspectives on I/O"

DECEMBER

10: PTC/MW Luncheon Meeting. Dr. Lance Anderson, Caliber Associates. PTC/NC Presidential Address

JANUARY 2004

14: WRIPAC Pre-Conference training programs: "Internal Consulting" and "How to Hire Superstars" Orange County, CA.

15: MPPAW Meeting. Gordy Curphy, President, Curphy Consulting Services. "Leaders, Transitions, and Teams: Implications for Assessment and Development."

15-16: WRIPAC Meeting. Orange County, CA. Hyatt Regency Orange County.

FEBRUARY 2004

2-4: Association of Test Publishers. Annual Conference. "Technology in Testing: Advancements in Best Practices" Palm Springs, CA. Contact: testpublishers.org/conference.htm

7-11: American Society for Training and Development. Conference. "Techknowledge 2004" Anaheim, CA. Contact astd.org

19: MPPAW Meeting. Frank Landy, CEO, SHL Litigation Support Services. "Can we protect psychology from the law? What's new in employment litigation."

MARCH 2004

4-6: Society of Psychologists in Management. Annual Conference. San Francisco, CA. Contact: spim.org

18: MPPAW Meeting. Scott Brooks, Executive Consultant, Director of Research and Development, Gantz Wiley Research. "Employee attitudes: Ethics, the economy, and links to customer and business results."

22-24: SHRM "Global Forum" Bal Harbour, FL. Contact: shrm.org

31-4/2: IPMA Western Region Conference, "eHR: Are We Ready for The 21st Century?" Oakland Marriot City Center. Contact: nccipma.org.

(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.)

Kristine Smith is a Senior Associate with Darany and Associates in Redlands, California. If you have regional organization news or an item to add to the calendar, please contact her by e-mail at smithk1@earthlink.net or by telephone at (909) 798-4475.—ACN

2003 IPMAAC Board of Directors and Committee Chairs

IPMAAC Board of Directors

President
Harry Brull (2003-2005)
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

President-Elect
Ilene Gast (2003-2005)
Senior Research Psychologist
Immigration and Naturalization Service
9507 Rockport Road
Vienna, VA 22180-3447
Tel 202.305.0590, Fax 202.305-3664
ilene.gast@dhs.gov

Past-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

IPMAAC Representative to IPMA Executive Council
Paul Kaiser (2003-2005)
Director of CSC Operations
NYS Dept. of Civil Service
State Campus Building #1
Albany, NY 12239
Tel 518.457.2575, Fax 518.457.9491
pdk@cs.state.ny.us
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

Dennis Doverspike (2003-2005)
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
Tel 330.972.8372, Fax 330.972.5174
dd1@uakron.edu

Jennifer French (2002-2004)
Sr. Associate
Darany and Associates
P.O. Box 6037
Kingman, AZ 86402-6037
Or
229 Deloris Ave
Kingman, AZ 86401
Tel 928.757.7783, Fax 928.757.2967
jfrench@ctaz.com

David Hamill (2001-2003)
Personnel Research Psychologist
Department of Homeland Security
800 K Street N.W., Rm 5000
Washington, DC 20536
Tel 202.305.1746, Fax 202.305.3664
david.g.hamill@dhs.gov

Deonda Scott (2001-2003)
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

Committees

Conference Program
Ilene Gast (2003-2005)
Senior Research Psychologist
Immigration and Naturalization Service
9507 Rockport Road
Vienna, VA 22180-3447
Tel 202.305.0590, Fax 202.305-3664
ilene.gast@dhs.gov

Amy Bauer
MD State Hwy Administration
707 N. Calvert St Room C602
Baltimore, MD 21202
Tel (410) 545-5609
Fax (410) 333-6023
abauer@sha.state.md.us

Conference Host
Christine Parker
Testing Department
6 St. Paul St. 5th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202
Tel (410) 767-0710
Fax (410) 333-0689
cparker@mdot.state.md.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
Ilene Gast (2003-2005)
Senior Research Psychologist
Immigration and Naturalization Service
9507 Rockport Road
Vienna, VA 22180-3447
Tel 202.305.0590, Fax 202.305-3664
ilene.gast@dhs.gov

Professional/Scientific Affairs
Dennis Doverspike
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
Tel 330.972.8372
Fax 330.972.5174
dd1@uakron.edu

Assessment Council News
Déonda Scott
Civil Service/Testing Manager
City of Orlando
400 S. Orange Avenue
Orlando, FL 32801-3302
Tel (407) 246-2061
Fax (407) 246-2019
dscott@ci.orlando.fl.us

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
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

Nominations/Bylaws
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

Bemis Award-Nomination
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

About the *ACN*

The *ACN* is the official newsletter of the International Public 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 deadline for the next issue is:

December: *October 31*

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.