International Personnel Assessment Council

Assessment Council News (ACN)

June 2011

Presidential Message

By Julia Bayless, President

Hello IPAC! Welcome to another exciting issue of our quarterly newsletter, the Assessment Council News (ACN)! It is hard to believe we're almost halfway through 2011 – it's been a busy year for IPAC and the assessment community so far. Here are some highlights:

⇒Educational Opportunities

The **2011 IPAC Conference: Capital Ideas in Assessment** is shaping up to be an outstanding opportunity for assessment professionals to come together to learn, share, and network with one another. We have a stellar line up of keynote speakers, pre-conference workshops, concurrent session programming, sponsorship and partner showcases, and social events all designed to create a learning environment in a great location – Washington, DC! Check out the conference page on the IPAC website to get the most up to date information on the conference and to register. We have some great opportunities for students to get involved in IPAC too – please e-mail conference@ipacweb.org if you are a student (or know a student!) who would like to help out onsite at the conference and have the chance to attend for FREE!

⇒Forum

In addition to the conference planning for 2011 there are several active committees and working groups involved in creating opportunities for IPAC members (and potential members!). If you are interested in helping out with new products and services that IPAC will offer, contributing to the ACN, or getting involved in the governance of IPAC, please send me a note or call me any time – we'd be delighted to get you involved and hear your ideas.

⇒Best Practices

Take a peek at our latest in up-to-date assessment best practices – our new monograph on legal issues by IPAC's very own **Bryan Baldwin**! This is the second in our monograph series – members can access the monographs for free in the members-only portion of the website. Coming soon!

⇒Resources

Keep your eyes on the IPAC website after next month's conference

(Continued on page 2)

Inside this issue:

(Continued from page 1)

for links to the conference presentations, and on the next issue of the ACN for summaries of the keynote addresses. Also stay tuned for upcoming live training and webinar offerings!

As the premier professional organization dedicated to advancing great assessment practices, IPAC continues to rely on your active participation in order to succeed. Please contact me or any of the board members or committee chairs if you have any suggestions or would like to become more involved. Thank you for your ongoing support of IPAC!


Beyond instinct. Beyond intuition.
We provide illumination.
Face it. Trying to identify the perfect candidates for the critical positions in your organization is a serious challenge.
As leaders in Human Resources for the Public Safety Sector, I/O Solutions will help you pinpoint the highest caliber people for your positions — whether you're recruiting raw talent or promoting from within.
Visit our Web site at IOSolutions.org and browse through our comprehensive catalog of HR programs — from testing and evaluations to analysis, study guides and much more.
I/O SOLUTIONS
I/O Solutions. The search is over.
THE PUBLIC SAFETY SELECTION SPECIALISTS™ PRODUCTS & SERVICES:
• National Criminal Justice Officer and Firefighter Selection Inventories
• National Public Safety Dispatcher Selection Inventory
• EMT Basic, Intermediate and Paramedic Examinations
• Personnel Report (Integrity/Ethics)
• Video-based Law Enforcement Examination
• Physical Ability Testing Programs
• Law Enforcement and Fireservice Promotional Examinations and Assessment Centers
• Online Employment Applications, Examination Purchase, Administration and Scoring
• And much more...

Membership News

By Julia Bayless, Membership Chair and President

The 2011 Membership Campaign has been very successful – thank you for your membership and for helping to grow the organization! We have some great opportunities for participation for the remainder of the 2011 year and for moving into the 2012 membership cycle. If you would like to be a part of the membership committee and have a more active role in helping IPAC meet its strategic goals, please send an e-mail to membership@ipacweb.org.

Stay tuned to the ACN and the IPAC website (www.ipacweb.org) for updates on the upcoming 2011 Conference, new monograph publications, more in the IPAC webinar series, and much, much more! Please contact any of the IPAC Board Members or Committee Chairs (listed on the IPAC website) with any questions or suggestions – thanks for your continued support!

Would you like to serve on the ACN editorial team?

To learn more, please contact IPAC-ACN Editor,

Jayanthi Polaki at jpolaki@mdta.state.md.us or

(410) 537-7557.

IPAC 2011 James C. Johnson Student Paper Competition Award Winner

Christopher Nye, University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign

By Dr. Lee Friedman, IPAC 2011 James C. Johnson Student Paper Chairperson

We had outstanding papers, making our decision truly a difficult one. We had eight reviewers for each paper that was submitted. All reviewers had a doctoral degree in industrial and organizational psychology or related fields and were knowledgeable about IPAC. Each paper was reviewed by four academicians and four practitioners. Reviewers were asked to rate each paper on the following two areas: (1) technical merit, which was comprised of four factors --problem statement, methodology, data analysis, findings and conclusions, and (2) practical significance, which was comprised of two factors -- problem importance and usefulness of results. Each of these six factors were rated based on a five-point Likert-type rating scale, with midpoint 3 being defined as “good quality, definitely has merit based on this factor.”

Based on these ratings, **Christopher Nye’s** paper “Vocational Interests and Performance: A Quantitative Summary of 60 Years of Research” has been judged the winner for the IPAC 2011 James C. Johnson Student Paper Competition Award. Congratulations!

Christopher Nye is a doctoral candidate in industrial and organizational psychology at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign. His research interests include employee selection, counterproductive work behaviors, and organizational research methods. He currently has 12 scholarly articles either in print or in press at peer-reviewed journals that include the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, the *Journal of Management*, and *Organizational Research Methods*. Christopher is also a research fellow with the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) and has conducted psychometric research for several large organizations including the College Board and the National Council of State Boards of Nursing. In the Fall, Christopher will join the faculty at Bowling Green State University in their industrial and organizational psychology program.

IPAC provides up to $600 in conference-related travel expenses, free conference registration, and a one-year membership in IPAC to the winner of the IPAC student paper competition. In addition, the winning paper will be recognized in the conference program and IPAC Assessment Council Newsletter (ACN). Furthermore, the University Department (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL) in which the research was completed will be awarded a $500 grant, as well as a plaque commemorating the IPAC award achievement.

2011 IPAC Pre-Conference Workshops: Capital Ideas in Assessment

By Deborah Whetzel, Conference Chair

Registration is now open and we have an exciting set of pre-conference workshop presenters for the July 17 workshops!

Suzanne Tsacoumis, Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)

Developing, Implementing and Scoring Valid Job Simulations (half-day)

This session will provide a comprehensive overview of the development and use of job simulations as assessment tools. Simulations such as role-play, analysis, and in-basket exercises can be very informative, powerful methods for evaluating general, as well as, technical job competencies. This workshop will cover how to follow a content-oriented strategy to develop valid simulations and rating scales and to identify the appropriate weights for each component of the assessment process. Various delivery options will be discussed, as well as implementation and logistical issues. The presenter will address the strengths and weaknesses of this type of assessment method, contrasting it with other commonly used approaches. This workshop also will include a discussion of different response formats and the implications of using video-based simulations, both in terms of implementation issues as well as in terms of validity evidence. This will be an interactive session to ensure participants understand all relevant principles.

Learning objectives include:

1. Create job simulations that possess high levels so psychological and physical fidelity by following a content oriented development strategy
2. Compare the benefits associated with different job simulations and alternative assessment strategies
3. Assess the different response formats and the implications of using computer-based delivery mode

Margaret Barton and Julie Weintraub, Office of Personnel Management (OPM)

Designing an Assessment Strategy (full-day)

Devoting resources and attention to assessment is a key element needed to make improvements to public sector hiring. Organizations must take a proactive stance on assessment to ensure high-quality hires. This day-long workshop is designed as a beginning primer to provide participants with a broad overview of current and emerging assessment options, as well as variables to consider when developing an assessment strategy. Specific topics include:

- Overview of assessment goals and principles, including an understanding of reliability and validity
- Discussion of a wide range of assessment options and models (e.g., multiple hurdles), including case studies highlighting assessment strategies successfully used within the government
- Discussion of assessment implementation considerations, including common methodologies for establishing cut points for use with assessments
- An interactive exercise focused on designing an assessment strategy

At the conclusion of this workshop, participants will be able to:

1. Communicate the importance of quality assessment practices for public-sector hiring
2. Analyze the key characteristics to consider when selecting and evaluating assessment tools
3. Design an assessment strategy based on current and emerging assessment options and models
4. Identify the steps and variables to consider when developing and implementing an assessment strategy

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

Matisha Montgomery and Rebecca Fraser, Office of Personnel Management (OPM)

Best Practices in Assessment Questionnaire Development (full-day)

The public sector significantly relies upon online assessment questionnaires of training and experience as the only means for assessing applicants. While assessment questionnaires are effective for screening purposes, their ability to predict job performance leaves something to be desired. This workshop is designed to cover a variety of topics for individuals interested in developing online assessment questionnaire content for the first time or in improving the effectiveness of their assessment. Workshop topics include: job analysis for quality questionnaire development; assessing minimum qualifications; best practices in writing questionnaire items; warnings and verification statements; and implementation considerations. The training consists of a balance of lecture and experiential (hands-on) learning exercises.

This workshop is designed to help you:

1. Describe the importance of quality assessment practices for hiring
2. Conduct a legally defensible job analysis
3. Develop appropriate minimum qualification questions
4. Identify competencies and develop items for an assessment questionnaire
5. Select appropriate rating scales
6. Apply suitable scoring procedures
7. Evaluate scoring options for each situation
8. Ensure quality throughout the assessment process

Kristine Smith, Duraney & Associates

Collecting Job Analysis Information: Tools and Tips (half-day)

Because the information collected during job analysis is the foundation of assessment process design, efforts in the area of data collection are an essential and invaluable component of an assessment program. However, like precious stones encased in the earth, the task of mining the authentic gem of accurate and complete information is often fraught with difficulties ranging from resource limitations to uncooperative participants. This workshop will provide perspective and tools to enhance the effectiveness of information obtained at key steps in the job analysis process. Discussion and exercises will focus on the primary information objective at each step in the process and approaches for achieving those objectives. Specific topics to be addressed include planning for information gathering, gaining cooperation from management and other participants, facilitating group meetings, and designing effective information gathering tools such as checklists and surveys.

Upon completing this workshop, participants will:

- List the job analysis information requirements identified in the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures regarding the documentation of the content of a job.
- Recognize the range of information sources available and how to most effectively use them.
- Identify considerations that effect sampling adequacy.
- Recognize the concerns of job analysis participants and identify methods for addressing them.
- Identify and apply meeting facilitation techniques to effectively conduct group meetings.
- Identify survey technique options and recognize the circumstances in which options are most effective.

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

As always, there are many opportunities to get involved and have a presence at the conference. These range from participating as a student volunteer to providing a booth at the vendor exhibit. For more information, please get in touch with us at conference@ipacweb.org.

Also, don't forget that the Innovations in Assessment award, posted on the IPAC website, will be accepted May 16, 2011 through June 17, 2011 to recognize those who have developed/applied an innovative personnel assessment tool or procedure.

Visit the IPAC website www.ipacweb.org for current information on all conference-related activities!

JULY 17 — JULY 20, 2011,

DUPONT HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

CONFERENCE FEES

Conference	Member	Non Member
Advanced (**until June 1**)	$250	$350
Standard (**June 2 – July 11**)	$300	$400
Workshop	**Member**	**Non Member**
Whole Day Workshop	$150	$195
Half-Day Workshop	$75	$125

Other Rates:

- Presenter = $225; deadline June 1
- Student = $100; must be engaged in full-time study
- Student Volunteer (with at least four hours of conference staffing time) = $0; on a first-come, first-served basis until the limited spaces are filled
- Administrative fee of $25 will be charged for all onsite registrations at the conference

The Negative Branding of the Public Sector Workforce

By Dennis Doverspike, Professional and Scientific Affairs Committee Chair and Thomas G. Doverspike

The public servant and the public sector are under attack. In an attempt to balance state and local budgets, politicians have targeted public employees as being overpaid, underachievers. Although a number of employee groups have been the target of this broadside attack, teachers and university professors have been signaled out as exemplars of the problems endemic to the public sector.

The surprising element in this attack is the apparent acceptance by voters, taxpayers, and the general public of this attempt to paint public employees in a negative light. Apparently, at least at some level, a negative general impression of the public sector exists, which makes it easier for the intended audience to accept the argument that the public sector is now suffering from a malaise of entitlement.

Why should this issue concern the assessment professional, beyond their role as a public employee? We would argue that assessment professionals have the skills, knowledges and competencies required to both 1) provide data and answers in response to some of the more questionable assumptions underlying the critique of public employees; and also 2) build better human resource systems in response to some of the legitimate issues underlying complaints regarding public sector workers. An organizational reputation reflects realities present in both the internal workings of an organization and its relationships with stakeholders. Thus, assessment professionals must ask what they can do in order to improve the reputation of the public sector employee by responding to some of the calls for change and innovation in employment policies.

In this column, we first briefly review the recent experiences leading to laws in Ohio and Wisconsin. Then, we look at some of the arguments, and corresponding themes, which were used in the political debate over the Ohio and Wisconsin legislation. Finally, we offer up suggestions for areas for involvement by assessment professionals.

The Ohio Experience – Senate Bill 5

The debate over public employees in Ohio began with the campaign and election of John Kasich as governor of Ohio in November of 2010. After passage by the Ohio legislature, Governor Kasich signed Senate Bill 5 into law on March 31, 2011. The bill is long, has been amended a number of times, and is currently facing a repeal action; we offer this as a caveat in case there are errors of omission or commission in our brief summary. Senate Bill 5 will limit collective bargaining rights for over 350,000 public workers including police, firefighters, and teachers. Ohio public employees will still be able to negotiate wages, hours worked, and some working conditions. However the unions will no longer be able to negotiate healthcare, pension benefits, and vacation time. In addition to limiting collective bargaining rights, the bill also prohibits public employees from striking, will eliminate some aspects of "seniority," and require pay for performance. It also classifies University professors as management.

The Wisconsin Experience

In a manner similar to Ohio, the debate over public employees in Wisconsin began with the campaign and election of Scott Walker to the office of Governor. On February 11th, 2011, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker released his Budget Repair Bill. Many aspects of Governor Walker's bill are very similar to Ohio Senate Bill 5. The bill will limit collective bargaining on employee wages and contracts. Public employees will be limited in receiving raises that exceed inflation. In addition, employers will be prohibited from taking union dues out of paychecks. The new bill calls for changes in contributions to pensions and health care by increasing the percentage required from state employees. Under the new bill, employees will be required to contribute fifty percent of their pension payment and a minimum of 12.6% of the cost of annual health insurance premiums.

Themes and Negative Branding

We believe that many of the arguments used by proponents of the legislation speak to broader themes and a negative branding of the public sector. The ease with which the general public seems to have accepted some of these negative arguments should be a matter of concern. In particular, it suggests that the "good work" view of public service has its perceived dark side.

In order to identify the elements or factors underlying the negative side of the public employment reputation, we reviewed speeches, newspaper articles, and blog postings. We also listened to quite a bit of talk radio. (In addition, we would like to thank graduate students from a summer compensation class for their contributions). Based on this review, we identified the following four general themes (at this point these are initial impressions and

(Continued on page 10)

(Continued from page 9)

are not based on any more rigorous, scientific methodology):

1. Overpaid and underworked. This theme reflects the idea that public sector pay is too high. At the same time, performance and productivity in the public sector are seen as declining. In addition, there is a perception that there are simply too many employees.
2. Overly Generous Benefits. Although related to the first theme, it has unique aspects. The benefits in the public sector are seen as too generous. This includes a failure of public employees to pay their fair share for benefits. Pensions are also seen as too generous. Finally, job security represents an additional benefit.
3. Pay Not Based on Performance. Pay in the public sector is not seen as connected to merit or performance. Seniority and other irrelevant factors are seen as contributing to pay.
4. Other factors. At this point, a catch-all category. This category includes factors such as nepotism, restrictive unions, and a need to change leadership.

As an additional comment, these critiques are not new to the public sector. The same arguments were used under the general banner of "the days of entitlement are over" during the 1990s to argue against the strong influence exerted by unions in the private sector.

A Short List of Action Items for Assessment Professionals

We are proponents of the view that assessment professionals have a unique and strong skill set that provides them with the tools to respond to many human resource problems beyond those of merit-based selection. With this in mind, we propose three areas where assessment professionals can make an immediate contribution:

1. Organizational Branding. Fundamentally, the issue here is one of why does the image that the public possesses of the public sector employee make it easier to accept what many of us would view as fallacious, negative arguments. This requires the identification of best methods for assessing an organization's reputation. Once an awareness of one's brand image is established, then an organization can engage in efforts aimed at managing and improving the organizational reputation. We would recommend the excellent article in the March 2011 *ACN* by Anna Forsberg and Amy Gurjian entitled *Talented People. Innovative Minds*.
2. Studies of External Pay Equity. The available research is inconclusive as to whether public sector employees are overpaid as compared to their private sector counterparts. Studies are needed at the jurisdictional level. Assessment professionals have many of the research, measurement, and statistical skills necessary to conduct studies in order to determine whether public sector employees are over, under, or fairly paid compared to the private sector.
3. Pay for Performance. It is probably time for the public sector to accept the idea of pay for performance. Of course, this requires valid and reliable measures of merit and of performance. In particular, assessment professionals will need to answer questions such as whether adequate systems for assessing performance exist. Are the systems valid and reliable? Could tests be used as a part of pay for performance systems as a way of demonstrating expert levels of performance?

Conclusion

In order to change the negative perception of public employees, we must take control of the argument by reshaping the brand image. To paraphrase Forsberg and Gurjian, your brand will define what politicians and the general public think about your organization and your employees. "It represents the way you do business and the promise you make to your customers - as perceived by your customers" (page 6). We must consider how we want to be perceived as doing business and what promises we are delivering to the public. The message we deliver should emphasize the substantial public benefits, contributions, and the good work delivered by the public sector.

Personal Addendums

- Note: This was my third Professional and Scientific Affairs Committee column. I continue to welcome any comments or suggestions; so far I have received none. If you have suggestions, comments or questions, please feel free to email me at dennisdoverspike@gmail.com. I wrestled with the content and topic for this issue's Professional and Scientific Affairs Committee Column. Originally, I had indicated I would be writing about developing tests utilizing the new technologies. However, I decided that the current trend of criticism of the public sector and public employees demanded a response. Thus, the current column.
- Dennis Doverspike is the Chair of the IPAC Professional and Scientific Affairs Committee. He is a Full Professor of Psychology at the University of Akron, Senior Fellow of the Institute for Life-Span Development and Gerontology, and Director of

(Continued on page 11)

(Continued from page 10)

the Center for Organizational Research. He holds a Diplomate in Organizational and Business Consulting from the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) and is a licensed psychologist in the State of Ohio. He is a long term public employee and university professor.

- Thomas Gerald Doverspike has a Bachelor's Degree in Business from the University of Akron and is pursuing an MBA in Business. He has a specific interest in the interface of business principles and the political process.
- The following graduate students from a summer graduate class in compensation participated in a focus group and contributed their ideas: Andrew Barsa, Alison Benedetti, Kama Dodge, Jared Ferrell, Noelle Frantz, Kelsey Herb, Ernest Hoffman, Kimberly Hollman, Aaron Kraus, James Mathias, Daniel Neyman, and Chantale Wilson.

International Personnel Assessment Council

Innovations in Assessment Award

2011

. . . to recognize the development of an innovative assessment tool or procedure

Nominations should be submitted by 5:00 pm EST June 17, 2011 and no earlier than May 16, 2011

E-mail nomination forms to:

warren@allaboutperformance.biz

For more information, call:

(310) 670-4175

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S BUSY YEAR (SO FAR)

By Richard Tonowski, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

We are at the halfway mark for 2011 and already there have been several key Supreme Court decisions impacting employment, and specifically equal employment opportunity (EEO) law. Here are the highlights from the Supreme Court's docket to date and how those decisions are reverberating through the lower courts.

Thompson v. *North American Stainless, LP*. Continuing its string of decisions against employers who allegedly retaliated against employees who made EEO complaints, the Court ruled that third-party retaliation claims are viable in Title VII cases. That is, if the employer acts against an employee who did not personally participate in a discrimination complaint or otherwise oppose discrimination, but who was associated with someone who did complain, the adversely-affected employee may be covered by Title VII's anti-retaliation provisions and may sue the employer. The Court articulated a "zone of interest" standard regarding the degree to which an individual's complaint was related to the purposes of Title VII. However, the Court declined to provide a bright-line rule regarding the degree of association one must have with the party with the Title VII complaint.

The Fifth Circuit has applied *Thompson* to revive a case involving a son having allegedly suffered retaliation because of a complaint made by his father. Both are in the Houston Police Department (*Zamora* v. *Houston*, 5th Cir., No. 10-20625, unpublished opinion 5/12/2011).

Staub v. *Proctor Hospital*. In this Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act (USERRA) case, the Court found the employer potentially liable for an adverse employment action taken by a non-discriminating official, but instigated by an official intending to act unlawfully. This is the "cat's paw" theory. Staub's bosses allegedly resented having to schedule around his obligations in the U.S. Army Reserves, which is protected under USERRA. Staub charged that the bosses set him up to be fired. However, the firing was done by a Human Resources executive who presumably had no bias against people with military obligations. The Court reasoned that unlawful action could be attributed to the employer, even though there were two agents involved in the decision, one biased and one not. Presumably the employer might have avoided liability if the unbiased official had conducted a separate review and confirmed the adverse action to be justified. However, the Court did not provide guidance on how to conduct such a review and left open possibilities that liability could attach to various biased influences acting on an unsuspecting official.

The cat's paw has not scratched yet in a recent EEO case. However, commentators have noted that, like USERRA, discrimination is actionable as a "motivating factor" under Title VII.

Kasten v. *Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Corp*. The Court maintained its pro-plaintiff streak in retaliation cases. This one involved the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). The issue was whether an oral complaint counted for invoking legal protection. The Court held that FLSA oral complaints counted, provided that there was enough formality so that the employer was on notice that there was a complaint. In this situation Kasten had complained to company officials that the positioning of time clock was preventing employees from recording all of their time that should have been "on the clock." He was subsequently fired. As the dissent in the decision indicated, the Court did not address to whom the complaint must be made for it to count. One theory is that it has to be made to the Department of Labor, which enforces FLSA, and not just to company officials. Until there is further resolution in the courts, employer-side attorneys have noted the ambiguity in what complaining counts as a "real" complaint, and thus constitutes legally-protected activity. How much new ground this case breaks will depend on how well the case law is developed regarding specific EEO statutes.

AT&T Mobility v. *Concepcion*. This consumer case has the EEO defense bar in jubilation, because it allowed the Court to extend another of its streaks: pro-arbitration. The issue was whether the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) pre-empted California law which views as unconscionable (and thus, unenforceable) arbitration agreements that preclude class-wide relief. The issue involved a sales tax charge for allegedly "free" phones. The phone agreement had an individual-consumer arbitration clause to resolve such disputes, but the Concepcions (husband and wife) joined a putative class action in federal court in California. The district court and the Ninth Circuit refused to compel arbitration, citing California case law precedent. The Court found that this precedent conflicted with the FAA's purpose to ensure enforcement of arbitration agreements that, in turn, promote streamlined dispute resolution. Although the interpretation of the California courts did not

(Continued on page 13)

[1] Thompson was the fiancé of the complaining party in this case.

(Continued from page 12)

mandate class action provisions in an arbitration agreement, it did allow individuals to insist on them at a later time. This effectively made it unattractive to companies to have such agreements in the first place. Not fully resolved is how attractive the arbitration agreement must be to avoid being considered a one-sided contract of adhesion that allows the company to cheat individuals with impunity. The courts viewed the substance of AT&T's contract favorably regarding how it treated consumers, even when they found it unenforceable.

This decision is getting play in *Karp* v. *Cigna Healthcare Inc*., No. 4:11-cv-10361 (D. Mass.). Karp wants a $100M sex discrimination class action, alleging pattern and practice. Cigna wants a dismissal, noting that Karp is under an individual arbitration agreement covering Title VII and related state law. The agreement bars class actions. Anticipating plaintiff objections based in Massachusetts case law that banning class actions is a one-sided proposition that would effectively prohibit recovery where legal costs exceed the individual award, Cigna is arguing that the average award in a similar successful individual suits in Massachusetts exceeds $800K.

A Look Ahead

We'll have *Wal-Mart* v. *Dukes* coming up in the second half of the year, which should confirm 2011 as a very significant year for EEO law.

There are two late-breaking employee testing cases that review previous Supreme Court decisions. We have appellate-level follow-up to *Ricci* v. *Destefano* involving settlement agreements and affirmative action considerations arising from a custodian test (*United States* v. *Brennan*, 2nd Cir., Nos. 08-5171-cv (L) et al., 5/5/2011). On the same day as this decision, a physical ability test used was tossed out on summary judgment (*Easterling* v. *State of Connecticut Department of Correction*, No. 3:08-CV-0826, D. Conn., 5/5/2011). It appears that the agency was caught with adverse impact against women and without a rationale for the1.5 mile running portion of its test. In addition, the judge provided a discussion on the legal history of job relatedness and business necessity. See the online June Legal Update at www.PTCMW.org for summaries of these two cases.

This article first appeared in the June 2011 Quarterly Newsletter of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC/MW, www.PTCMW.org). It is being re-printed with the permission of Dr. Tonowski and PTC/MW. Dr. Tonowski also writes a monthly column, Legal Update, that is published on the PTC/MW website around the first of each month.

GET INVOLVED IN IPAC!

Opportunities to get involved in IPAC activities abound!

For further information, contact IPAC President Julia Bayless at

Julia.Bayless@sodexo.com or (301) 987-4343.

News of the Councils

American Psychological Association (APA) — The 2011 conference will be held May 19-22 in Orlando, FL. For more information, visit their website at www.apa.org.

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.ciop.net.

Gateway Industrial-Organizational Psychologists (GIOP) — GIOP is a group of psychologists and human resources professionals in the metropolitan St. Louis area. The group offers programs and conferences on a wide range of topics. For more information, visit the GIOP website at www.giop.org.

International Public Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA-HR) — For more information, visit the IPMA-HR website at www.ipma-hr.org.

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 a non-profit organization of public sector personnel agencies involved and concerned with testing and personnel selection issues. For details on MAPAC, visit the MAPAC webpage at www.ipacweb.org.

Minnesota Professionals for Psychology Applied to Work (MPPAW) — MPPAW is an organization consisting of a broad range of practitioners, consultants, and professors who meet to encourage an open exchange of information relevant to psychology as applied to work and human resources management. For more information, visit the MPPAW website at www.mppaw.org.

Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC/MW) — PTC/MW offers monthly luncheon programs and publishes an informative newsletter. See the 2011 calendar for scheduled luncheon speakers or visit the PTC/MW website accessible through the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.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 speak-

(Continued on page 16)

(Continued from page 15)

ers who are active contributors to the personnel assessment field. For more information regarding PTC/NC programs, visit the PTC/NC website accessible through the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.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; 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, visit the PTC/SC website accessible through the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.org.

Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) — The 2011 conference is scheduled for June 26-29, Las Vegas, NV. Contact www.shrm.org/education for a current listing of seminars and conferences.

Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology (SIOP) — The 2011 conference is scheduled for April 14-16, Chicago, IL. For more information, visit the SIOP website at www.siop.org.

Western Region Intergovernmental Personnel Assessment Council (WRIPAC) — WRIPAC comprises 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. Additional information may be obtained by visiting WRIPAC's website at www.wripac.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 more than 160 agencies nationwide. For more information, call (909) 387-5575. For more information, visit the website at www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us.

Upcoming Conferences and Workshops

July

17-20	International Personnel Assessment Council. Annual Conference. Washington, DC. Contact: www.ipacweb.org.
30-Aug 4	American Statistical Association. Annual Convention. Miami Beach, FL. Contact: www.amstat.org.

August

4-7	American Psychological Association. Annual Convention. Washington, DC. Contact: www.apa.org.
12-16	Academy of Management. Annual Conference. San Antonio, TX. Contact: www.aomonline.org.

September

24-28	International Public Management Association for Human Resources. Annual Conference. Chicago, IL. Contact: www.ipma-hr.org.
26-30	Human Factors & Ergonomics Society. Annual Conference. Las Vegas, NV. Contact: www.hfes.org.

If you have regional organization news or an item to add to the calendar, please contact the Editor by e-mail at jpolaki@mdta.state.md.us or by telephone at (410) 537-7557.

(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.)

2011 IPAC Officers

President
Julia Bayless

Director, Talent Development
Sodexo
9801 Washingtonian Blvd, Suite 106
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
(301) 987-4343
(301) 987-4177 (fax)
Julia.Bayless@sodexo.com

President-Elect
Jeffrey P. Feuquay

I/O Psychologist & Attorney
Managing Consultant, Psychology-Law Center, LLC
108 W. Walnut
Nevada, MO 64772
(417) 667-5076
JFeuquay@PsychLawCenter.com

Past President
Mike Willihnganz

Chief, Human Resources
CalPERS Human Resources Division
(916) 795-0636
(916) 795-4001 (fax)
Michael_Willihnganz@calpers.ca.gov

Financial Officer
Reid Klion

Chief Science Officer
pan—A TALX Company
11590 North Meridian St., Suite 200
Carmel, IN 46032
(317) 814-8808
(317) 814-8888 (fax)
financial@ipacweb.org

Secretary
Marianne Tonjes

Executive Director
CODESP
20422 Beach Blvd. Suite 310
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-4377
(714) 374-8644
marcodesp@aol.com

2011 IPAC Board Members

Warren Bobrow

All About Performance, LLC
5812 W. 76th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90045-1616
(310) 670-4175
(501) 635-9850 (fax)
warren@allaboutperformance.biz

Christine Parker

PDRI, a PreVisor Company
1300 N 17th Street, Suite 100
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(202) 243-9314
(443) 445-6911 (fax)
chris.parker@pdri.com

Lee Frier

Owner/Consultant
Smart Solutions Consulting LLC
9132 E. Calle Diego
Tucson, AZ 85710
(520) 225-0052
lfrier@ssconllc.com

2011 IPAC Committee Chairs

Assessment Council News Editor

Jayanthi Polaki
Recruitment and Examinations Unit
Office of Human Resources and Workforce Development
Maryland Transportation Authority
305 Authority Drive
Baltimore, MD 21222
(410) 537-7557
(410) 537-7555 (fax))
jpolaki@mdta.state.md.us

Electronic Communications Network

Bill Waldron
President
Waldron Consulting Group, LLC
4111 Canoga Park Drive
Brandon, FL 33511
(813) 413-1682
elcomnet@ipacweb.org

Policy and Procedures Committee

Lynne Jantz
Director, Selection & Classification
Las Vegas Metro Police Dept
101 Convention Center Dr.
Suite P 200
Las Vegas, NV 89109
(702) 828-3981
(702) 828-3980 (fax)
L2899J@lvmpd.com

Bemis Memorial Award Nomination

Julia M. Bayless
Director, Talent Development
Sodexo
9801 Washingtonian Blvd, Suite 106
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
(301) 987-4343
(301) 987-4177 (fax)

Innovations in Assessment Award

Warren Bobrow
Principal
All About Performance, LLC
5812 W. 76th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90045
(310) 670-4175
warren@allaboutperformance.biz

Professional and Scientific Affairs Committee

Dennis Doverspike
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
(330) 972-8372
(330) 972-5174 (fax)
dd1@uakron.edu

Continuity Committee

Jeffrey P. Feuquay
I/O Psychologist & Attorney
Managing Consultant, Psychology-Law Center, LLC
108 W. Walnut
Nevada, MO 64772
(417) 667-5076
JFeuquay@PsychLawCenter.com

Membership & Committee Services

Julia M. Bayless
Director, Talent Development
Sodexo
9801 Washingtonian Blvd, Suite 106
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
(301) 987-4343
(301) 987-4177 (fax)
membership@ipacweb.org

University Liaison/Student Paper Committee

Lee Friedman
Principal Consultant
SpecTal
13481 Falcon View Court
Bristow, VA 20136
(571) 331-1388
leefriedman1406@yahoo.com

Conference Chairperson

Deborah L. Whetzel
Manager, Personnel Selection and Development
HumRRO
66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 700
Alexandria, VA 22314-1591
(703) 706-5605
(703) 548-5574 (fax)
dwhetzel@humrro.org

Nominations/Bylaws Committee

Mike Willihnganz
Chief, Human Resources
CalPERS Human Resources Division
(916) 795-0636
(916) 795-4001 (fax)
Michael_Willihnganz@calpers.ca.gov

About the ACN

The *ACN* is the official newsletter of the International Personnel Assessment Council, an association of individuals actively engaged in or contributing to the professional, academic, and practical field of personnel research and assessment. 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. The Council has approximately 300 members.

The *ACN* is published on a quarterly basis: March, June, September, and December. Respective closing dates for submissions are February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1.

Submissions for Publication: Prospective authors are invited to send in their articles, research reports, reviews, reactions, discussion papers, conference reports, etc., pertaining to the field of personnel research and assessment. Topics for submission include, but are not limited to:

- Technical
- Practical – lessons learned, best practices
- Legal
- Technology/Tools
- Statistics/Measurement
- Book reviews

Articles and information for inclusion should be submitted directly to the Editor via e-mail, at jpolaki@mdta.state.md.us. Articles will be accepted only by electronic submission (Word compatible). Submissions should be written according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th edition. The editor has the prerogative to make minor changes (typographical/grammatical errors, format, etc.); substantial changes will be discussed with the author. Submissions more than 1500 words should include an abstract of maximum 100 words, preferably with three keywords.

If you have questions or need further information, please contact the editor.

Editor

Jayanthi Polaki
Recruitment and Examinations Unit
Office of Human Resources and Workforce Development
Maryland Transportation Authority
305 Authority Drive
Baltimore, Maryland 21222
Tel 410-537-7557
Fax 410-537-7555
jpolaki@mdta.state.md.us

Associate Editors

Legal Update
Richard F. Tonowski
Chief Psychologist
Office of General Counsel/Research and Analytic Services
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
131 M Street NE Room 5NW16H
Washington DC 20507-0003
Tel 202-663-4752
Fax 202-663-4196
richard.tonowski@eeoc.gov

Professional and Scientific Affairs
Dennis Doverspike
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
(330) 972-8372
(330) 972-5174 (fax)
dd1@uakron.edu
dennisdoverspike@gmail.com

Advertising Rates

Advertisement Size	Advertisement Dimensions	Cost per Advertisement	Cost for 4 Issues
Full Page	7.5” x 9.75”	$50	$200
Half Page	7.5” x 4.875”	$25	$100
Business Card Size	3.5” x 2”	$12.50	$50