



Newsletter

A monthly publication of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington
Volume XXIV Number 10
October 2000

October PTC/MW Breakfast Workshop



- Date:** Wednesday, October 11, 2000
- Time:** 8:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. Breakfast is included in the registration fee.
- Place:** **Pier 7 Restaurant.** 650 Water Street, SW, Washington, DC (approximately one block south of the intersection of Maine Avenue and 7th Street SW).
- Price:** Students \$25, Members \$40, Non-members \$50. Free parking up to 3 hours.
- Menu:** Fresh fruit plate, an omelet of your choice, hash brown potatoes, breakfast pastries, petite breakfast rolls, coffee/tea/decaf, and juice. Omelets: Eggbeaters (no cholesterol) plain, Eggbeaters with vegetables, Eggbeaters with ham and cheese, regular egg plain, regular egg with vegetables, or regular egg with ham and cheese.
- Reservations:** Please sign up via our website, www.ptcmw.org, or contact Kris Benson at Caliber Associates, Tel: (703) 385-3200, Fax: (703) 385-3206. If you leave a message, please include the following information in your message: name, membership status, whether you are a student, your choice of omelet, e-mail address, and telephone number. **The deadline for workshop reservations is 2:00 p.m., Monday, October 9th.** Cancel by 2:00 p.m. Tuesday to avoid having to pay the registration fee.
- Topic:** **Innovations in Selection: Use of Conditional Reasoning to Identify Reliable Employees**
- Speakers:** **Lawrence R. James**
Michael D. McIntyre
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville & Innovative Assessment Technology, LLC

This workshop will introduce a newly developed personality measurement system – Conditional Reasoning – that complements (i.e., increases the predictive validity of) traditional self-report systems. In contrast to direct, self-report tests of personality, Conditional Reasoning tests indirectly assess latent motives by engaging respondents in inductive problem solving exercises. Simply stated, respondents with different motives pick different solutions to the Conditional Reasoning problems. This session will briefly review the theory underlying item development and test construction, while the focus of the session will be on integrating Conditional Reasoning tests with traditional self-report systems. The practitioner will walk away with an understanding of how to use Conditional Reasoning tests to identify reliable employees.

Lawrence R. James is a founding partner of Innovative Assessment Technology, LLC, a company specializing in developing innovative approaches to personality assessment. Larry also holds the Pilot Oil Chair of Excellence in Management and Industrial-Organizational Psychology at The University of Tennessee. His research has contributed to areas such as organizational climate, leadership, personnel selection, and research methods. He has published over 70 articles and has recently authored a book on personality for Sage. During the last 10 years, Larry has been developing and refining the conditional reasoning methodology for personality assessment. Larry has held a number of positions in Divisions 5 and 14 of APA and holds the status of fellow in both divisions.

Michael D. McIntyre is also a founding partner of Innovative Assessment Technology, LLC. He is currently Research Assistant Professor in the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Program at The University of Tennessee, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1995. Michael's research focuses on personnel selection and personality assessment. He has spent the last 8 years developing and refining conditional reasoning tests of personality.

Inside this month's issue...

President's Message.....	p. 2
August Luncheon Summary: Development of a Computerized Variable Item Generator	p. 3
Inability to Perform Manual Tasks a Disability	p. 4
Employers Win Majority of ADA Cases.....	p. 4
Seventh Circuit allows Race Discrimination Suit to Proceed	p. 5
House and Senate Initiatives Require Notice of Electronic Monitoring.....	p. 5
Job Announcements	p. 6
Professional Calendar.....	p. 7



President's Message

Shane Pittman

The Pittman McLenagan Group, L.C.

The issue of construct validity within the assessment center model - I know this is not a new theme but it is still a compelling one to me. Of course, this did happen to be my dissertation (unfortunately not that long ago) topic.

Out of the many related issues on this topic, I struggle the most with making the assessment center an effective instrument but still wanting to know and understand what really makes it work.

From a practical standpoint, I used to believe that the assessment center had to directly rate constructs (more commonly called dimensions) in order to accurately evaluate candidates. The exercises were merely the vehicle for making these evaluations. This approach of rating the dimensions also provided great fodder for feedback to candidates. Candidates liked hearing how they performed in "problem solving" or "communication" skills. They generally perceived this information as more useful than exercise-specific feedback in understanding how to improve for the future.

However, I have come to the conclusion that this approach (rating dimensions rather than exercises) is a disservice to the candidate and overly burdensome to assessors. How can we as professionals believe that the dimension ratings from assessors have any validity at all when it has been virtually impossible to "discover" construct validity within the assessment center? If construct validity is obscured or unattainable from a quantitative standpoint, why does anyone think that giving specific behavioral feedback to a candidate under the guise of "problem solving" feedback or "interpersonal skill" feedback is useful or valid? Why do we think we are telling the candidate anything real about their problem solving performance? Isn't this somewhat misleading?

Also, let's not forget the assessors. How can we expect assessors to quickly learn how to identify constructs within an exercise and differentiate between highly related constructs such as communication skill and interpersonal skill or between planning/organizing and problem solving? Certainly it would be one thing if the dimension labels were used only as convenient "hooks" for identifying and recording behaviors. It is when the labels are given more significance than appropriate and candidates are told they meet some level of performance within a certain dimension that creates the real concerns.

These practical considerations have had the greatest influence in directing the process toward a more content-oriented model—not attempting to claim construct validity and not requiring assessors to perform some task that is virtually impossible under the constraints of most assessment centers. This model, with more emphasis on behavioral statements and evaluation of specific behaviors that reflect an understanding of certain dimensions, creates the same understanding of performance in the eyes of the candidate and does not require such a monumental task by assessors.

However, when considering the research side of things, how can one imagine developing an assessment center that is not steeped in constructs? If there is not this underlying basis for the instrument, what are we really measuring? How do we make predictive statements that can generalize to other tasks not directly assessed? How do we know that the candidate can perform these other tasks?

I do want to share one small piece of my dissertation research related to the assessment center and construct functioning (without burdening you with the details). While I certainly was disappointed (but not surprised) in being unable to support a construct validity approach, it did appear that the data suggested a particular construct—interpersonal skill—as being more powerful than others in identifying the underlying constructs within the assessment center. When regressing the constructs used in the assessment center onto the overall assessment center score, interpersonal skill appeared to be the most predictive construct. Further, when using a regression analysis where the predictors were overall assessment center score, external measures of interpersonal skill, and external measures of problem solving; and the criterion was supervisory rating of interpersonal skill, the assessment center score and the interpersonal skill measures were significant predictors while the problem solving measure was not. In another investigation where the supervisory rating of problem solving was the criterion, the assessment center score and the external measures of interpersonal skill did not predict while the problem solving measures did.

While not definitive, these analyses certainly suggest that interpersonal skill carries significant weight within the assessment center and is highly predictive of this skill in the job. Of course, my greatest interest related to the assessment center is the idea that there is a central construct that drives performance such as self-monitoring or social intelligence (not that dissimilar to interpersonal skill). This is the ultimate question I would like to have answered. Any responses?

----- PTC

AUGUST LUNCHEON SUMMARY

Development of a Computerized Variable Item Generator (Vigor)

Suzanne Tsacumis

Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)

Routine test development and maintenance activities typically include steps for subject matter experts (SMEs) to develop alternate test questions. Then, different versions of the test are either rationally or statistically equated. An alternate approach that has considerable intuitive appeal is computer generation of test items. Computers, suitably programmed, can generate seemingly innumerable variations of some types of test items. During the August luncheon, Suzanne Tsacumis described a project that involved the development of variable item generation software.

Implementing computer technology that generates multiple alternative versions of assessment tools within the personnel selection arena may be risky unless precautions are taken to ensure the equivalence of alternate versions of the test items themselves and of the test forms and test scores based on them. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) developed an 89-item multiple-choice, computer-based test of basic electronics that is a perfect candidate for evaluating the feasibility and requirements for developing and implementing a software-based item generator for an employment test.

One purpose of this project was to identify the facets or characteristics of test items that can be changed without impacting the level of difficulty of the item. An additional purpose was to develop and integrate variable item generation software with the existing test software. First, subject matter experts (SMEs) identified 48 knowledges that are required to solve the test items (e.g., Ohm's Law, ranch analysis, digital IC circuits). Next, the SMEs determined which items were most appropriate for variable item generation. These included items that are numerical in nature, involve circuit diagrams, and/or calculations to compute the answer. There were a total of 60 items that met these criteria, referred to as Vigor items. Items that were excluded from this subset were word problems and non-quantitative test questions.

Once the Vigor items were selected, the SMEs identified 20 structural characteristics that are proposed to be aspects of the items that, at this point, should not be varied when creating alternate versions in order to maintain equal levels of difficulty. Example structural characteristics are: number of formulae, number of steps required to solve the problem, and typicality of the circuit.

The next step was to prepare item generation specifications. This involved working with SMEs to: (1) solve the Vigor items and record the solution steps, (2) determine how the distracters were computed, (3) decide which values to vary, (4) determine the range of values, and (5) identify any constraints. The nature of constraints varied. As an example, one constraint may be that two values in a particular item always have to be the same. The item generation specifications provided the specific information for varying the items, including what values to vary, how the values should vary, and how to compute the correct answer and distracters given the alternate values. (Graphics and text remained static; only numerical values changed.) Once the specifications were developed, they were programmed into Visual Basic to generate alternate item values and associated answers and distracters. This allowed SMEs the opportunity to review the range of values in the test questions and the answers/distracters that would be generated using the specifications. SMEs made modifications to the specifications as appropriate. These specifications were the framework for the item generation software.

After a description of the research process, Suzanne demonstrated the output produced by the Visual Basic program during the item generation specification process and the item generation software. First, she displayed the original item followed by the generated list of values and alternatives produced by the Visual Basic item specification program. Then, using the item generation software, she displayed the item and demonstrated some of the alternatives that are produced for that item.

This project was an initial step to investigating the feasibility of computer-generated alternate items for a selection test. It offered insight into the components that may impact item difficulty and identified useful methodologies for developing alternate tests for other projects. Future research needs to be conducted to assess the difficulty and comparability of the different items/tests generated by Vigor.

----- PTC

PTC/MW Executive Board Meeting

The next meeting of the PTC Executive Board is Monday, October 16th, at 6 p.m. at the Office of Personnel Management. Contact PTC/MW President Shane Pittman via telephone at (301) 320-9500 or e-mail at shanep@pittmanlc.com for more information.

Inability to Perform Manual Tasks a Disability

Reprinted with permission from *IPMA News*,
September 2000

The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit ruled that the inability to perform manual tasks is a disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The lower court had dismissed the employee's claims on summary judgment, finding as a matter of law that an inability to perform manual tasks, in this case repetitive motion, was not a disability. The Sixth Circuit reversed, finding that the employee's inability to perform certain tasks, and the permanent nature of her disability, was more akin to having a missing or damaged limb than to a temporary muscular disorder. *Ella Williams v. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Kentucky, Inc.* Docket No. 99-5234, July 10, 2000.

Toyota transferred Ella Williams from an assembly line position to a paint inspection section following her complaint that the assembly line work caused her to develop carpal tunnel syndrome and tendonitis in her hands and arms. Williams worked successfully for three years in the paint inspection position, which involved inspecting cars for paint defects and wiping the cars down as they passed on a conveyor belt. However, when Williams' job duties were expanded to include applying highlight oil to the passing cars at a rate of one per minute, her previous condition returned and worsened. Applying the highlight oil required Williams to grip a block of wood with a sponge attached and to work over her head. Williams asked to be reassigned to her previous paint inspection duties but the request was denied.

The court concluded that whether or not Williams is disabled under the ADA is a question for a jury to decide. She presented sufficient evidence that her range of motion and inability to perform certain manual tasks covers a broad range of activities affecting her ability to work. The ADA defines a disability as a physical impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities. In order to be disabled in the major life activity of working, one must show that she is prevented from performing a broad range or class of jobs.

Although the court ruled that Williams presented sufficient evidence of disability to proceed to trial, a jury could still find that she was not disabled. Additionally, Toyota may present evidence that it could not offer a reasonable accommodation because of undue hardship or business necessity.

----- PTC

Employers Win Majority of ADA Cases

Linda K. Sullivan and David W. Arnold, Esq.
Reid Psychological Systems

According to the recently released third annual American Bar Association (ABA) survey, employers have won their cases in 95.7% of the 1999 federal court decisions involving Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The survey covered 434 reported and unreported decisions in 1999. Although this represents a slight increase in decisions favoring employers, these results are consistent with prior results. Between 1992 and 1997 employers won 91.6% of cases (N=1,200) and during 1998 employers prevailed in 94.4% of decisions (N=403).

Interestingly, the federal circuits vary in the degree to which employers prevail. In the Third, Fourth, Sixth, Eleventh and District of Columbia circuits, as well as the U.S. Supreme Court, employers won every decision in 1999. The First and the Ninth Circuits were most favorable to plaintiffs where decisions favored them 16.6% and 12.5% of the time, respectively.

The ABA also surveyed the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Here the frequency of plaintiffs prevailing was less than 15% in 1998 and 1999, and 14% from 1992 until 1997.

----- PTC

JOIN PTC/MW

Benefits

- ✓ Membership directory
- ✓ Monthly newsletter with hot topics and legal updates
- ✓ Monthly luncheon meetings with invited speakers
- ✓ Interactive workshops
- ✓ Networking
- ✓ and more!

Dues

Regular membership @ \$30/year
Student membership @ \$15/year

How to Join

Print the membership application off of our website and mail it, with dues, to PTC <<http://www.ptcmw.org>> Questions? Contact Anthony Bayless, Membership Committee Chair, at (202) 616-3564 or anthony.bayless@usdoj.gov.

Seventh Circuit allows Race Discrimination Suit to Proceed

Reprinted with permission from *IPMA News*, September 2000

Four white police officers with the City of Markham, Illinois, sued the city arguing that they were denied raises and promotions in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The lower court dismissed the suit on summary judgment, believing that the racially derogatory comments made by the officers' superiors were insufficient as a matter of law to show discrimination. The United States court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit reversed, allowing the case to proceed to trial. *James Hunt, et al. v. City of Markham, Illinois*, Docket No. 99-1331, July 11, 2000.

The majority of city leaders in the City of Markham are black, including the Mayor, the majority of the city council, and all the members of the board of fire and police commissioners. The four officers offered evidence that from 1993 to 1997, when this suit was filed, that they were subjected to numerous racist and "ageist" comments by their supervisor. Two of the officers alleged that they were denied raises based on their race and age, one alleges that he was denied a temporary promotion and the fourth officer alleges that he was constructively discharged following comments that he would never meet the mayor's expectations.

The Seventh Circuit ruled that all four officers should be allowed to proceed with their claims. The city had argued that the two officers were denied raises based on the city's weak financial condition and that other officers were also denied raises. The city further argued that the officers had no right to a raise and that the denial of a raise was not an adverse employment action, under Title VII. The Seventh Circuit disagreed, finding there was sufficient evidence that other officers received not only pay raises but also the use of city cars and tuition reimbursement. Further, the court held as a matter of law that not receiving a raise is an adverse employment action. In many cases a raise is necessary to keep pace with inflation and to keep the value of the salary from declining, and apart from inflation, raises are the norm, rewarding employees for the efficiency gained through experience.

The court also allowed the other two officers to proceed with their claims. The city argued that the officer denied the temporary promotion to sergeant had failed the sergeant's exam, but the officer provided evidence of promotions made to other officers in similar or even worse situations. Finally, the other officer was allowed to proceed based on a theory of constructive discharge because the court believed that he provided sufficient

House and Senate Initiatives Require Notice of Electronic Monitoring

Linda K. Sullivan and David W. Arnold, Esq.

Reid Psychological Systems

On July 20, 2000, a bill was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Representatives Canady (R-Florida) and Barr (R-Georgia) entitled the "Notice of Electronic Monitoring Act" (H.R. 4908). Senator Schumer (D-New York) also introduced a parallel bill in the Senate (S. 2898). This Act would provide for the disclosure of electronic monitoring of employee communications and computer usage in the workplace. Most recently, on September 6, the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on H.R. 4908.

With certain exceptions, H.R. 4908 would mandate that employers provide notice before conducting any electronic monitoring in the workplace. According to the bill, "an employer who intentionally, by any electronic means, reads, listens to, or otherwise monitors any wire communication, oral communication, or electronic communication of an employee of the employer, or otherwise monitors the computer usage of an employee of the employer, without first having provided the employee notice meeting the requirements of subsection (b)" will be liable to the employee.

According to the referenced subsection (b), a clear and conspicuous notice must describe: "1. the form of communication or computer usage that will be monitored; 2. the means by which such monitoring will be accomplished and the kinds of information that will be obtained through such monitoring, including whether communications or computer usage not related to the employer's business are likely to be monitored; 3. the frequency of such monitoring; and 4. how information obtained by such monitoring will be stored, used, or disclosed." Such notice must also be provided on an annual basis and before implementing any material changes to an employer's monitoring practices.

Under this initiative, "An employer may conduct electronic monitoring—without the notice required—if the employer has reasonable grounds to believe that: 1. a particular employee of the employer is engaged in conduct that: A. violates the legal rights of the employer or another person, and B. involves significant harm to the employer or such other person; and 2. the electronic monitoring will produce evidence of such conduct."

evidence of having been forced to quit given the derogatory comments.

Job Announcements

Director, Research and Development (San Francisco, CA; Palo Alto, CA; Austin, TX; Cambridge, MA). InMomentum, Inc. is currently seeking a skilled research professional to spearhead programmatic research efforts as we continue to refine InMomentum's i-Culture Index, or central market offering. Responsibilities include designing, managing, and delivering research studies to internal and external clients, as well as developing research-based tools and services.

Applicants should possess a very solid background in research, survey design, data analysis, and qualitative research approaches. Candidates should have an M.A. or Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior, Industrial/Organizational Psychology or related field and 5-9 years of experience in organizational research. Experience in the technology industry is a plus.

We offer a competitive salary and comprehensive benefits. For consideration, please visit our web site at www.inmomentum.com and submit your résumé and cover letter online. Alternatively, you may send your résumé and cover letter to: InMomentum, Inc., 1510 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

☪

Consultant/Associate. The Pittman McLenagan Group, L.C., a Bethesda-based consulting firm, has an immediate opening for a full time professional interested in growing with us. We have a diverse set of clients requiring services including test development (assessment centers, video-based, paper and pencil, etc.) and implementation, training development and delivery, survey design, strategic planning and statistical analysis.

The ideal candidate must have excellent attention to detail, superior interpersonal and communication skills and a strong desire to learn new skills. You must have experience in job analysis, test development, and data management and analysis. Other relevant experiences may be a plus such as training, organizational development, and survey development and analysis. Direct client management is highly desirable.

Excellent benefits including bonuses available. We are looking for a unique person to complement our team. Our team environment puts an emphasis on rapid development and growth in a wide range of skills. E-mail your résumé to HR@pittmanlc.com or fax to HR: (301) 320-9525.

☪

Director, Testing & Assessment, Science Directorate. The Director of Testing and Assessment is APA's primary authority on all matters that relate to testing and assessment across diverse settings. This includes serving as consultant on legal, ethical, and scientific issues involving testing and assessment, managing the staffing of governance groups addressing testing and assessment, and coordinating inter-directorate activities. The director also monitors federal, national or state legislative, regulatory or other policy issues that involve testing and assessment and develops advocacy positions on behalf of APA.

Requirements: Doctorate in psychology with focus on testing and assessment, well-developed methodological expertise and work experience beyond doctoral degree in testing/assessment or policy areas. In addition, successful candidate will exhibit excellent interpersonal, public speaking and writing skills, and ability to work collaboratively across constituencies with diverse perspectives. Master's level candidate with substantial work experience in testing/assessment and policy arenas can be considered.

The American Psychological Association offers a comprehensive salary and benefits package and exercise facilities. Visit our web site at www.apa.org for more information. APA is an equal employment opportunity employer. Please send vita or résumé to: APA, Attn: Human Resources (3021), 750 First St., NE, Washington, DC 20002. Jobs@apa.org

PTC

MEMBER NEWS

Welcome New Members!

Regular Members

Kelli J. Sheets, International Personnel Management Association (IPMA)
Michelle A. Dean, University of North Texas

Visit PTC On-line

Visit us at <http://www.ptcmw.org>. Find out about recent legal and other developments in our field - Check the calendar for upcoming professional events - Learn about PTC - Join PTC.

PROFESSIONAL CALENDAR

by Lance W. Seberhagen, Seberhagen & Associates, sebe@erols.com

- Oct 2-4 Society for Human Resource Management. Workplace Diversity Conference. Washington, DC. Contact: SHRM, (703) 548-3440.
- Oct 2-4. Virginia Tech. Seminar. "Statistical Methods." Washington, DC. Contact: Beverly Turner, VT, (540) 231-2188 or conted.vt.edu/stat.htm.
- Oct 2-4. Virginia Tech. Seminar. "Modern Linear and Nonlinear Regression." Washington, DC. Contact: Beverly Turner, VT, (540) 231-2188 or conted.vt.edu/stat.htm.
- Oct 4-6. Virginia Tech. Seminar. "Multivariate Methods." Washington, DC. Contact: Beverly Turner, VT, (540) 231-2188 or conted.vt.edu/stat.htm.
- Oct 4-6. Virginia Tech. Seminar. "Advanced Regression." Washington, DC. Contact: Beverly Turner, VT, (540) 231-2188 or conted.vt.edu/stat.htm.
- Oct 5 Washington Statistical Society. Seminar. "Litigation Science: How Much Science? How Much Litigation?" Washington, DC. Contact: Pamela Douglas, (202) 691-7524.
- Oct 5 Institute for Personality & Ability Testing. "16PF Introductory Workshop." Oak Brook, IL. Contact: IPAT, (800) 225-4728.
- Oct 6 Institute for Personality & Ability Testing. "16PF Advanced Workshop." Oak Brook, IL. Contact: IPAT, (800) 225-4728.
- Oct 10-13 Linkage Inc. Conference. "Emotional Intelligence" Chicago, IL. Contact: LI, (781) 862-3157 or linkageinc.com/ei2000.
- OCT 11** **PTC/MW. SPECIAL EVENT! BREAKFAST/WORKSHOP. (8:00 am - 11:30 am, extra charge). Dr. Lawrence James & Dr. Michael McIntyre, University of Tennessee & Innovative Assessment Technology. "Innovations in Selection: Use of Conditional Reasoning to Identify Reliable Employees." Pier 7 Restaurant, Washington, DC. Contact: Dan Russell, Aon Consulting, Vienna, VA, (703) 208-6803 or daniel_p_russell@aoncons.com.**
- Oct 11-13 Institute for Professional Education. Seminar. "Linear and Nonlinear Regression with Applications." Washington, DC. Contact: IPE, (703) 527-8700.
- Oct 15-19 International Personnel Management Association. Annual Conference. San Francisco, CA. Contact: IPMA, (703) 549-7100 or ipma.org.
- Oct 17-19 International Quality & Productivity Center. Conference. "e-Career Development: Leveraging Internet Technology to Attract, Develop, and Retain Top Talent." Chicago, IL. Contact: IQPC, (800) 882-8684 or iqpc.com.
- Oct 20 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Workshop. "Developing Organizations' Fitness to Compete" by Michael Beer, Harvard University. Cambridge, MA. Contact: Jack Kennedy, (212) 490-1600 or jackkennedy@bandm.com.
- NOV 8** **PTC/MW. LUNCHEON MEETING. Ms. Beth Holst, National Retail Federation and NSSB Voluntary Partnership on Sales and Service, Washington, DC. "Assessment Via the Internet." Pier 7 Restaurant, Washington, DC. Contact: Dr. Lance Anderson, Caliber Associates, Fairfax, VA, (703) 219-4448 or anderson@calib.com.**
- Nov 11-15 International Association of Chiefs of Police. Annual Conference. San Diego, CA. Contact: IACP, (703) 836-6767.
- Nov 14-17 Institute for Professional Education. Seminar. "Designing Effective Surveys." Washington, DC. Contact: IPE, (703) 527-8700.
- Dec 4-6 Institute for Professional Education. Seminar. "Applied Statistics." Washington, DC. Contact: IPE, (703) 527-8700.
- Dec 6-8 Institute for Professional Education. Seminar. "Linear and Nonlinear Regression with Applications." Washington, DC. Contact: IPE, (703) 527-8700.
- DEC 13** **PTC/MW. LUNCHEON MEETING. Dr. Shane Pittman, The Pittman-McLenagan Group, Bethesda, MD. "PTC/MW Presidential Address." Pier 7 Restaurant, Washington, DC. Contact: Dr. Lance Anderson, Caliber Associates, Fairfax, VA, (703) 219-4448 or anderson@calib.com.**
- Dec 18-20 Institute for Professional Education. Seminar. "Applied Multivariate Methods Using Popular Statistical Computing Packages." Washington, DC. Contact: IPE, (703) 527-8700.

2001

- JAN 10** **PTC/MW. LUNCHEON MEETING. Speaker to be announced. Pier 7 Restaurant, Washington, DC. Contact: Dr. Lance Anderson, Caliber Associates, Fairfax, VA, (703) 219-4448 or anderson@calib.com.**

Future SIOP: San Diego, 2001; Toronto, 2002; Orlando, 2003; Chicago, 2004; Los Angeles, 2005.

PERSONNEL TESTING COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON

1300 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1000, Arlington, VA 22209

<http://www.ptcmw.org>

<i>PTC/MW Elected Officers, 2000</i>				
Office	Name	Affiliation	Work Phone	E-Mail
President	Shane Pittman, Ph.D.	Pittman McLenagan Group	(301) 320-9500	shanep@pittmanlc.com
Past President	Deirdre Knapp, Ph.D.	HumRRO	(703) 706-5662	dknapp@humrro.org
President-Elect	Ann Quigley, M.A.	U.S. Postal Service	(202) 268-3952	aquigley@email.usps.gov
Vice President	Lance Anderson, Ph.D.	Caliber Associates	(703) 219-4448	anderson@calib.com
Secretary	Gary Carter, Ph.D.	PDRI	(703) 812-3053	garyc@pdi-corp.com
Treasurer	Elaine Engle, Ph.D.	Burgess Levin & Company	(703) 450-1101	elainemengle@aol.com
Recorder	Tina Strickland, M.A.	OPM	(202) 606-1428	tsstrick@opm.gov

<i>PTC/MW Committee Chairs, 2000</i>				
Committee	Name	Affiliation	Work Phone	E-Mail
Legal	Lance Seberhagen, Ph.D.	Seberhagen & Associates	(703) 790-0796	sebe@erols.com
Membership	Anthony Bayless, Ph.D.	Dept of Justice, INS	(202) 616-3564	anthony.bayless@usdoj.gov
Nom/Elections	Deirdre Knapp, Ph.D.	HumRRO	(703) 706-5662	dknapp@humrro.org
Newsletter	Lia Meyer, M.A.	Pittman McLenagan Group	(301) 320-9500	liam@pittmanlc.com
Website	Joe Psotka, Ph.D.	ARI	(703) 617-5572	psotka@ari.army.mil
Training	Daniel P. Russell, M.S.	Aon Consulting	(703) 208-6803	daniel_p_russell@aoncons.com
Calendar	Lance Seberhagen, Ph.D.	Seberhagen & Associates	(703) 790-0796	sebe@erols.com

Copyright © 2000, Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington. PTC/MW encourages other groups to reprint articles from the PTC/MW Newsletter, provided that credit is given to the author(s) and to the PTC/MW Newsletter. All statements expressed in this newsletter are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinions or policies of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington. **The deadline for submissions for the November newsletter is Wednesday, October 11, 2000.**

PTC/MW
Gary Carter
PDRI
1300 Wilson Blvd, Suite 1000
Arlington, VA 22209

**FIRST CLASS
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 116
ALEXANDRIA, VA**