

# Executive Briefing: Implementing Best-Practice Assessment and Screening Technologies



Executive Briefing  
October 27, 2005  
By John Chaisson

Sponsored by:



## INTRODUCTION

*"It is becoming increasingly important for organizations to incorporate a detailed and comprehensive assessment strategy into the staffing process."* ~ Taleo's Senior Industrial Psychologist, Nathan Mondragon, Ph.D.

Introduction of the World Wide Web as a sourcing tool has enabled corporations to reach a tremendous database of applicants efficiently and with relatively low cost as compared to more traditional sourcing methods. In some cases, corporate web pages and online applications flood companies with applicants, both qualified and unqualified. The range and volume of applicants pose a tremendous workload for staffing personnel and introduce higher probabilities of either hiring the wrong person for the job or simply missing the best candidate.

Given the current recruitment landscape, organizations that have implemented sourcing strategies that attract many applicants while simultaneously filtering out unqualified individuals enjoy a clear competitive edge. "Around late 2000 and into 2001", according to Allan Schwyer, Executive Director of the Human Capital Institute, "as Applicant Tracking Systems [ATS] became web-enabled, corporations saw a doubling and tripling in the amount of applicants responding to job postings. However, at about this time, recruitment strategies shifted in part, from sourcing to managing and matching applications. Recruiters went from a dearth of candidates to a flood, and their focus changed from casting a wider recruitment net to finding efficient ways to filter out unqualified applicants."

As a result, and as staffing methods changed and assessment and tracking systems evolved, a tremendous growth in the technology available for pre-screening and assessment emerged. Today, these tools continue to improve as they address organizational recruitment and staffing challenges. There are currently hundreds of ATS products on the market. Many of them have embedded pre-screening assessment tools that assist in channeling the flood of resumes into the initial "consider further" and "rejected" categories.

In meeting recruiters' needs beyond initial pre-screening, ATS providers have also begun developing more sophisticated tools to perform automated screening further into the

selection process. According to John Chaisson, a Senior Director with the Human Capital Institute, "The providers are often ahead of their customers in this regard. Even before the science of the selection (had reached) the organizations, advanced screening tools have become available. Some of these modules are valuable and some are not."

In his recent paper, "Raising the Bar on Hiring Standards: Using Technology to Integrate Candidate Sourcing and Screening"<sup>1</sup> written by Dr. Charles Handler, PhD., he states that "although there are clear advantages that the increase in technology brings to the area of sourcing, such as broadening the reach of a corporation, increasing the ability to communicate effectively the employer branding initiatives of a company, proactive hiring, cost savings, greater diversity and a favorable selection ratio, there is also produced the problem of 'information overload' for staffing and recruiting personnel. 'Noise' or unnecessary data places limitations on the entire hiring process because, besides information overload, it limits the accuracy of hiring decisions by allowing applicants who are not qualified to remain in consideration for a position."

Although companies attempt to reach specific talent through corporate branding and other recruiting initiatives via the Web, employing a sourcing initiative without implementing a strategic and reliable assessment system to assist in dealing with the response is costly, dangerous and incredibly time consuming at a corporate level. "The less irrelevant information that must be processed, the faster information that has value can be identified and used to help achieve the objectives for which the process has been created in the first place." Dr. Handler states in "Raising the Bar on Hiring

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see:  
<http://www.redmatch.com/siteFiles/1/2/139.asp?source=rockethire>

Standards: Using Technology to Integrate Candidate Sourcing and Screening.”<sup>2</sup>

The objective of any screening or pre-screening tool is to filter through the “noise” to assist in the assessment and hiring initiatives of a corporation. John Chaisson, in an HCI web cast dated September 15, 2005, entitled: Implementing Best-Practice Assessment and Screening Technologies, makes the valid argument that any selection tool has to “actually meet the business objectives inside a company and [must] align with the hiring, recruiting and talent goals” of that company. “You are the expert in your talent management goal. You are the expert in the hiring goals of your business and expert in how that assessment aligns to your business outcome

Recruiters should seek out appropriate and effective tools that mesh specifically with their organization’s corporate initiatives by staying involved in all stages of implementing an ATS. From this perspective, integration of talent tools and talent technology is a holistic process. Corporations can’t just arbitrarily plug in assessment tools and hope the performance of the tools meet the standards of success that vendors claim. Some studies show that corporations are still shying away from evaluating how a system is working within the organization. Data from Dr. Handler’s Dec 15, 2005 article: “ 2005 Online Screening and Assessment Survey Results, Part 2” led one reader to respond: “ ...so out of the 100% of companies that used testing ... 72% are c-l-u-e-l-e-s-s as to whether the test is accomplishing anything!”<sup>3</sup>

Essentially, companies need a game plan for online assessment. In particular, to direct and achieve a better quality of hiring. The company needs to ask, “are we getting what we need?” and more importantly, “Do we know what we need to reach our goals?” Perhaps integration of internal job assessments and measuring results with external talent may result in employing or rejecting possible assessment

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Please see:

<http://www.ereexchange.com/articles/db/5602DB189C984EEBA1C4C25176CEEF8D.asp> Reader responses (by Frank Risalvato, CPC)

tools. Regardless, there is a need to make investments early in the assessment process: “The obvious one being the interview training and online technical support to initiate better interviewing techniques.” according to John Chaisson.

“Leverage these tools up front and don’t avoid them because you think they may cost too much,” recommends Jeff Dahltop of the Performance Assessment Network (PAN Powered), “For example, implementing some of the available online tools in an attempt to test more applicants may in the long run cost corporations much less. The reality is, what is the cost of turnover for a corporation?” He asks. Companies that scrimp on investing in a solid and valuable assessment and hiring system, or by not taking the time to understand and determine the validity of the system within the matrices of that company’s culture and business goals are missing the boat, so to speak.

The predictability of any assessment tool or system of tools is testimony to the efficacy of the chosen tool. By monitoring the validity of a tool internally, corporations have the added advantage of testing the true success of a product they have introduced into their hiring strategy. Lewis Hollweg of Batrus Hollweg suggests that determining how valid predictability is, can only be valuable if you know “... what you are predicting for. What data is available to signify what constitutes success for a particular role within an organization for which an ATS is designated to evaluate.”?

What are the criteria for developing an appropriate test or selection system? “Part of the problem is that companies don’t have the criteria or the information to measure success

for a given position in question.” Says Handler in a recent article; “This can present problems because if you are using a test that is not optimal for the outcomes you are trying to predict, the ability of the test to demonstrate value will be greatly reduced.”<sup>4</sup>

For example, success in an entry level position may be measured by supervisor ratings or job turnover: “If this is the case, than it is important to choose an HMS or ATS that uses turnover as the ultimate criteria for which to measure success”, according to Lewis Hollweg. “But how turnover is classified within the organization is the defining criteria of the relevance of that comparison. Ultimately, (despite the broad spectrum of exemplary technology available to employers) it depends on a company’s ability to develop criteria or standards for what constitutes success in a particular job.”

According to Handler. “An applicant pool is only as good as those individuals who are reached with a message and compelled to apply.” Suggesting that in accurately assessing a company’s needs and goals, appropriate applicants will be attracted to a particular posting. As well as streamlining the applications that make it to the talent pool, companies need to understand the directive of that streamline process so as to effectively extract candidates with the highest likelihood of success. Following is a brief introduction of some of the assessment tools available to companies through third party vendors.

Assessment/screening tools are defined by Dr. Charles Handler as: “Scientifically-based screening tools that look more deeply into a candidate’s abilities, interests, and skills. These tools include personality measures, cognitive tests (i.e., verbal and quantitative skills), situational judgment tests, job simulations, etc. They are typically used for a more in-depth evaluation later on in the staffing process.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Please see:  
<http://www.ereexchange.com/articles/db/BEB492794EB84B5799C20787CE3D2A5D.asp>

<sup>5</sup> Please see: <http://www.ereexchange.com2005> Online Screening and Assessment Survey Results, Part 2:Trends Centered Around the use of Assessment Tools at Organizations.

Prescreening/screening tools are defined as: “Tools that gather information about, or ask candidates to respond to questions about their experience, skills and qualifications in order to identify if they meet minimum job requirements. These tools are typically used early on in the staffing process.”<sup>6</sup>

Pre-screening was first introduced as a method to help recruiters deal with an expansive volume of resumes. The tools took the form of simplified questionnaires, which could be voluntary or mandatory and, in some cases, weighted. Currently the extensive variance and availability of such tools makes it difficult to define what differentiates a screening from a pre-screening tool. Essentially pre-screening tools are implemented at the primary stages of an application and are designed to differentiate applicants from potential candidates by uncovering the most elemental of qualifications.

Initially, pre-screening tools were not used to the same level of success that is typical today. As the recruiting environment changed over time, the extent of efficacy, validity and reliability of pre-screening tests evolved to a much more sophisticated and predictable variable in the selection process. In general these tests are used early in the process and in many instances are seamlessly integrated in the application process. In some cases, they might help to identify candidates who possess attributes that the company considers essential to the position in question. More frequently, they are used to eliminate candidates that do not possess critical requirements for the job. The questionnaires may appear in the form of a few simple “knock-out questions” or constitute a lengthier questionnaire. Ultimately pre-screening and screening tools, or any tools used

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid

in assessment and selection, are only as useful as the results of such tests are predictable, validated and reliable, both in an objective and scientific sense, and to what extent that test can predict the success of a potential candidate.

#### PRE-SCREENING", SCREENING AND SEARCH TOOLS

"Prescreening" suggests implementation prior to an applicant becoming a candidate. This may be a useful way to distinguish it from "screening", which can occur at any point during the selection process and generally involves the use of a variety of assessment and selection tools. The emphasis on the use of any prescreening test or any assessment tool is to be specific about the information the test is geared to extract. In being specific, from a "know thyself" approach, screening and prescreening tools can be extremely useful tools in the preliminary and elementary stages of the "recruiting life cycle."

Two items of concern for the organization in the use of screening tools are in the possible legal ramifications and in "turning off" potential candidates. The question has arisen as to the millennial generation's acceptance of the use of such tests. Studies indicate that "provided applicants can see a relative correlation between the questions being asked and the position for which they are applying, the consensus view is that they are not adverse to participating in the questionnaire." According to Schweyer.

A key concern is in keeping a personalized approach overall, throughout the screening process and throughout the recruiting process. Studies indicate that screening, if used intelligently, deriving questions in alignment with the job and the corporate goals and business objectives, is an excellent tool for streamlining and narrowing the talent pool. Organizations can better avoid pitfalls and legal dangers if hiring personnel work closely with the vendor that provides the tools used. In doing so, screening as part of the decision making process, proves valuable to corporations.

Determining what tools to use poses a unique challenge to recruiters as there are literally hundreds of thousands of tests available; all purporting to be reliable. Organizations should

also consider applicant pool search tools as screening and assessment options. According to many professionals, they are a tool that can help corporations get to individuals in the talent pool who may already work for the organization, and people that are within the company's existing data base, allowing them to get to the "short list" of qualified applicants much more expediently. "The search tool allows for a more immediate and streamlined use of a resume data base from which to proceed with the assessment process." According to Schweyer.

At the beginning of the process, the tools are used to build the best talent pool for each position. Qualification prescreening if used in conjunction with complementary sourcing tactics introduced at the earliest stages of the searching/matching process, and executed and monitored in alignment with corporate goals and identity can be extremely useful. The use of broad base sourcing and filtering tools can provide a database of the most qualified applicants from which to proceed. The system has to be efficient and effective in that it targets specific qualifications that have proven impact upon the success of an applicant to perform the requirements of a particular position. Integrating sourcing strategies that attract many, and simultaneously filtering out unqualified applicants, thus reducing the "noise", increases the success and accuracy of the hiring initiative. When deeper level screening tools and powerful talent pool search technology is added, the system emerges as an efficient and effective component of the decision making process. It is mandatory that the organization be involved in the process of defining success and devising the best ways to extract the best applicants. "Making a good hiring decision is a blend of two things-

gathering enough predicative data to help learn about an applicant's capabilities relative to job requirements and having hiring personnel who have the experience and ability to accurately interpret this data and use it to their advantage. The hiring process is a continuum, and the outcome of each element in the process is limited by the step that comes before it." According to Dr. Charles Handler, in a recent report on candidate assessment and selection<sup>7</sup>.

### SKILLS TESTING

There are a tremendous amount of technological products available to corporations for testing individuals who have made it past the primary buffer and into the secondary and tertiary phases of recruitment. For example, skills tests that are very specific to a particular position. All tests will neither fit for all companies, nor all positions within a company. Although these tests may not translate from one organization to the other, corporations that invest the time and money in acquiring and implementing such tests are benefiting tremendously. Again it is essential to be aware of the test claims and integrate the tests in such a way as to intelligently take advantage of the technology<sup>8</sup>.

Use of online testing, which is very cost effective and less time consuming than traditional on site testing, allows companies to test more candidates, thus increasing the likelihood of finding the best ones. In its efficiency and convenience, online testing is attractive for both applicants and organizations. The tests range from very fundamental and simple job skills tests, to tests that are highly technologically sophisticated – as with job simulation testing. Corporations need to sift through the diversity of tests available and find a valid test most suited to meet the corporate needs and environment in which the position exists.

---

<sup>7</sup> Please see:  
<http://www.erexchange.com/articles/db/D387FCFDEA7F4AEB8E79EBDD37C4198D.asp>

<sup>8</sup> The range of tests is too extensive for this paper, however an excellent resource for any company designing a system for assessing skills, traits, attributes etc. can be found at [www. Rocket-Hire.com](http://www.Rocket-Hire.com): " 2005 Online Buyer's Guide to Web-Based Screening & Assessment Systems", an excellent and essential resource for any company that wishes to make a competent and informed decision regarding an ATS platform.

### PSYCHOMETRIC TESTS

Such tests as personality and ability and aptitude assessment fall into this category. "Psychometric testing is less vulnerable to cheating", according to Schweyer (because when you talk about online testing there's always the possibility that the tests are falsified) "they are designed to create a managerial aid to recruiting, selecting, training, career planning and team management. However, there is great debate as to the effectiveness of these tools because of the complexities of the positions for which they are designed to test and the natural distaste many people have for being categorized typified through testing."

The argument often follows patters similar to the following:

*"Testing individuals is a flawed process itself. Why? Because if I hire all 'aggressive, assertive, competitive hunters' ... I will wind up with an office of backstabbing hyper-competitive reps that can't get along with one another."* Says Frank Risalvato, CPC, in a discussion thread related to an article posted by Charles Handler<sup>9</sup>.

Or consider another post by Karen Mattonen C.A.C. to the same article:

*"... [When I] recently informed a candidate that he was to take a psychometric test, he started asking some very interesting questions, such as: 'Which test is it? What type is it? (projective, objective, idiographic, etc.) What are they trying to determine? What is the main goal? What is the company culture?' and so on. After about 20 minutes, I dug deeper, [I] wondered why he asked so many deep questions about the company's profile and managers.. ...he made a*

---

<sup>9</sup> Please see:  
<http://www.erexchange.com/articles/db/F341811909704A5092A59F8A7322B3DA.asp>

*comment that was very interesting, he said 'just tell me what personality you want me to be and I will be it'. [He] told me a story of how his boss had told him that he needed to take a test, he said the same to his boss, his boss laughed just like I did... Well this candidate later proved to me, and his boss, that through some sales training and classes he took (some were at the local university) he learned how to master psychometric tests."*<sup>10</sup>

A strong rebuttal comes from another responder to the same message thread: David Arnold, Ph.D., J.D. references: *'The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 85 Years of Research Findings.'* He says, "This 1998 article published in the American Psychological Association's *Psychological Bulletin* concludes that research shows that a combination of certain assessments is often the most valid and practical means of selecting employees. Parenthetically, it is important to note that no test, interview, job simulation, drug test or background check is going to be a perfect predictor of employee performance. As a result, there will always be stories from the trenches that an applicant's performance on the job was exactly the opposite of what the test, interview or other form of assessment predicted or that an applicant faked out the interviewer, test or other process because it was apparent what the job required. Reciprocally, there will also be stories from the trenches that an applicant's job performance was perfectly predicted by the test, interview or assessment. Obviously, an organization's reliance on testing or any selection procedure is much more appropriately justified by professionally conducted and legally probative validation studies, rather than a few isolated case studies derived from the trenches. I trust this information is helpful in moving this discussion to being a bit more fact-focused."<sup>11</sup>

Bill McKeown of Republic Windows and Doors inc. commented in HCI's September, 15, webcast entitled "Implementing Best-Practice: Assessment and Screening

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

Technologies", that "Purchasers (of ATS) are recruiters and they don't have the knowledge of testing, psychometric instruments, etc. Nor are they aware of the rules of validity – the universals that govern the accuracy of the tests they are implementing." He argues that because "they grow up on the recruiting side of things, they lack the statistical knowledge to test the validity of the systems they purchase and deploy." As a result, it is difficult if not impossible for them to reliably align the assessment tools with the company goals. His concern is that the tests that companies base their assessment and screening process on are simple generic tests that do not factor in the complexity of the hiring initiative each test individually claims to support. In agreement Lewis Hollweg of Batrus Hollweg sees the need to evaluate each test within the hiring system. "Selection (of an appropriate ATS) is a very complicated process which, with mid-size companies especially, can be very problematic. They simply don't have the resources available to them to test the validity of each tool within the ATS." But the market is responding to these needs in an attempt to develop programs that can facilitate internal confirmation of the relative success of a strategy. If a test has been used in a number of different environments, it is said to have more "robustness" than a test that has been tested in only one or a few particular instances and places, according to Hollweg. Because corporations are always changing, there is a need to examine the robustness of a test as opposed to a time specific validity coefficient. Furthermore, how does this test transfer to other usage within an organization? For example, internal evaluation/comparison of a position. "There has to be a balance between bringing in outside expertise and keeping a hands on approach to

understanding what is a valid tool/method of assessment,” according to Chaisson.

“Companies have to define their goals, vendors should educate the companies and the companies should seek that education. There should be an attempt at due diligence before any company uses a tool.” warns Chaisson, “There needs to be an alignment between the outcomes of the tool, and the actual business and recruiting and hiring goals of the company, and there needs to be ongoing involvement on the part of the company.” This is where many companies are being “cheated” in the value of the tools because of the complexity of testing for validity and reliability. Recruiters, purchasers etc., will unintentionally dis-empower the corporation if certain products are implemented without a clear understanding of how these products can and do fulfill the requirements of the assessment and hiring goals. The question remains: Do companies step back and let more qualified personnel assess the success of a product, or if by withholding methods to simply test products, are vendors disempowering corporations and diminishing the value of the tools they sell?

#### VALIDITY

Validity is essentially the relationship between a particular selection tool and its ability to predict performance in some meaningful way, which is usually expressed numerically with a correlation coefficient. There is the element of time in that, “you can’t get any validity coefficient if you don’t have a reliable instrument... one relates and supports the other in that if you test the person one day, a week later it should produce the same results,” according to Hollweg. On a corporate level there is a consistency with the type of person you choose each time you implement a particular tool. Ultimately, it is the company’s responsibility to verify on a consistent basis that a tool is doing what it purports to do and that validation is paramount in its use of a particular system. There is a need to consider systems as opposed to any specific tool in question to provide “support to the validity and reliability of any specific element of that system. Particularly, as we get into the cross section of the assessment tool and technology.” Hollweg argues.

Usually companies are advised to use a battery of tests rather than a single test in the assessment selection process. The greatest challenge is to try and mesh the knowledge of “very skilled scientific individuals that validate the tools and make that knowledge available to the companies that are trying to make sense of it from a business perspective and lawyers trying to make legal sense of the tools.” According to John Chaisson.

How can a company know what they are getting? Jeff Dahltorp of Performance Assessment Network, realistically expects that “any organization that works with and intends to implement a particular assessment tool or tools, should be able to ask and be provided with statistical data that promotes the validity and reliability of a particular tool and ultimately its ability to predict success as an assessment tool for a particular job.” It is also important that the standards that the vendor uses to measure the validity of a particular ATS be reputable and that the claims are not all “smoke and mirrors”. “It is imperative that companies either understand the important elements or have a consulting firm that [they] trust and a long term relationship that can steer [the corporation] through these difficult waters because obviously there are legal ramifications as well.” According to Lewis Hollweg

Essentially any system can be broken down into the components that exist within that system. However, the emphasis in assessment tools is that no individual test should be given primary consideration when considering how effective a system is. Leveraging certain tools with a mix of other tools that may have lower validities from a scientific standpoint, yet may have a stronger validity within the context of a particular corporation, might sometimes be

necessary. Nor are all testing styles suitable across the board. One company may value simple questionnaires, another, the interview. In the latter, as with the rigor surrounding other tests and screening tools, it is important that the interview be structured. One that has “consistency in the type of questions being asked across the board as they relate to a particular organizational culture. [The interview should] go one step further to very specific questions related to that particular candidate”, advises Dahltorp. Intelligent interviewing helps to reduce subjectivity and focuses more on how well an applicant can particularly perform specific tasks as they relate to the overall goals and culture of an organization. “Really digging in and asking very specific questions that will reveal to the interviewer aspects of a person as they relate to a very specific role within the organization is crucial.” Dahltorp insists. So that in essence, like the validity and scientifically tested screening tool, the interview can be tweaked to fit within a goal specific platform unique to that organization. This type of interview can also be validated to the extent the types of responses to the questions asked are indicative of success on the job.

Determining the validity of any assessment system is “incremental validity represented by a series of steps. For example, pre-screening, assessment tools, interviews, etc.”, according to Lewis Hollweg, “Each tool on its own may not have a high coefficient, however, as a system may be highly valid and reliable. It’s really about taking all of it and putting it together. Job related skills, competencies, job analysis and putting that together in a methodical way. Using tools that have some robustness and then ultimately validating that over a period of time; that is the way to ensure the effectiveness of [the company’s] assessment/selection process. If companies are willing to go through these few steps, then by and large, a company will benefit from a sound and proven, powerful assessment system.” Emphasizes Hollweg.

In conclusion, the successful implementation and use of screening, testing, interviewing and other assessment/selection tools is best summarized as follows, by Dr. Charles Handler:

*“I feel that pre-employment assessment is really starting to come into its own as a viable tool for adding value via its ability to ensure organizations hire individuals who will allow them to better meet their strategic business objectives. No matter what the business, winning is still about two things: effective leadership and having the right people in the right jobs. Pre-employment assessment is an essential ingredient for both of these and thus its value will continue to become apparent as hiring moves forward into the end of this decade.”<sup>12</sup>*

#### KEY SOURCES:

<http://www.uniformguidelines.com/uniformguidelines.html>

[http://www.onetcenter.org/dl\\_files/empTestAsses.pdf](http://www.onetcenter.org/dl_files/empTestAsses.pdf)

The Need for Speed: Validation Strategies of the Future Thursday, January 09, 2003 | by [Dr. Charles Handler](#)

<http://www.erexchange.com/articles/db/28C3D6545A694E599D300F8AEF7373A3.asp>

Automated Matching of Supply and Demand  
by Yves Lermusiaux [www.taleo.com](http://www.taleo.com)

Trends in Pre-Employment Assessment – What to look for in 2006  
By Charles Handler, Ph.D

---

<sup>12</sup> Trends in Pre-Employment Assessment – What to look for in 2006  
By Charles Handler, Ph.D

## ABOUT THE PANEL PARTICIPANTS

The guest moderator for this open session was John Chaisson.

### BILL MCKEOWN

#### REPUBLIC WINDOWS & DOORS, INC.

Bill McKeown is the Manager of Talent for Republic Windows & Doors, Inc., a leading manufacturer of premium-quality windows, and patio doors. In his current role, Bill is responsible for workforce design and structure as well as the acquisition, assessment, development and retention of talented individuals in order to optimize organizational performance.

### NATHAN MONDRAGON, PH.D.

#### TALEO

Dr. Mondragon is an Industrial and Organizational Psychologist and leads the Assessment Solution for Taleo (formerly Recruitsoft). He has over 15 years experience in assessment, selection, and talent management practices. Dr. Mondragon holds a Ph.D in Industrial and Organizational Psychology from Colorado State University.

### TOM NORFLEET

#### MOEN, INCORPORATED

Tom is the Director of HR for Moen Incorporated. Throughout his CAREER, TOM'S Focus has been on system improvement processes in making organizations, teams, and individuals successful as well as organizational change initiatives. Tom has a Master's in Human Resource Development as well as professional certifications from SHRM and ISPI.

### PAULA RADLOFF

#### STARBUCKS COFFEE COMPANY

Paula Radloff joined Starbucks Coffee Company in March 2000 as director, Partner Resources, Retail North America leading partner resources functions for Store Development, North America Finance, IT and Retail Operations & Implementation. She was the Partner Resources leader responsible for the successful integration efforts associated with the acquisition of Seattle Coffee Company. After successfully managing

Partner Resources for her assigned departments and integration work, Radloff became VP of Global Staffing in September 2003. She is now responsible for overall staffing strategies for Starbucks Coffee Company. Radloff has a wide range of experience in human resources and Management. Radloff has a Bachelor of Arts from Western Washington University with a concentration in Education and History.

### DANNA SZWED

#### VP, HUMAN RESOURCES

#### CITIGROUP

Danna Szwed, Vice President of Human Resources, is currently employed by Citigroup as a Global Functional e-Recruitment Manager. She began with Citi in 1995 as a Management Associate, where she held various assignments Located in New York, South Dakota, and Zurich, Switzerland. In 1997, she relocated to Las Vegas, where she currently resides. Since 1997, Danna spent 2 years as a Generalist, 2 years as a Staffing Manager, and 2 years as the North America Staffing HRIS Director. Danna received her Masters degree in Labor Relations and Human Resources in 1995 from Michigan State University, and currently lives in Las Vegas with Rob, her husband of 6 years, and their 2 dogs, Katie and Hershey.

### JEFF DAHLTORP

#### PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT NETWORK

Jeff is the VP of Global Marketing & Strategic Alliances for Performance Assessment Network (pan) a the leading provider of Internet-based testing and assessment solutions, with over 6500 corporate, government, and education clients internationally, administering millions of tests, assessments, and surveys annually from over 45 of the top test publishers in North America and Europe. pan also manages a nationwide network of testing centers in

addition to its internet testing platform, IT professional services, and product distribution businesses. Closely held pan is based in Carmel, IN, USA.

**CHARLES HANDLER**  
**ROCKET-HIRE**

Dr. Charles Handler is the president and founder of Rocket-Hire.com. Throughout his career he has specialized in developing effective, legally defensible employee selection systems. His philosophy focuses on combining sound science with innovation and practicality to create online hiring strategies that provide ROI and demonstrate the value of human capital. Charles has a Master's and Ph.D. in Industrial Psychology.

**LEWIS HOLLWEG**  
**BATRUS HOLLWEG**

Lewis Hollweg is Chairman and CEO of Batrus Hollweg. Throughout his 30-plus-year career, Lewis has focused on understanding the cornerstones of developing peak **P**erforming individuals and teams. He has consulted with many distinguished national and international clients in such industries as food service, airline, health care, hotel, manufacturing, and technology. Lewis has worked with top managers and their teams across the U.S. and Europe in the diagnosis of individual and team effectiveness.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR



**JOHN CHAISSON**  
Senior Director  
Human Capital Institute

John Chaisson leads the Talent Acquisition thought leadership panels and webcast activities for HCI. He is also the Chief Purpose Prophet and Principal Qualitative Analyst for The Prophet Group based outside New Orleans and is responsible for uniting the leadership perspectives, approaches and tools for building leaders and leading enterprises. John has built a career founded on the “purpose” of fostering sustainable workforces, businesses, services and products. After completing Stanford Law School, he worked as a corporate attorney for leading law firms including internationally-renowned Wilson, Sonsini and later began his Silicon Valley business career as General Counsel and VP Business Development for Resumix, also supporting public software and HR services giant Ceridian Corporation. He later co-founded several market-leading technology and management Consulting groups focused on ERP software and Human Capital solutions, before launching TPG. Among other roles, he is a Member of the National Advisory Board of the Human Capital Institute and a Board Member of consumer electronics incubator, Sector Labs.

## ABOUT THE HUMAN CAPITAL INSTITUTE



The Human Capital Institute is a catalyst for innovative new thinking in talent acquisition, development and deployment. Through research and collaboration, our programs collect original, creative ideas from a field of top executives and the brightest thought leaders in strategic HR and talent management. Those ideas are then transformed into measurable, real-world strategies that help our members attract and retain the best talent, build a diverse, inclusive workplace, and leverage individual and team performance throughout the enterprise.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



This Executive Briefing is made possible by Taleo, sponsor of HCI's Assessment and Selection Learning Track

### ABOUT TALEO

Taleo Corporation is a leading provider of enterprise staffing management solutions that enable large organizations to establish, automate and manage worldwide staffing processes for professional, hourly and temporary staff. Taleo customers use the company's solutions to enhance the quality, productivity and satisfaction of their workforces. Taleo solutions incorporate resource allocation principles similar to those employed successfully in supply chain management automation to more accurately match total labor demand and supply across complex organizations. Taleo customers include Honeywell, HP, Mercer Human Resource Consulting, P&G, Starbucks Corporation, SUEZ, UnitedHealth Group, Washington Mutual, Yellow Corporation, among many others. Taleo is headquartered in San Francisco, CA.

The Human Capital Institute gratefully acknowledges the financial and volunteer contributions of our founding partners. They include:

- AIRS
- THE ASSOCIATION OF EXECUTIVE SEARCH CONSULTANTS
- BRASSRING
- THE CENTER FOR TALENT RETENTION
- EXECUNET
- EXXCEED
- HIREDESK
- HUMAN CAPITAL MAGAZINE
- JOB CENTRAL
- JOBSTER
- JWT
- KENEXA
- MENTTIUM
- MONSTER
- MONSTER GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS
- MYBIZOFFICE
- ORACLE
- PEOPLECLICK
- PEOPLEFILTER
- PROJECTIX
- RECRUITMAX
- SKILLSNET
- SKILLSOFT
- SOFTSCAPE
- SUCCESSFACTORS
- TALEO
- TRUSTAR SOLUTIONS
- UNICRU
- VALTERA
- VIRTUAL EDGE
- WEBHIRE
- ZOOMINFO