



ASSESSMENT CENTER RESULTS

FOR

OVERALL SUMMARY

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY SPRING 2012

CONDUCTED BY COLLEGIATE ASSESSMENT PARTNERS (CAPS)

NOTE:

This report is designed to show the relative performance of Sam Houston State University's students during the Spring 2012. During Spring 2012, a small sample of 6 students completed the assessment center.

Overview of Your Assessment Center Feedback

This report provides a summary of student performance during the recently completed assessment center. The information contained within this report is for developmental purposes only. In order for you to **MAXIMIZE** the usefulness of the feedback, **PLEASE READ IT CAREFULLY**.

The feedback in this report is divided into 4 sections:

- **Section 1:** Assessment center performance by skill dimension
- **Section 2:** Assessment center performance by activity
- **Section 3:** Detailed assessment center performance for videotaped activities
- **Section 4:** Assessment center performance for In-basket activity

A Note about the Assessment Center Scores

Multiple trained raters observed student behavior from the videotapes and the memos written during the assessment activities. These ratings were then weighted by importance ratings provided by practicing managers from a wide variety of industries. As a result, each participant receives point totals that are used to indicate their performance in the assessment center. These point totals are then compared to the point totals of approximately 10,000 previous students who have completed the identical assessment center. Thus, the scores presented below provide a measure of how the students' performance compared to these other students. Due to the small number of students included in the SHSU sample, no statistical testing will be done.

Section 1

Assessment Center Performance by Skill Dimension

Below is the performance feedback for each skill area. During the assessment center, students were provided multiple opportunities (e.g., speech, CEO selection meeting, Customer service meeting, Inbasket) to demonstrate the skills that were assessed.

The table below summarizes their raw score results for each skill area assessed. Standard deviations have been provided (in parentheses).

Assessed Skill	Description	Recent Assessment Center Score	Referent Group of Peers
Initiative	Actively attempting to influence events to achieve goals: showing self-starting actions rather than passive acceptance.	57.4 (12.4)	43.7 (19.0)
Decision-Making	Relating data from different sources, identifying possible causes of problems, and making decisions that reflect factual information.	118.4 (7.1)	144.4 (27.6)
Organizing	Establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal.	125.2 (14.5)	140.7 (18.7)
Communication	Effective expression in individual and group situations. Includes both verbal and nonverbal forms of communication.	239.6 (13.8)	214.8 (27.1)
Teamwork	Fosters collaboration among team members by showing respect for others, encouraging open expression of ideas, and contributing to the overall effectiveness of the team.	70.4 (12.1)	73.2 (15.2)

Section 2

Assessment Center Performance By Activity

Below is the performance feedback for each activity completed during the assessment center. Recall that the students completed four activities during the assessment center:

- CEO Selection Meeting
- Customer Service Meeting
- 3-Minute Presentation
- In-basket Activity

Below are their average scores and the associated standard deviations (in parentheses) for each assessment center activity.

Activity Name	Recent Assessment Center Score	Referent Group of Peers
CEO Selection Meeting	147.2 (8.9)	150.7 (25.2)
Customer Service Meeting	134.6 (10.6)	149.5 (24.8)
3-Minute Presentation	176.4 (19.5)	196.5 (30.7)
In-basket	152.8 (28.6)	120.1 (48.5)

Section 3

Detailed Performance for Videotaped Activities

Three of the activities in which the students participated in were videotaped. Raters then viewed these tapes and the values below are those results. These values are provided to give further detail as to what the students did well and what areas could be improved. The activities that were videotaped and rated included:

- CEO Selection Meeting
- Customer Service Meeting
- 3-Minute Presentation

On the following page are their scores for each behavior as it was assessed in each videotaped activity. The numbers to the right of each behavior represent the degree to which they performed (some positively and negatively) the behaviors. To interpret the numbers, use the following guide. Note that not all of the behaviors use the full rating scale (-1 to 2)*. The range of behavior assessed is located in the parentheses to the right of the behavior. An explanation of each rating value is as follows:

-1 = behavior was performed negatively, it detracted from overall performance

0 = behavior was not performed at all or performed at minimally acceptable level

1 = the behavior was performed once or in a moderately positive manner

2 = the behavior was performed more than once or in a strongly positive manner

* In one case, a 3 is used as it represents a simple count of behaviors.

Finally, the letters next to the parentheses for each behavior correspond to the specific skill being measured.

I = Initiative

D = Decision-Making

O = Organizing

C = Communication

T = Teamwork

List of Detailed Behaviors Exhibited During the Assessment Center

CEO Selection Meeting Behaviors		New	Ref
Attends correct meeting on time (-1,0,1,2)	O	2.00	1.95
States name and number (-1, 0,1,2)	O	2.00	1.96
Identifies next appropriate step (-1,0,1,2)	D	0.00	0.18
Defines decision criteria (0,1,2)	D	0.00	0.68
Candidate strengths & weaknesses (0,1,2)	D	2.00	1.70
Focus on handwriting (-1,0)	D	-0.40	-0.12
Focus on irrelevant personal info. (-1,0)	D	0.00	-0.05
Focus on personality (0,1)	D	1.00	0.62
Focus on intelligence (0,1)	D	1.00	0.36
Focus on relevant resume info. (0,2)	D	2.00	1.95
Seeks input from team members (0,1,2)	T	0.40	0.42
Validates other team members (-1,0,1)	T	0.80	0.50
Does not interrupt others (-1,0)	T	-0.40	-0.04
Checks for common understanding (0,1)	T	0.00	0.21
Contributes to meeting (-1,0,1)	T	1.00	0.97
Refocuses team members (0,1)	I	0.00	0.07
Documents group discussion (0,1)	I	0.20	0.14
Monitors time remaining (0,1)	I	0.40	0.10
Clarifies team task (0,1)	I	0.00	0.13
Asks for clarification (0, 1, 2)	I	0.00	0.24
Speaks clearly (-1,0,1,2)	C	2.00	1.84
Speaks confidently (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.92
Speaks concisely (-1,0,1,2)	C	2.00	1.92
Uses appropriate grammar (-1,0,1,2)	C	2.00	1.92
Appropriate non-verbals (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.97
Speaks with expressiveness (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.96

Customer Service Meeting Behaviors		New	Ref
Attends correct meeting on time (-1,0,1,2)	O	1.80	1.97
States name and number (-1, 0,1,2)	O	2.00	1.96
Identifies next appropriate step (-1,0,1,2)	D	0.20	0.11
Defines decision criteria (0,1,2)	D	0.00	0.35
Strengths & weaknesses of initiative (0,1,2)	D	2.00	1.42
Appropriate recommendation (-1,0,1,2)	D	0.60	1.04
Evaluates consequences of actions (0,1)	D	0.00	0.77
Considers impact on customers (0,1)	D	0.00	0.85
Seeks input from team members (0,1,2)	T	0.60	0.32
Validates other team members (-1,0,1)	T	0.80	0.54
Does not interrupt others (-1,0)	T	0.00	-0.03
Checks for common understanding (0,1)	T	0.00	0.20
Contributes to meeting (-1,0,1)	T	1.00	0.96
Refocuses team members (0,1)	I	0.00	0.11
Documents group discussion (0,1)	I	1.00	0.12
Monitors time remaining (0,1)	I	0.00	0.05
Clarifies team task (0,1)	I	0.00	0.19
Asks for clarification (0,1,2)	I	0.20	0.23
Speaks clearly (-1,0,1,2)	C	1.80	1.84
Speaks confidently (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.95
Speaks concisely (-1,0,1,2)	C	1.80	1.92
Uses appropriate grammar (-1,0,1,2)	C	2.00	1.96
Appropriate non-verbals (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.97
Speaks with expressiveness (-1,0,1)	C	0.80	0.96

3-Minute Presentation Behaviors		New	Ref
Gives speech, in group, in order (-1,0,1,2)	O	2.00	1.95
Follows directions: name, #, market (0,1,2,3)	O	3.00	2.84
Time close to 3 minutes (0,1,2)	O	0.60	1.05
States purpose within 30 seconds (0,1)	O	1.00	0.95
Develops a clear outline (0,1,2)	O	0.20	0.47
Makes a clear closing statement (0,1,2)	O	0.40	1.21
Asks for questions (0,1)	O	0.00	0.79
Provides multiple info sources (-1,0,1)	D	0.60	0.70
Explicitly defines decision criteria (0,1,2)	D	0.60	1.33
Market strengths & weaknesses (0,1,2)	D	2.00	1.72
Makes recommendations (0,1)	D	1.00	0.96
Addresses consequences of decision (0,1)	D	0.00	0.62
Speaks clearly (-1,1,2)	C	1.80	1.80
Uses appropriate grammar (-1,1,2)	C	1.80	1.73
Appropriate non-verbals (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.80
Does not read speech - eye contact (-1,0,1)	C	0.60	0.59
Speaks with expressiveness (-1,0, 1)	C	1.00	0.86
Speaks confidently (-1,0,1)	C	0.60	0.44
Uses appropriate pace (-1,0,1)	C	1.00	0.66

Section 4

Performance Ratings for In-basket Activity

The in-basket activity required students to organize, prioritize, and respond to a set of memos. Student responses were read and these responses were assessed. Here again, the referent group consists of students who completed the exact same inbasket. The scores on the inbasket can have a significant effect on skill scores and this feedback may help to understand how the inbasket performance impacted the other feedback areas.

Rating	Description	Recent Score	Referent Group
Work Pace	The number of memos completed versus the average number of memos completed in the comparison group. This score is a percentile ranking. Completing more memos than other people has a positive influence on the initiative score and also has a positive influence upon the organizing score because a high work pace is a sign of being more organized.	81.9 (19.0)	55.2 (28.2)
Attention to Detail	There were 7 memos requiring a heightened attention to detail in order to complete the memo appropriately. Number attempted:	5.2 (1.3)	3.8 (1.5)
	This second attention to detail score represents the relative number of correct responses students had when heightened attention to detail was needed (e.g., did they catch the error). The score is a percentile ranking and compared their performance to that of the referent group's.	57.6 (21.4)	60.1 (27.2)
Prioritization	This score represents how well students prioritized their in-baskets. The number of important memos completed relative to other people measured prioritization. This is presented as a percentile.	78.1 (16.6)	60.8 (29.1)
Writing Quality	This score ranks their writing quality against the comparison group. In this category students earned points for writing memos that a) contained correct grammar and spelling, and b) were written in paragraph form with complete sentences. Writing more memos gave them the opportunity to earn more writing points. This is presented as a percentile and their writing quality had a significant impact on the communication skill area.	82.0 (17.9)	50.8 (28.8)