

>

> Greetings!

>

> We want to set some context for this afternoon's meeting in writing, recognizing that not all invitees may be able to attend. We think (and hope) that this meeting will serve to clear up some confusion over what the proposed assessment program (Blodata & AT-SAT) is and what it isn't.

>

> We need to be clear that this assessment program was never designed as a minimum qualification. Assuming that we had the empirical evidence (which we don't) to set a cutoff on these tests that would screen in only the minimally qualified, the result of this application would be to strip this assessment program of its power and utility and essentially render it useless. It would be akin to hiring a highly competent carpentry crew to come to our house for a week to pound in one nail. Minimum qualifications are best assessed by education, experience, training and potentially through certification or job knowledge tests - not through tests of personal characteristics and aptitude.

>

> If we were to follow through and treat this assessment program as a minimum qualification, the cutoff would need to be set so low (equated to a 70 on the legacy AT-SAT) that we would have overwhelming numbers of candidates passing through the process (almost everyone taking the AT-SAT) and no CSP to tease through this large volume and make selection decisions. How do we decide among the 97% of candidates who should be selected?

>

> This proposed assessment program was designed to automate and obviate the need for the CSP. We cannot have our cake and eat it too - or keeping with the holiday season, we cannot have our pumpkin pie and eat it too. If we want to eliminate the CSP, we need a process that will screen in the "best and the brightest" candidates for referral to the Academy - and one which does that in a fair and balanced fashion. The system that we have assembled relies on extensive CAMI research as well as best practice in maximizing validity and minimizing adverse impact.

>

> This process was designed to remedy the adverse impact associated with the legacy AT-SAT and CSP processes. It places a non-cognitive screening tool up front in the process that validly screens out 70% (projected) of candidates with no discernible adverse impact. This reduced group then goes on to take the cognitive assessment portion of the AT-SAT - which screens out 20% (projected) of the remaining candidates with only minimal adverse impact projected. The final composite test battery is a combination of 2.5 X Blodata & 1 X AT-SAT Cognitive for use in placing the remaining candidates into 3 bands. This combined test battery does not show adverse impact based on our current research. The 3 bands are then used for placement into the Academy - exhaust the top band before moving on to the second band.

>

> The proposed assessment process is serving a lot of masters here and we are meeting a number of goals. But we should be clear that this is not an MQ and not treat it as such. Hopefully this framing will help in our discussion later today.

>

> Best Regards,

> John

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: David M. Finch

> Sent: Monday, November 26, 2013 7:29 PM

> To: Rick.Mitchell@faa.gov; Rickie Cannon/AWA/FAA; dana.broach@faa.gov; gene.burdick@faa.gov; Jacqueline.Yeatman@faa.gov; Anthony.Chu@faa.gov; Humberto.Ruiz@faa.gov; Christina.Kominoth/AWA/FAA

> Cc: John C. Scott; Brandon Fleener

> Subject: RE: Briefing from the Barrier Analysis Executive Steering Committee

> Importance: High

>

> Good evening,

>

> In light of a meeting earlier today, we believe we need to reconvene with those on this note to discuss how we can use the biodata measure as a valid and legally defensible means to mitigate adverse impact. We're working against a Dec 2 deadline to provide final cut scores to the Aviator team, and need to work through this prior to this. We're hopeful everyone on this note can still meet during this time slot tomorrow to talk through this. I have attached a few slides, including the testing model which we presented to the ESC, to frame up our discussion.

>

> Rick, can you send out an invitation including bridge info for the originally held time tomorrow?

>

> Thanks,

> David