Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Index Ratings

Replace Text: RankByApplicant_Summary 000001

Applicant Ranking for All Assessments

	ID	Name	P	R	CS	S	WC	K	S	A	WA	WE	WS
1	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	52	26	73	119	275	43	104	189	71	76	20
2	A0022	Varney, Mark	55	27	80	118	268	30	60	138	34	93	17
3	A0023	Castro, Sergio	56	25	69	117	328	51	97	188	78	131	17
4	A0027	Teacher, Student	58	27	66	56	264	35	46	146	28	94	15
5	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	44	17	53	83	277	46	81	160	66	66	16
6	A0032	Sauber, Leah	47	21	54	111	290	45	59	105	52	64	21
7	A0042	Foster, Larry	53	19	66	92	330	33	69	123	69	72	20
8	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	52	28	71	106	255	28	27	133	48	79	20
9	A0044	Miles, Lisa	61	24	79	114	325	52	81	211	81	73	23
10	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	59	24	67	100	334	47	98	208	77	73	24
11	A0056	Glenn, Beth	53	26	75	84	294	34	58	163	68	77	17
12	A0057	Connors, Megan	52	19	70	80	269	38	45	140	57	73	21
13	A0059	Oss, Holly	65	28	60	81	277	41	27	74	29	69	18
14	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	63	27	57	56	296	30	32	85	34	79	18
15	A0068	Taylor, Helen	69	28	74	80	262	31	37	96	33	54	*AJ
16	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	63	30	73	87	278	32	59	134	51	60	17
17	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	64	30	80	83	301	32	28	106	41	68	21
18	A0073	Smith, Joan	*A	*A	*A	*A	*AJ	30	37	122	12	67	17
19	A0076	Demo, Client	51	23	62	71	284	37	49	125	54	62	22
20	A0085	Demo, Karen	61	23	71	101	344	37	57	99	46	56	17

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Performance & Retention Index Rating

For non-exempt, hourly positions the Performance assessment identifies individuals who are more likely to be reliable, dependable, motivated and conscientious, and the Retention assessment predicts the likelihood that an individual will stay on the job for at least 3 months. Individuals are shown in the order of their Performance Ratings.

You should keep in mind that candidates at the top of the list will generally be preferable to those at the bottom, but there may be little difference between candidates whose scores differ by only a few points.

The performance scale is linear and has 3 ranges; 1. (0 – 47 recommend rejection - RR), 2. (48 – 52 caution - C), 3. (53 – 88 recommend hire - RH). The Retention Scale is similar; 1. (0 – 22 recommend rejection - RR), 2. (23 – 26 caution - C), 3. (27 – 43 recommend hire - RH).

Performance and Retention are filters that can be used for ruling out certain candidates. Other I-Match assessments can be used to determine which of the candidates with high performance and retention scores would probably be best for a job.

Applicant Ranking by Performance & Retention Index

	ID	Name	Index P	Index R	Performance Profile	Retention Profile
1	A0068	Taylor, Helen	69	28		
2	A0059	Oss, Holly	65	28		
3	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	64	30		
4	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	63	27		
5	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	63	30		
6	A0044	Miles, Lisa	61	24		
7	A0085	Demo, Karen	61	23		
8	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	59	24		
9	A0027	Teacher, Student	58	27		
10	A0023	Castro, Sergio	56	25		
11	A0022	Varney, Mark	55	27		
12	A0042	Foster, Larry	53	19		
13	A0056	Glenn, Beth	53	26		
14	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	52	26		
15	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	52	28		
16	A0057	Connors, Megan	52	19		
17	A0076	Demo, Client	51	23		
18	A0032	Sauber, Leah	47	21		
19	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	44	17		
20	A0073	Smith, Joan	n/a	n/a		

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Customer Service Index Rating

The Customer Service assessment predicts success in positions with customer contact (internal or external). It is designed to identify character traits such as friendliness, courteousness, helpfulness and service orientation.

You should keep in mind that candidates at the top of the list will generally be preferable to those at the bottom, but there may be little difference between candidates whose scores differ by only a few points.

The Customer Service Scale is linear and has 3 ranges 1. (0 – 57 Recommend Rejection - RR), 2. (58 - 64 Caution - C), and 3. (65 – 85 Recommend Hire - RH).

The Customer Service Assessment is a filter that can be used for ruling out certain candidates. Other I-Match assessments can be used to determine which of the candidates with high a Customer Service scores would probably be best for a job.

Applicant Ranking by Customer Service Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Higher Index is Better)		
				RR	C	RH
1	A0022	Varney, Mark	80			
2	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	80			
3	A0044	Miles, Lisa	79			
4	A0056	Glenn, Beth	75			
5	A0068	Taylor, Helen	74			
6	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	73			
7	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	73			
8	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	71			
9	A0085	Demo, Karen	71			
10	A0057	Connors, Megan	70			
11	A0023	Castro, Sergio	69			
12	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	67			
13	A0027	Teacher, Student	66			
14	A0042	Foster, Larry	66			
15	A0076	Demo, Client	62			
16	A0059	Oss, Holly	60			
17	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	57			
18	A0032	Sauber, Leah	54			
19	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	53			
20	A0073	Smith, Joan	*A			

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Sales Index Rating

The Sales assessment predicts success in jobs that involve selling ideas, service or products. It is designed to identify character traits such as initiative, commitment, persuasiveness and resilience.

You should keep in mind that candidates at the top of the list will generally be preferable to those at the bottom, but there may be little difference between candidates whose scores differ by only a few points.

The Sales Scale is linear and has 3 ranges; 1. (0 – 92 Recommend Rejection), 2. (93 – 102 Caution), and 3. (103 – 137 Recommend Hire).

The Sales Assessment is a filter that can be used for ruling out certain candidates. Other I-Match assessments can be used to determine which of the candidates with high Sales assessment scores would probably be best for a job.

Applicant Ranking by Sales Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Higher Index is Better)		
				RR	C	RH
1	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	119			
2	A0022	Varney, Mark	118			
3	A0023	Castro, Sergio	117			
4	A0044	Miles, Lisa	114			
5	A0032	Sauber, Leah	111			
6	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	106			
7	A0085	Demo, Karen	101			
8	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	100			
9	A0042	Foster, Larry	92			
10	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	87			
11	A0056	Glenn, Beth	84			
12	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	83			
13	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	83			
14	A0059	Oss, Holly	81			
15	A0057	Connors, Megan	80			
16	A0068	Taylor, Helen	80			
17	A0076	Demo, Client	71			
18	A0027	Teacher, Student	56			
19	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	56			
20	A0073	Smith, Joan	*A			

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Work Culture Overview

The Work Culture assessment is designed to predict compatability with the values of a particular work environment as opposed to superior job performance, though lack of campatability can lead to poor performance.

You should keep in mind that candidates at the top of the list will generally be preferable to those at the bottom, but there may be little difference between candidates whose scores differ by only a few points.

Cultural Fit is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to determine which of the culturally compatable candidates would probably be best for a job.

Applicant Ranking by Work Culture Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	255	
2	A0068	Taylor, Helen	262	
3	A0027	Teacher, Student	264	
4	A0022	Varney, Mark	268	
5	A0057	Connors, Megan	269	
6	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	275	
7	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	277	
8	A0059	Oss, Holly	277	
9	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	278	
10	A0076	Demo, Client	284	
11	A0032	Sauber, Leah	290	
12	A0056	Glenn, Beth	294	
13	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	296	
14	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	301	
15	A0044	Miles, Lisa	325	
16	A0023	Castro, Sergio	328	
17	A0042	Foster, Larry	330	
18	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	334	
19	A0085	Demo, Karen	344	
20	A0073	Smith, Joan	*AJ	

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Knowledge Index Rating

Knowledge Characteristics are designed to identify the level of knowledge in work-related areas. Ratings were completed for 33 Knowledge characteristics that included the areas of administration & management, manufacturing & production, engineering & technology, mathematics & science, health services, education & training, arts & humanities and law & public safety. Each Knowledge requirement was rated in two dimensions; Importance (1-4) and Knowledge Proficiency (1-7).

You should remember that candidates are at the top of the list because of they have the fewest apparent mismatches with the required Knowledge, and that those at the bottom of the list have the most apparent mismatches. Being at the top does not indicate that the candidate would necessarily be a good employee.

Knowledge is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to help determine which candidates appear most desirable.

Applicant Ranking by Knowledge Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	28	
2	A0022	Varney, Mark	30	
3	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	30	
4	A0073	Smith, Joan	30	
5	A0068	Taylor, Helen	31	
6	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	32	
7	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	32	
8	A0042	Foster, Larry	33	
9	A0056	Glenn, Beth	34	
10	A0027	Teacher, Student	35	
11	A0076	Demo, Client	37	
12	A0085	Demo, Karen	37	
13	A0057	Connors, Megan	38	
14	A0059	Oss, Holly	41	
15	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	43	
16	A0032	Sauber, Leah	45	
17	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	46	
18	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	47	
19	A0023	Castro, Sergio	51	
20	A0044	Miles, Lisa	52	

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Skills Index Rating

Skills characteristics are designed to identify the level of skills (basic & cross-functional) in work-related areas. Ratings will be completed for 35 skills including the areas of content, process, social, complex problem solving, technical, systems and resource management. Each Skill requirement was rated in two dimensions; Importance (1-4) and Skill Proficiency (1-7).

You should remember that candidates are at the top of the list because of they have the fewest apparent mismatches with the required Skills, and that those at the bottom of the list have the most apparent mismatches. Being at the top does not indicate that the candidate would necessarily be a good employee.

Skills is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to help determine which candidates appear most desirable.

Applicant Ranking by Skills Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	27	
2	A0059	Oss, Holly	27	
3	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	28	
4	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	32	
5	A0068	Taylor, Helen	37	
6	A0073	Smith, Joan	37	
7	A0057	Connors, Megan	45	
8	A0027	Teacher, Student	46	
9	A0076	Demo, Client	49	
10	A0085	Demo, Karen	57	
11	A0056	Glenn, Beth	58	
12	A0032	Sauber, Leah	59	
13	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	59	
14	A0022	Varney, Mark	60	
15	A0042	Foster, Larry	69	
16	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	81	
17	A0044	Miles, Lisa	81	
18	A0023	Castro, Sergio	97	
19	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	98	
20	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	104	

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Abilities Index Rating

Abilities characteristics are designed to identify the enduring talents (cognitive, psychomotor, physical & sensory) that can help in work-related areas. Ratings will be complete for 52 abilities including the areas of cognitive, psychomotor, verbal, idea generation & reasoning abilities, quantitative, memory, perceptual, spatial, attentiveness, fine manipulative, control movement, reaction (time & speed), physical strength, endurance, flexibility (balance & coordination), visual and auditory & speech. Each Abilities requirement was rated in two dimensions; Importance (1-4) and Abilities Proficiency (1-7).

You should remember that candidates are at the top of the list because of they have the fewest apparent mismatches with the required Abilities, and that those at the bottom of the list have the most apparent mismatches. Being at the top does not indicate that the candidate would necessarily be a good employee.

Abilities is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to help determine which candidates appear most desirable.

Applicant Ranking by Abilities Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0059	Oss, Holly	74	
2	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	85	
3	A0068	Taylor, Helen	96	
4	A0085	Demo, Karen	99	
5	A0032	Sauber, Leah	105	
6	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	106	
7	A0073	Smith, Joan	122	
8	A0042	Foster, Larry	123	
9	A0076	Demo, Client	125	
10	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	133	
11	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	134	
12	A0022	Varney, Mark	138	
13	A0057	Connors, Megan	140	
14	A0027	Teacher, Student	146	
15	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	160	
16	A0056	Glenn, Beth	163	
17	A0023	Castro, Sergio	188	
18	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	189	
19	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	208	
20	A0044	Miles, Lisa	211	

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Work Activities Index Rating

Work Activities are designed to identify the similar actions that are performed together in many different jobs. Ratings were completed for 41 work activities including the areas of information input, mental process, work output and interacting with others. Each Work Activity requirement was rated in two dimensions; Importance (1-4) and Work Activity Proficiency (1-7).

You should remember that candidates are at the top of the list because of they have the fewest apparent mismatches with the required Knowledge, and that those at the bottom of the list have the most apparent mismatches. Being at the top does not indicate that the candidate would necessarily be a good employee.

Work Activities is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to help determine which candidates appear most desirable.

Applicant Ranking by Work Activities Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0073	Smith, Joan	12	
2	A0027	Teacher, Student	28	
3	A0059	Oss, Holly	29	
4	A0068	Taylor, Helen	33	
5	A0022	Varney, Mark	34	
6	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	34	
7	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	41	
8	A0085	Demo, Karen	46	
9	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	48	
10	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	51	
11	A0032	Sauber, Leah	52	
12	A0076	Demo, Client	54	
13	A0057	Connors, Megan	57	
14	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	66	
15	A0056	Glenn, Beth	68	
16	A0042	Foster, Larry	69	
17	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	71	
18	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	77	
19	A0023	Castro, Sergio	78	
20	A0044	Miles, Lisa	81	

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Work Environment Index Rating

Work Environment assessment is designed to identify working conditions in a work setting. Ratings were completed for 57 work environment characteristics including the areas of interpersonal relationships, physical working conditions and structural (criticality of position, routine vs. challenging work, competition). Each Work Environment requirement was rated to answer the frequency or importance to the work environment situation.

You should remember that candidates are at the top of the list because of they have the fewest apparent mismatches with the required Knowledge, and that those at the bottom of the list have the most apparent mismatches. Being at the top does not indicate that the candidate would necessarily be a good employee.

Work Environment is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to help determine which candidates appear most desirable.

Applicant Ranking by Work Environment Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0068	Taylor, Helen	54	
2	A0085	Demo, Karen	56	
3	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	60	
4	A0076	Demo, Client	62	
5	A0032	Sauber, Leah	64	
6	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	66	
7	A0073	Smith, Joan	67	
8	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	68	
9	A0059	Oss, Holly	69	
10	A0042	Foster, Larry	72	
11	A0044	Miles, Lisa	73	
12	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	73	
13	A0057	Connors, Megan	73	
14	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	76	
15	A0056	Glenn, Beth	77	
16	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	79	
17	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	79	
18	A0022	Varney, Mark	93	
19	A0027	Teacher, Student	94	
20	A0023	Castro, Sergio	131	

Comparison of Applicants to Job - Work Styles

Job Title: **Security Guard (J0056)**
Evaluator: **Carl**
Organization:
Administrator: **Jim Roberts**
Date: **09/21/05**

Work Styles Index Rating

Work Styles assessment is designed to identify the characteristics that can affect how well someone does a job. Ratings were completed for 16 work style characteristics including the areas of achievement orientation, social influence, interpersonal orientation, adjustment, conscientiousness, independence and practical intelligence. The importance was rated for each Work Style characteristic.

You should remember that candidates are at the top of the list because of they have the fewest apparent mismatches with the required Knowledge, and that those at the bottom of the list have the most apparent mismatches. Being at the top does not indicate that the candidate would necessarily be a good employee.

Work Styles is one of the filters that can be used for eliminating certain candidates. Other i-match assessments can be used to help determine which candidates appear most desirable.

Applicant Ranking by Work Styles Index

	ID	Name	Index	Index Profile (A Lower Index is Better)
1	A0027	Teacher, Student	15	
2	A0028	Marinaro, Lauren	16	
3	A0022	Varney, Mark	17	
4	A0023	Castro, Sergio	17	
5	A0056	Glenn, Beth	17	
6	A0070	Lovina, Sunita	17	
7	A0073	Smith, Joan	17	
8	A0085	Demo, Karen	17	
9	A0059	Oss, Holly	18	
10	A0062	Sexton, Michelle	18	
11	A0020	Stintsman, Bonnie	20	
12	A0042	Foster, Larry	20	
13	A0043	Ekiert, Sandy	20	
14	A0032	Sauber, Leah	21	
15	A0057	Connors, Megan	21	
16	A0072	Miklavcic, MaryAnn	21	
17	A0076	Demo, Client	22	
18	A0044	Miles, Lisa	23	
19	A0046	Fabrizio, Vickie	24	
20	A0068	Taylor, Helen	*AJ	