

Dear customers,

As you know, we implemented a series of adjustments in the back end of the Career Fitness Profiler in January.

In the meantime, we have learned that in our communication in the webinar we could have dwelt more on the implications this has on the use of the Career Fitness Profiler. That is why we would like to inform you about some of the then unresolved implications of the innovations in the report.

### 1. New standards

For example, we had announced that the standards had been updated, but we had not realized that some of you would sometimes draw the same report several times or that you would compare with other reports from the same person, downloaded at an earlier point in time. In these cases, the comparability of the reports is influenced.

In other words, if you compare a report of a candidate downloaded before January 10th, 2018 with a report from the same candidate, downloaded after January 10th, there is a chance that said report will show other values, pitfalls, types and scores on PsyCap if the score was close to a cut-off. Such a shift of 1 STEN can suddenly also give a very different type to the attitudes, even though the percentage of that type should have been relatively low both before and after the renormation.

How do you solve that?

In order to compare reports from two participants with each other, you have to generate them both again. When you download the report from the Talento environment, it is generated repeatedly, each time with the latest standards and additions (such as the new pitfalls).

Please note: after the introduction of the standards in December, we discovered an error.

- The algorithms for the STEN scores were converted with an error in the formula, so the scores suddenly deviated enormously. That mistake was very striking. As such, it could be that a value that scored highest in the overview of the top 5 (calculated based on percentiles, which were correct) in the detailed overview (the 12 flags on p.4 for example) a '-5' was mentioned, which is, of course, not possible. Because the error was so striking, some customers had noticed the mistake very quickly and we corrected it immediately.

### 2. Refurbished and new pitfalls

In theory, all pitfalls can be different in the newly drawn reports. The formulas behind it have been refined, so that in some cases a pitfall may suddenly no longer be applicable to the candidate in question. In itself, the revisions to the algorithms are subtle, so that the old and the new pitfalls will usually not deviate too much. Shifts are, however, possible.

In addition, six new pitfalls have been added, which may apply to the candidate concerned.

How do you deal with that?

The new algorithms behind the revision are based on an analysis of the results filled in until July of 2017 and thus represent a refinement in the sense that the cut-offs and conditions are now an even better fit with the profile of the coachee. We leave it up to you to decide whether or not to address new pitfalls when you see a coachee again to check for any additional information. In the case of perfectionist or very analytically oriented coachee (e.g. the type of engineer or accountant), we strongly advise against this, since the discussion that arises then contributes little to the career development of the coachee.

### 3. Three norm groups

There are currently three standard groups: Dutch, French, and English. The system automatically selects the norm group based on the language of the candidate.

So if you are a candidate who is registered in the system as Dutch and you would download your report in French, Dutch norm groups will be used. This way, the reports remain comparable to each other, regardless of the language in which you download them.

When we do another such intervention, we will inform you in good time of the impact.

With best regards,

Lesley Vanleke

Wouter Van Bockhaven