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In this article we will look at a number of developments taking place in assessment methods and issues that are likely to affect attempts to use sophisticated tools like the assessment centre, taking account of the pressures and changes in international business life being experienced in the 1990s. We also look at the way in which assumptions about employee development have been changing, with the ownership and responsibility for development shifting from the employer more towards the individual.

What is the state of the assessment centre method?

We need first to set the assessment centre method (ACM) in some kind of context. The origins provide us with one kind of context in which the emphasis was primarily on prediction of performance in a role not yet occupied, and other concerns of human resource management, such as training needs and defining development plans, were secondary. In part this was caused by an interest in establishing the predictive validity of the method (for example, [1]), and in such cases any resulting training and development interventions would contaminate the results. Thus ACM was seen as a method of assessing patterns of human behaviour by applying a systematic assessment methodology to representative situations or role-playing, relevant to the post or career in question. The situational exercises or role-plays are derived from a job analysis that highlights the critical situations encountered in the job or career. The behaviour sought during the critical situations is described in detail in the job analysis. This, in turn, is translated into behaviour categories or behaviour criteria. This methodology used the important principle that a person's overall assessment (from exercises, role-playing and relating them to the behaviour criteria) is based on the collective observations of several assessors.

Variations

Within the perspective outlined above there exists, however, room enough to apply the method in different ways. These different ways actually exist by virtue of the fact that we can no longer talk of a kind of “standard assessment centre”. Each centre is different, not only in terms of the methods applied (role-playing, written exercises, discussion groups, personality questionnaires, intelligence tests, behaviour-oriented interviews, in-depth interviews, etc.), but also in terms of execution (context factors, including the way in which the role-players take part in defining the context). In the main, these variations arise from the centre's aim, which could be selection or promotion or identification of training needs or for development or career guidance. There may be variations also arising from the particular target group (e.g. internal or external participants) and the criteria used, not to mention the special points stressed by individual assessment users.

In addition, we could include a number of variations in the way the ACM is applied because of changes in the business scene, for instance limiting the number of assessors available in one place at a time or enabling participants to be assessed more individually rather than needing a significant number to be brought together at once. Some of these issues will be picked up later.

ACM as an integrator of human resource management

It is becoming increasingly possible to see ACM not as an isolated tool but as a means of linking various parts of human resource management. If the job analysis and behaviour criteria have been soundly and thoroughly established, the observation of the
required behaviour can be taken beyond selection role-playing to enable reliable assessment methodology to be used at other stages. By viewing the ACM in this way it becomes clear that the method is potentially more than an isolated tool, but represents a basic methodology from which to build an integrated HRM tool-kit. Thus the ACM acts more like a computer operating system than a specific application. The Michigan Model[2] gives the pillars of the human resource management cycle as selection (including promotion and placement), appraisal, rewards and development (see Figure 1). The assessment methodology is active in all these aspects, not least by providing a constant throughout the cycle.

Following selection/promotion the employee’s profile on the criteria can be used to plan the induction and initial performance expected of him or her. The ideal profile expressed in behaviour criteria can be clearly described and the employee therefore learns a broad outline of how he or she is to perform and can look to his or her manager for advice. This would be much more difficult if the ideal profile were described merely in vague concepts such as maturity.

The next stage, that of appraisal, would involve assessing the employee against the same profile. Criteria-oriented appraisal has much in common with criteria-oriented selection as the same behaviour is being assessed. The only difference is that in appraisal the information is being gathered by observations spread over a longer time. It is an impossible task for the manager to carry out a permanent assessment of all staff in all of their activities and actions (especially as their numbers tend to grow the more the organization flattens). In other words, the manager must be selective. To keep this selectivity on a fair and even keel, and to ensure that it is not directed solely by random events, the manager should really concentrate on situations akin to the critical situations that surfaced during the job analysis. Training as an assessor as part of ACM greatly assists this process. Rewards, determined by job evaluation or performance-related pay, would benefit similarly from ACM as well as from more normal determinants.

Development of the employee
One of the ways in which ACM has been extended while keeping its essential methodology is in using assessments as a stimulus for all kinds of development of the participants. This extension is available even if the primary aim is selection/promotion. The collection of reliable information on strengths and weaknesses is a valuable opportunity which can, with the small extra effort needed, be turned into material to stimulate development. This has become more important in current conditions where opportunities for promotion are less numerous and many people who perform their jobs well needed to be encouraged to see the future in terms of development without obvious promotion.

Examples are given in other chapters of the increased attention being given to the support of employee development. In some countries there has been a trend towards using the term “development centre”, in place of “assessment centre”. Often the change of emphasis has not actually been very great, but there has been a gain in reduced anxiety – participants find the term “development” more friendly and less threatening than “assessment”. If the aim is genuinely directed towards the development of all participants then the development centre title is justified and honest. If, however, there are mixed aims, and some sponsoring managers are using the activity to select people (positively and/or negatively), the title will be seen as the sham it actually is, and the motivation to see it as an open opportunity for development will suffer.

Can we change the assessment centre method?
We have argued above that some changes have taken place and need to be made in order to match the various objectives. The ACM has long been the method of pragmatists. It was not developed from theoretical models, but from practice, from the idea that...
if you want to know whether someone can do something well you should assess him or her in situations where the skills have an opportunity to be shown. Even the behaviour criteria used in ACM are drawn up in the language of management rather than in that of psychology. Nevertheless, even with a pragmatic point of departure the ACM has always had to prove itself and enforce itself. This is evident from the mere fact that the vast majority of theoretical studies dealing with the method, certainly in the early years, are validation studies, or, in other words, studies designed to prove that the method actually measures what it claims to measure.

There would be no sense in sticking to an established pattern if it became clear that the time demands on observers, role-players and assessors had become unacceptable in current business conditions. Experiments and modifications will be essential if this work is to continue, although regular checks on validity are highly desirable. There could, of course, come a point where the fundamental principles were lost, and at one extreme an assessment centre could become no different from a development programme and at the other extreme it would be limited to interviews and individual paper-and-pencil tests, which offends the definition of most authorities as an assessment centre or even a development centre. The essential core of the ACM is the use of some situationally-based exercises to which interviews and tests can be added, if desired, and trained observers and assessors working to predetermined criteria which form the basis of the programme of exercises.

One change, which is related to a change in society in many countries of Europe, is the transfer of greater responsibility to the employees coupled with a greater say in the development of their own careers. This implies a change for ACM, whereby it no longer acts as a vehicle for implementing a centralized career policy, but rather offers the employee an opportunity to gain a personal insight into how he or she performs, and so develop a career from there. This change has taken place in the midst of a growing recognition that companies can no longer project ahead reliably to have a picture of future requirements and opportunities, and that individuals need to do their own predictions, positioning themselves to be well equipped to face whatever develops.

### Developments in the assessment centre method

#### Assessor time

One of the most important factors that an organizer of an assessment centre has to manage is the economic use of the time of assessors and role-players. Increased pressure in business and reduced numbers in the hierarchies have combined to make this a vital issue, limiting the length of an assessment centre and the frequency at which it can be held. There are some methods being tried to find ways of restricting the time demands without appreciably reducing the quality of assessment and development.

The first alternative for limiting the time demands is the use of audio-visual material, such as video. The candidate is presented with open-ended, realistic situations on video. A typical situation may be, for example, that a customer comes to the counter of a travel agent’s with a complaint about a holiday just experienced. The conversation is interrupted at a given moment and the candidate is given a number of possible reactions to choose from (detailed descriptions of possible forms of behaviour in the situation). This method allows one or even several role-players to be eliminated per candidate – role-players, indeed, who have to be trained, while a video tape can be copied ad infinitum and sent anywhere in the world. Furthermore, video offers a level of standardization that is practically impossible with role-players.

The advantage of this method brings with it, however, a major methodological drawback: in recording the candidate’s choice of reaction we are a long way away from assessing behaviour. The candidate says what he or she would do, whereas the distinction between what someone says they will do in a given situation and what they actually do is an essential characteristic of the assessment centre method.

The use of video in this way can prove beneficial as a tool for pre-selection when a large number of candidates have to be screened for a particular post, or as a tool for development, because knowing what is the effective behaviour in a given situation is the first step towards exhibiting this behaviour. We also believe that the principle is in itself valuable, in particular with the improvement in standardization, but finding an application that conforms to the requirements of ACM means facilitating interaction with the candidate, which will remain
impossible, in our opinion, until developments in the field of visual reality render the method affordable.

Another alternative for limiting the time of assessor involvement is to replace individual role-plays with group exercises where each person has a defined role and is required to sustain it. The disadvantage is that the behaviour of the group may be uneven or unrepresentative and may not give each individual a standardized situation, but, as we said above, if more than one actor is used in an individual role-play for various candidates there will not be complete standardization anyway. By varying the composition of groups if there is more than one group exercise it should be possible to see each individual in more than one context to give better reliability.

One trend which may be increasing is for companies to use consultants as assessors, mixed in with company managers. This goes against the principle of ensuring that the “customers” for the candidates’ services are the assessors, but having a proportion of the assessors from outside seems to be acceptable. Indeed, there can be advantages in giving some kind of guarantee that the process conforms to a wider set of standards beyond one company’s practices. The cost may be increased, but this may be acceptable if managers are in short supply. Role-players can certainly come from outside the company without any major disadvantage, provided they are capable of sustaining the required role and are well trained.

Use of computers

The most complete application of this development is in the conducting of all tests and exercises by computer, including all role-playing and instructions. Even the candidates’ reactions can be processed on the computer, leading to a final assessment. At first sight this method seems a little too technical, but there are in fact a number of good applications. We should point out, however, that this type of application is only justifiable for certain simulations (in-tray, management game, etc.) and with a limited number of criteria (such as problem solving, delegation, etc.). One disadvantage here that should never be underestimated is the fact that only a purely quantitative assessment seems possible, based on results (such as the time needed to analyse data) or a multiple choice exercise (“To which of the following four people should I delegate this task?”).

The computer is incapable of interpreting qualitative data. Moreover, the question arises as to whether applications such as these are acceptable and realistic for the candidate, or, in other words, whether they enjoy the same (high) “face-validity” as classical assessment centre simulations.

Another application of computers is limited to the processing of results with the use of support software. In such cases the assessment centre is usually operated in the traditional manner, with role-players and assessors writing up in detail all the behavioural nuances of the candidates and providing reports on each candidate for each simulation and each criterion. Only the evaluation discussion looks a little different. The assessors assemble their scores for each candidate, simulation and criterion and enter the data into the computer. The computer then reaches a final score per criterion with the help of a decision model.

Seasoned assessors may view this intervention via the computer as a dilution of the assessment centre’s results, but this is not so. Research has shown[3] that the arithmetical average of the criteria scores gives a qualitatively better (more accurate) score than that gained from the evaluation discussion. And an even better method would seem to be that used under the “expert system” model, whereby a simulation is made of the assessors’ ideal decision-making process.

One example of support software being used to process the results of an assessment centre is the decision model adopted by the Dutch bureau Optimum. Once all the assessors have given a score per candidate and per criterion all these scores are entered into the computer. A print-out for a person in an actual case is shown in Figure 2.

First, the computer calculates an average score per criterion (AVG) and then a total score, with account taken of the weight attached to the criterion concerned. The computer also indicates the extent to which the scores in the various exercises (and thus from the various assessors) deviate from each other (STD). On the basis of this information the figures can be corrected after an evaluation discussion. Following this, a total score is given per candidate (the sum of the weighted criteria scores) and the computer gives a report of how closely the candidate matches the desired profile, as shown in Figure 3.

Another software application is where the criteria are weighted according to their importance for different job profiles. One of the consequences is that the assessment...
centre can, if the necessary validation work has been done, give an indication of the direction in which a career should be developed. A computer can readily be programmed to apply the weightings in these various ways. Not only does this enable the calculations to be done at much greater speed than by other methods, but also it has been found to be more reliable and less prone to errors than in calculating in other ways. If there are, for instance, 12 abilities being assessed and some are more important than others, then there could be several factors applied to the scores according to the relative importance of each ability for each relevant job path. This enables total scores to be obtained which can be compared with the norms built up for various careers.

The scores and statistics arising from assessment are not necessarily the most important output – the descriptive detail, the individual abilities and ideas for development are often just as important, if not more so – but such figures can give a useful background and provide a stimulus for decisions on career development. Accuracy and reasonable speed in calculation can assist a decision-making group in their evaluation of performance in an assessment centre. Computers that have been pre-programmed to deal with the scores that are agreed by the group can provide a useful service. The implications of the analysis can be looked at by the group while they are in session and are focused on the assessment material.

One use of this is in an organization that offers opportunities for progression to both general management roles and more specialist roles. Some of the abilities are needed in both roles, but often to different extents. And there are one or two abilities which only feature in one of the career paths, which can be represented in the computer program by giving zero weighting against such abilities in career paths where they are not needed.

Table I illustrates how this can work where there are two career paths involved.

Although some important abilities are shared between the two career paths (such as A and B) this is not always the case (for example, C and E). A weighting system like this is obtained by asking senior managers in both career areas to rank order the abilities and comment on their relevance, after an initial role (or career) analysis has been undertaken. In this case there may be need for correction of the weighted rating total for career path Y by a factor of 17/15 if the total is to be compared with the total for career path X. The support of computers can make such matching processes available instantaneously.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abilities</th>
<th>Weighting for career path X</th>
<th>Weighting for career path Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

Scores of a candidate as entered into computer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abilities</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>CF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written commun.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX
Salesman to specialist
28/02/1994
Simulation day number 0

**Figure 3**

List of results and computer report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XX</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salesman to specialist</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/1994</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation day</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C.H.J.M. V</td>
<td>Doesn't come up to the standards</td>
<td>328.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L.A. C</td>
<td>Discuss this candidate</td>
<td>410.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.M.R.P. R</td>
<td>Doesn't come up to the standards</td>
<td>388.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G.M.L. C</td>
<td>Doesn't come up to the standards</td>
<td>258.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early identification for development

Although assessment centres have frequently been used to identify some people for special forms of development, it is becoming clear that more radical intervention may be needed for some purposes. One example is the building up of a “cadre” or “squad” of future international managers who are ready and prepared to move to other countries. An opportunity for development is missed if people are left in their home country for the early part of their career until they have become senior enough to be noticed and are then suddenly asked to move to another country.

Early assessment and discussion for those who might want to become future “Euromanager” or international specialists enable plans to be made for career development and early international experience which will make them more effective later. Some of the other factors which we have found to be relevant are:

• making the Euromanager option explicit at initial selection, e.g. graduate recruitment;
• recruiting people from other countries to join a management trainee squad;
• having a Euro-squad that is given facilities for “networking” on a regular basis between countries;
• giving extra rewards for language acquisition;
• encouraging exchanges, including job exchanges, between countries at various levels in the organization.

Feedback during the assessment centre

In conjunction with the trend towards the use of the term “development centre” some companies have given the opportunity for assessors and participants to meet after exercises to discuss the events and the behaviour seen. The main purpose of this is to provide a means of learning from the event while it is still fresh in the mind, but it also has the effect of reinforcing the message that the centre has a developmental purpose and that the participant can start taking action on this without waiting until the programme has finished. Each person can thus build up his or her own file on development needs and proposed initiatives. Commitment to the learning opportunities is likely to develop more naturally and more willingly. Some of the reported advantages are:

• earlier development of the relationship between assessor and participants;
• development planning can begin while participants and assessors are together in a “learning community”;
• assessors have the opportunity to ask participants why they behaved as they did and what they felt about it;
• participants feel more responsibility for the way the event progresses and the outcome from it.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages:

• the event itself is likely to last longer and cost more in accommodation costs and staff time;
• the performance on the measured criteria may change during the event as a result of feedback, thus making it difficult to give a precise picture of development needs;
• some participants may take part in exercises in a different order from others, gaining feedback which may change the capabilities shown in other exercises;
• there may be confusion about whether it is intended to be a development programme or an assessment of future capabilities and the need for development.

Whether or not to use this change of method is a decision that should be determined by the defined purpose of the event.

Group assessment

A possible and probably necessary development of the ACM is the introduction of centres for the assessment and development of groups. The intention is not actually to assess how a given individual behaves in a group – a conventional assessment centre can do this if the criteria and exercises are designed for this. What concerns us here is the evolution and functioning of self-managing work teams and other new forms of cooperation that are currently becoming popular in the business world. The behaviour of a group, rather than an individual, is obviously more complex to assess with the emphasis on performance of the group as a whole.

The whole domain of “team building” is involved and, although there are a number of training programmes designed for this, the reasons and objectives are usually less clear than for individual training programmes. The starting point is to define “group performance criteria” and then design exercises that relate to these in the context in which the group has to work. Assessing group behaviour in a systematic and consistent way is still in its early stages. However,
progress has already been made in designing exercises for assessing the "managers" (or "facilitators") of self-managing work teams.

Assessment in a "flattened" organization
The changes that have taken place in companies in a number of countries in Europe in the early 1990s have involved the removal of some layers of management so that there are fewer levels between operating staff and top management. Assessment centres were developed under conditions of ample levels of middle management from which a ready supply of assessors could be obtained. The removal of several levels implies a reduction in the number of supervising managers, and those that are left are responsible for larger groups of people with consequently less time available for extra activities such as assessment centres. There is also a greater risk that an individual will have to be observed in an assessment centre by someone who is the immediate manager of that individual, which offends a normal principle of ACM.

Another difficulty of using assessment centres in a flatter organization is that there are fewer opportunities for "upward" progression. Individuals who invest time and energy in an assessment/development centre often have an explicit or implicit expectation that some form of promotion could result from it, sooner or later. Those operating ACM need to make clear to participants that the outcome and consequent development plans are primarily geared towards identifying improvements in performance without movement up the hierarchy.

Ownership of assessment data
In the early applications of ACM, for instance with AT&T in the USA in the 1960s, it was assumed that the employer owned the information that was collected and could use it, or not use it, for managerial purposes without giving any right of decision about this to the candidate. As the method became more widely used and the protection of personal data became an issue in society in many countries, questions began to be asked about the use of data and the respecting of confidentiality with regard to personal data. In Europe it is now becoming accepted that it is becoming accepted he or she should not be forced to do so.

In Dutch companies there are often arrangements that the results should not be kept in the company files for longer than a certain limited period as people change and develop continuously. The French concept of "Balance of Skills" is an excellent idea: one can work on improving one's ability and, after a year has passed, a new "Balance" is formulated.

Self-assessment and self-development
A number of influences are pointing towards a more radical development in ACM, although some experiments have been in operation for about ten years. This is for an organization to provide an opportunity for people to review their options and devise their own development plans with expert assistance. For participants to be in a position where they can reliably assess themselves and other participants in this event they need to be given training as assessors and feedback counsellors. It is likely that this will double the time taken in the group event, but to balance this there will be less requirement for other staff to serve as assessors and less need after the event to have feedback sessions and other management involvement.

Two members of Assessment Circle Europe co-operated in 1984 in running such an event for 12 people, where the participants had to do all the observing for one another and, in small groups of four people, build up an assessment picture for one another and then use the resources of the full group to set objectives and move into development. In 1985 Hoechst (UK) started running development centres which used self- and peer assessment for a large proportion of the work of the event[4]. In 1994 we are working with clients who, because they are reducing the number of hierarchical layers in the organization, are dispensing with line manager assessors. One benefit of this change is that it will normally satisfy the condition of confidentiality of data, stressed earlier. Having been helped to produce the data in conditions of self- and peer assessment it is then natural to assume that the individual owns the results and can decide whether or not to share them with those who are in managerial roles in relation to the individual.
A parallel development is for government agencies, as is happening in France, to provide facilities for individuals to be assessed externally, and to be helped to devise a development plan outside their employment. With changing technologies and business methods it may become normal for most people to undertake such a review every five years or so to ensure that their employability remains at a satisfactory level.

**Summary**

In this article we have suggested ways in which managers and human resource specialists who want to plan strategically to provide assessment and development systems which will match the future environment may need to apply their efforts. The following questions may help to summarize the ideas:

- Are assessment and development methods based on an analysis of current and future job and career demands?
- If the assessment centre method is used, is it being used to its full potential of stimulating development and providing clear behavioural criteria for appraisal purposes?
- Is it necessary to reduce the time demands on line managers by use of video, computers, actors or consultants, or by redesigning the assessment or development method?
- Is there a need to identify some forms of potential very early in order to intervene with special development programmes?
- Are there self-directed work teams which might benefit from group assessment so that they can be helped to develop faster as high-performing teams?
- Has the “flattened” organization been taken fully into account in ensuring that assessment, appraisal and development systems match this new situation?
- Is it clear who owns any assessment data and that such information is able to be used by individuals as fully as possible in developing their performance and careers?
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