

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

**Assistant Parole Supervisor (Field Parole Officer C)
and Parole Supervisor (Field Parole Officer D)**

Candidate Preparation Guide

Prepared By:



March 2025

Copyright © 2025 by Talogy, Inc. All rights to the information contained herein reserved by Talogy, Inc. No part of this document may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from Talogy, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| DESCRIPTION OF THE PROMOTIONAL EXAMINATION with emphasis on the SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST | 3 |
| I. Date, Time, and Location | 3 |
| II. Technical Knowledge (TK) Content | 3 |
| III. Situational Judgment Test (SJT) Content..... | 3 |
| IV. Situational Judgment Test Competencies | 3 |
| V. Administrative Logistics..... | 4 |
| VI. Situational Judgment Test Scoring | 4 |
| PREPARATION STRATEGIES FOR THE SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST | 6 |
| VII. Preparation Strategies..... | 6 |
| A. Situational Judgment Test-Taking Strategies | 6 |
| B. Common Pitfalls | 8 |
| SAMPLE TEST ITEMS | 12 |
| VIII. Sample Situational Judgment Test Items..... | 12 |
| CONCLUSION | 17 |

INTRODUCTION

This Guide is intended to provide specific information to candidates regarding the 2025 examinations for Assistant Parole Supervisor (Field Parole Officer C) and Parole Supervisor (Field Parole Officer D). Because a similar examination process will be used for both ranks, the phrase “APS/PS” will be used to indicate that the concept applies to candidates for the Assistant Parole Supervisor (APS) and Parole Supervisor (PS) ranks.

The APS/PS examinations will each consist of two components including:

- Technical Knowledge Test [TK]
- Situational Judgment Test [SJT]

The examination components are designed based on job analysis information obtained from APS/PS incumbents from civil service locations across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The job analysis identified the duties performed and the knowledge and competencies (abilities and personal characteristics) required to perform these duties effectively. The examination process is intended to assess the required knowledge and competencies in the context of important duties and tasks.

Although this Guide will provide general information about both test components, the focus of this Guide is assisting candidates in preparing for the Situational Judgment Test, as this is a new test component for these positions.

Accordingly, this Guide provides information about the Situational Judgment Test in terms of the:

- content,
- administrative logistics,
- evaluation methods,
- preparation strategies, and
- sample questions.

From the information presented in this Guide, candidates should be able to gain an understanding of the Situational Judgment Test, including the test procedures, the types of questions they will encounter, and suggested preparation strategies.

We encourage candidates to review this Guide carefully and to take advantage of all opportunities to prepare for the Situational Judgment Test.

GOOD LUCK!

NOTE: In this Guide, an effort has been made to provide information about the intended format, content, logistics, and evaluation of the Situational Judgment Test. However, it is possible that minor alterations may be made in the testing procedures between the time this Guide is distributed and the administration of the test. We will work with the Human Resources Division to provide you with any updates that may be required.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROMOTIONAL EXAMINATION with emphasis on the SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST

- I. **Date, Time, and Location:** The computerized online written exam which contains two examination components will be administered to APS/PS candidates on Saturday, May 17, 2025. Testing will take place at multiple testing locations and each group of candidates will be assigned to a testing session. Two weeks prior to the exam date, you will receive a Notice to Appear that indicates the site where you will test and the arrival and testing times for your session. Please make note of your testing time to ensure you show up on time. Candidates arriving late may be disqualified from testing.
- II. **Technical Knowledge (TK) Content:** The Technical Knowledge Test will consist of 70 multiple-choice questions drawn from the sources listed on the Reading List. The TK Test consists only of closed-book questions. You will not be permitted to bring any Departmental reference sources (from the reading list) or any other documents or materials with you to the test facility. If any such materials are found in your possession once you are seated at a computer at the testing site, you may be disqualified from testing.
- III. **Situational Judgment Test (SJT) Content:** Candidates will be asked to consider the role of Assistant Parole Supervisor or Parole Supervisor and will be presented with a series of 10-15 job relevant scenarios. Each scenario will describe a job situation which an APS/PS might face. Following each scenario, candidates will be presented with 4 to 6 potential actions that the APS/PS in that scenario might take in response to the situation presented. Candidates will be asked to read, consider, and rate the effectiveness of each potential action using the following rating scale:

| 1 Highly Ineffective | 2 Ineffective | 3 Effective | 4 Highly Effective |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue | Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue |

When rating the effectiveness of each potential action, candidates should consider only the information presented in the scenario. If knowledge of any department-specific policy or procedure is needed to determine appropriate responses to a scenario, that information will be explicitly provided in the scenario description.

- IV. **Situational Judgment Test Competencies:** The Situational Judgment Test was designed to assess a series of competencies found to be important to effective job performance in the context of situations encountered by Assistant Parole Supervisors/Parole Supervisors in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Based on the job analysis results, the five (5) competencies to be assessed during the Situational Judgment Test are identified below. In other words, the Situational Judgment Test scenarios reflect or align with the competencies listed below:
 - 1. **Accountability:** This competency involves adhering to and applying performance standards in an appropriate, consistent, and fair manner. This includes holding oneself and others accountable by addressing and correcting problem performance or discipline violations in a timely, consistent, and fair manner.
 - 2. **Adaptability:** This competency involves the ability to evaluate and modify one’s behavior to meet the needs of changing circumstances or priorities. This includes maintaining a

calm and professional demeanor in both routine and stressful situations or crises. This competency also involves the ability to demonstrate resilience by persevering through adverse or difficult circumstances and by bouncing back from setbacks, disappointments, criticism, or emotionally challenging situations.

3. **Analyzing and Deciding**: This competency involves the ability to select an appropriate and timely course of action by seeking out and analyzing information from various sources, evaluating the importance and relevance of information, and considering alternative approaches and their implications.
4. **Interpersonal Interactions**: This competency involves the ability to establish constructive working relationships with others. This includes demonstrating consideration and respect for others' feelings, needs, views, and contributions while maintaining the necessary balance to ensure that objectives continue to be met. This also includes the ability to foster a cooperative team environment and negotiate/reconcile conflict, among others.
5. **Leadership**: This competency involves demonstrating "drive" and the tendency to take action without being prompted to achieve objectives. It also involves the ability to work with limited or no oversight while still recognizing when it is necessary to seek others' input before taking action. This competency also involves the ability to establish goals, plan activities, and identify and direct resources in an efficient and effective manner in order to achieve objectives. This includes developing strategies for accomplishing goals that include contingencies for anticipated obstacles, allocating authority and responsibility based on personnel capabilities and priorities, clearly explaining assigned tasks and performance expectations, and monitoring/measuring progress toward goals.

V. **Administrative Logistics**: During a single testing session, candidates will complete both examination components. The tests will be administered on a computer in a controlled testing environment. At the start of the testing session, after a set of instructions, candidates will complete the Technical Knowledge Test. Once the Technical Knowledge Test is completed, candidates will proceed to review additional instructions regarding the Situational Judgment Test and then complete the Situational Judgment Test. The test period will be timed as a single testing session. Although this Guide provides guidance as to how much time a candidate should expect to spend on each portion of this examination, it is up to the candidate to keep track of time and ensure that he/she has sufficient time to complete each test component.

The timed session for this promotional examination will be 3 hours and 5 minutes. The recommended allocation of time is:

- 10 minutes to read the initial instructions for the examination
- 105 minutes (one hour and 45 minutes) to complete the Technical Knowledge Test
- 10 minutes to read the additional instructions for the Situational Judgment Test
- 60 minutes to complete the Situational Judgment Test

Please keep in mind that the examination timer will run continuously once the examination is initiated, and it is up to each candidate to ensure he/she spends the time appropriately to be able to complete both test components before the timer expires.

VI. **Situational Judgment Test Scoring**: All responses on the Situational Judgment Test will be scored against an established scoring key. Each response will be worth a minimum of zero points and a maximum of two points. Note that candidates rate the effectiveness of each potential action the APS/PS in that scenario might take using a scale that ranges from Highly Ineffective to Highly Effective. Each potential action that is rated by a candidate is considered a "response" on the Situational Judgment Test.

The scoring key for each potential action (i.e., the “correct” or most appropriate effectiveness rating for that scenario response) was determined by a group of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) representative of locations across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. These SMEs determined the most appropriate effectiveness rating (i.e., the scoring key) for each potential action.

Candidates will receive one point for each response if the effectiveness rating identified by the candidate is on the same “side” of the effectiveness scale as the scoring key, plus one additional point per response if the effectiveness rating identified by the candidate matches the scoring key exactly. Zero points will be awarded for a response if the effectiveness rating identified by the candidate is on the opposite “side” of the effectiveness scale from the scoring key. Illustrative examples of the scoring process are provided below.

| Candidate Effectiveness Rating | Scoring Key (Correct Response) | Points Awarded to Candidate | Explanation |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Highly Effective OR Effective | Ineffective | 0 | The candidate’s response is on the “effective side” of the rating scale, and the scoring key is on the “ineffective side” of the rating scale. The candidate’s response is therefore on the opposite side of the scale from the scoring key, and 0 points are awarded. |
| Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | 1 | The candidate’s response is on the “ineffective side” of the rating scale, and the scoring key is on the “ineffective side” of the rating scale. The candidate’s response is therefore on the same side of the scale as the scoring key, and 1 point is awarded. |
| Ineffective | Ineffective | 2 | The candidate’s response is on the same side of the scale (“ineffective”) as the scoring key, so 1 initial point is awarded. In addition, the candidate’s rating of “Ineffective” matches the scoring key, so an additional 1 point is awarded. The candidate therefore receives 2 points for this response. |

All scoring computations will be performed by Talogy using the scoring key established by the SMEs.

PREPARATION STRATEGIES FOR THE SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST

VII. Preparation Strategies: The Situational Judgment Test is designed to assess the underlying competencies as they contribute to the performance of Assistant Parole Supervisors/Parole Supervisors. Technical knowledge of policies, procedures, rules, and regulations is not the primary focus since knowledge is assessed as part of the Technical Knowledge Test. However, keep in mind that the competencies involve such things as analyzing information, considering alternative approaches and their implications, identifying and coordinating resources, and monitoring progress toward goals. The application of these competencies towards resolving a situation or problem must inevitably occur within the context of the relevant policies, procedures, rules, and regulations. Thus, it is essential to have a foundational understanding of acceptable behaviors and procedures on the job.

You can improve your performance on a Situational Judgment Test in a couple of different ways. First, know and understand the test situation so that you can avoid making mistakes caused by a failure to understand the meaning of test questions, test format, or test procedures. Second, you can try to gain an understanding of your own test-taking behavior. If you become aware of the kinds of errors that are common on Situational Judgment Tests, you can try to avoid them. This section of the Guide provides suggestions for improving your performance in each of these areas:

- **Situational Judgment Test-Taking Strategies - Understanding the Test Situation:** This section provides some strategies that you can apply when taking the Situational Judgment Test. These strategies include such suggestions as systematically breaking down the rating scale and answering easier questions first.
- **Common Pitfalls - Understanding Your Own Test-Taking Behavior:** This section provides information about common pitfalls in test-taking in general, in situational judgment tests in particular, and reasons why you might face such pitfalls. You are encouraged to identify the kinds of behaviors you might tend to engage in by reading through this list. In this way, you will be more aware of the tendency toward these pitfalls when you take the test and can determine what steps you can take to avoid them.

A. Situational Judgment Test-Taking Strategies

The purpose of the Situational Judgment Test is to evaluate the competencies required to perform certain work-related situations, particularly as they relate to making decisions or judgments regarding effective versus ineffective behaviors in those situations. Because we want to directly evaluate these competencies, we are offering the following suggestions.

1. Make sure you understand the test format and requirements.

- a) Read all directions carefully.
- b) Read each scenario and all potential actions carefully before attempting to rate them. Scenarios and potential actions are brief, so re-reading may be a good use of your time to ensure you have not misunderstood anything in the scenario or potential actions.
- c) Make sure you know how to use the rating scale to rate the effectiveness of each potential action.

- d) Make sure you know how much time you have remaining to complete the test. As you take the test, check the timer on the computer periodically so that you can keep track of the amount of time remaining in the testing period.

2. Proceed through the scenarios strategically.

- a) Break down the rating scale. First, think about whether each potential action for the given scenario is generally “effective” or generally “ineffective.” Imagine the person in the situation responding in the way that is described in the given item. Then think about whether that action would generally make the situation better or worse. When thinking about the ramifications of the given action, you may want to consider the impact that action would have on others described in the scenario. Consider things such as whether the action promotes or inhibits safety, whether the action is consistent with any expressly stated rules or policies, and whether the action demonstrates strong levels of responsibility, adaptability, leadership, professionalism, etc. If you believe the given action would make the situation better, you should respond by selecting a rating on the “effective” side of the scale. If you believe the given action would make the situation worse, you should respond by selecting a rating on the “ineffective” side of the scale.

One question often asked by candidates is what constitutes “the situation” or “the issue” in the scenario – i.e., what if a given action resolves or improves some aspects of the situation but in the meantime, causes other issues or makes other aspects of the situation worse? You should consider every aspect of the situation in this case. If the net effect is for the action to help more than it hurts, then you should rate the action somewhere on the effective side of the scale. If the net effect is for the action to cause more issues than it resolves (or to hurt more than it helps), then you should rate the action somewhere on the ineffective side of the scale.

Once you have determined whether the potential action is effective (or ineffective), then think about the *degree* to which that response is effective (or ineffective). If a given response is *extremely* or *very* likely to improve the situation, or likely to resolve *most* or *all* of the issue, then you should select the “Highly Effective” (4) rating. If you believe a given response is *somewhat* likely to improve the situation, or if the response would resolve *some* or *part* of the issue, then you should select the “Effective” (3) rating. Similarly, on the ineffective side of the scale, if you believe an action would be *extremely* or *very* likely to worsen the situation, or would be *very* unlikely to resolve the issue, you should select the “Highly Ineffective” (1) rating. If you believe an action would be *somewhat* likely to worsen the situation, or *somewhat* unlikely to resolve the issue, you should select the “Ineffective” (2) rating. (See table on page 3.)

- b) Rate the “easier” potential actions first. As you read the potential actions for a given scenario, you may find that some of those actions are easy to rate (e.g., they are clearly “Highly Effective” or clearly “Ineffective”). Rate those potential actions first to get them out of the way and then spend time thinking about the actions that may be a little more difficult to judge. Don’t forget to use the strategy described above in step (a) to evaluate the effectiveness of the potential actions.
- c) Take a mental break when needed. If you feel that your ability to concentrate is decreasing at points during the test, take a brief mental break. Close your eyes and take a minute to clear your mind and relax. Of course, you must keep in mind the time limit for the test, but the positive effects of a brief mental break may well be worth the few seconds or minutes it takes.
- d) Answer every question. You will not lose any more credit for an incorrect response than

you will for no response, so even if you must guess, rate every potential action. If the test period is about to end, and you believe there will be several scenarios that you will not be able to get to, reserve some time (e.g., 60 seconds) at the end of the test period to rate the scenario's potential actions, even if you must guess. While your guesses may not be correct, the alternative is to leave these actions blank and be guaranteed to get them wrong.

3. Use extra time wisely

Once you complete the test, go back and review your responses to make sure they still make sense to you as you read through them again. Pay particular attention to scenarios and potential actions where you may have initially questioned your responses. Re-read them, think through them again in a systematic way, and make sure you are comfortable with your responses. You will not get extra points for completing the test before the time limit expires, so if time remains, review as many of your responses as time allows.

Remember, test administrators will be available to help every candidate, but only to clarify procedures. If you have any procedural questions, ask for assistance before the test begins.

B. Common Pitfalls

There are several common reasons candidates might choose an incorrect rating for a potential action. Eight of these reasons are presented below along with suggestions for avoiding these errors.

1. **Misreading the rating scale:** Candidates may mistakenly rate a potential action differently from how they intended to rate it, simply due to misreading the scale. Be sure to make note of the scale points (1 = Highly Ineffective, 2 = Ineffective, 3 = Effective, 4 = Highly Effective) and the directionality of the rating scale - lower ratings indicate ineffective responses and higher ratings indicate effective responses.

In a similar vein, note that the rating scale asks about the *effectiveness* of each potential action. You are NOT to rate the *likelihood* that someone (including you) might take the action listed. Instead, you are to rate, if the individual in that scenario did take the listed action, how effective that action would be.

2. **Misunderstanding the instructions or making false assumptions:** Candidates may fail to fully read the instructions or may assume they already know how to proceed without reading the instructions, especially when there is pressure to finish before the test time limit. The instructions for rating the potential actions will be presented with each new scenario. It is important that you understand the instructions before rating the potential actions. The instructions will be as follows:

“Read the brief scenario description below, followed by a number of potential actions the APS (or PS) might take in response to the situation described. Rate the effectiveness of each separate action, independent of the other potential actions, using the rating scale provided. Be sure to rate the effectiveness of all of the potential actions. You may use the same rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Ineffective) for multiple actions within a single scenario. Further, within any given scenario, you are not required to use every effectiveness rating; there may be no listed actions to which you give a rating of Ineffective, for example, or no actions to which you give a rating of Highly Effective.”

Important Note: You do NOT have to select a different rating for every potential action to the

same scenario. You may rate more than one action as Effective, more than one as Highly Ineffective, etc. Similarly, you do NOT have to use every rating point on the scale when evaluating the potential actions within a given scenario. In other words, it is NOT necessary to assume that every scenario will include at least one potential action at each of the four levels of effectiveness. Within any given scenario, you may find that there are no potential actions to which you give a rating of “Highly Effective,” or no actions to which you give a rating of “Ineffective,” etc.

An example is provided below of a scenario with four potential actions. The darkened numbered circles indicate the effectiveness rating selected by the candidate for each potential action. Notice that, in this example, a rating of “Effective” is given to two of the potential actions, and the rating of “Highly Ineffective” is not selected at all. As previously mentioned, there is no requirement to select a rating from each point on the scale for the potential actions for the same scenario.

Scenario Example

A brief description of the scenario involving a Parole Supervisor (or Assistant Parole Supervisor) will be presented here.

| Potential Actions | | 1 Highly Ineffective | 2 Ineffective | 3 Effective | 4 Highly Effective |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue | Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue |
| A) | PS (or APS) takes action A in response to the scenario above. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| B) | PS (or APS) takes action B in response to the scenario above. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| C) | PS (or APS) takes action C in response to the scenario above. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| D) | PS (or APS) takes action D in response to the scenario above. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |

- 3. Viewing the potential scenario actions as interdependent:** Within any given scenario, the listed actions that the APS/PS might take in response to that scenario are NOT to be viewed as chronological or as interdependent in any way. The responses do NOT build on one another. Instead, each potential action listed for a scenario is meant to be viewed and rated independently from the other actions. Be sure to rate each potential action separately.

4. **Misreading part of the scenario or potential action by overlooking a keyword or phrase:** The solution to this problem is taking the time to read carefully and thoroughly, re-reading if there is time. Make note of key words or phrases that may indicate the most effective ways in which to respond to a situation. Be sure not to overlook critical words such as “not” – for example, “this individual has not been trained on this technique.” Overlooking the word “not” in this phrase could lead to faulty assumptions about the most effective actions to take in a scenario that involves assigning the best resources to manage a particular incident.
5. **Not knowing the meaning of one or more key terms:** Situational Judgment Test scenarios and potential actions will not include a great deal of technical terminology. Nevertheless, when taking the test, if you have difficulty with a term, re-read the sentence to determine its general meaning without worrying about the exact meaning of the particular word. Try to understand the general message of the sentence or paragraph. The meaning of the unfamiliar word should become clearer once you understand the general context within which it has been placed.
6. **Not sticking to the scenario as presented:** When evaluating Situational Judgment Test potential actions, it is tempting to make assumptions or jump to conclusions based on preconceived notions or past experiences related to the scenario being described. Be careful NOT to make assumptions or jump to conclusions. Focus on the information provided in the scenario. Do not assume or add information or think about “what ifs” such as, “If the immediate supervisor has this type of personality, I might respond differently,” or “If this has been an ongoing issue, then this might be an appropriate response,” etc. Focus solely on the information provided when reading and thinking about the scenario and potential actions. If there is added information that is needed (e.g., information about personality conflicts, background stating that an issue is ongoing or has occurred repeatedly), that information will be clearly stated in the scenario. If some challenge, problem, or conflict is not stated in the scenario itself, do NOT assume it exists and do NOT let such an assumption impact your responses.

Similarly, focus on the potential actions that are provided. It may be that the course of action that YOU would take is not listed as an option, or that you can think of other, more or less effective, alternative actions that are not listed as potential actions. Do not allow yourself to be distracted by thinking about alternative actions that are not provided. Focus on the potential actions that are listed, and the context provided around those actions in the scenario.

7. **Committing common rating errors or biases:** When using any kind of rating scale, such as the effectiveness rating scale that will be used to rate the potential actions, candidates often tend to have natural biases that lead them to only use specific portions of the scale. One common bias is to use only the extremities of the scale – in this case, only “Highly Effective” or “Highly Ineffective.” Another common bias is to avoid those extreme ratings and only use the middle points of the scale – in this case, only “Effective” or “Ineffective.” Other common biases involve being overly “lenient” by rating every potential action somewhere on the “effective” side of the scale, or instead being overly “critical” by rating every potential action somewhere on the “ineffective” side of the scale.

The key to overcoming these errors or biases is to re-read the meaning of each scale point and systematically think through how effective each potential action is. Look back at strategy A2a (*Proceed through the scenarios strategically – Break down the rating scale*) as a reminder.

8. **Rushing or not taking enough time to think through your ratings:** When there is an overall time limit to the test, it is tempting to rush through the reading of the scenarios and the rating of the potential actions. Note, you should have sufficient time to read carefully through

all the scenarios and potential actions. Do not agonize for several minutes over one potential action but do take the time needed to carefully read and consider the action. Some additional tips for systematically thinking through your ratings of the potential actions include:

- Have an answer in mind before you look over the potential actions. Thinking about the most effective action to a scenario may help you anticipate what effective versus ineffective actions might look like, which can aid you in rating the potential actions that are listed. Be careful, however, not to dismiss all listed potential actions as ineffective simply because they do not match exactly what YOU might do in that situation. Keep in mind there may be several effective (and by extension several ineffective) actions to addressing any given challenge.
- Consider the rationale behind your rating of each potential action. If someone were to ask you why you rated a particular action as Ineffective, as Highly Effective, etc., would you be able to provide a reason? If not, you may wish to re-think your rating.

SAMPLE TEST ITEMS

Some samples are provided below to give you an idea of what to expect on the Situational Judgment Test. These scenarios and potential actions represent generic prototypes that are similar in format, length, and content to the types of scenarios and actions that will appear on the upcoming Situational Judgment Test.

VIII. Sample Situational Judgment Test Items:

These sample scenarios and potential actions are meant to illustrate the nature of the test you will complete. The format (i.e., instructions, scenario description, listing of potential actions with associated effectiveness rating scale) mirrors the format you will see during the actual Situational Judgment Test.

For each example scenario, the scoring key (i.e., effectiveness rating that is considered most accurate) is provided on the page following the scenario. You may use the scenarios as practice items and then look to the page following the scenario for the answer key.

The final Situational Judgment Test items that appear on the actual exam have been vetted/approved by Commonwealth of Massachusetts Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), who have also determined the official scoring key for each potential scenario response. The sample items below have been through this same vetting process, and the scoring key indicated for these example items have been officially determined/approved by the SMEs. The scoring key provided for the sample items therefore follows the same logic and judgment process as that used by the experts to develop the key for the actual SJT.

Assistant Parole Supervisor (APS) Example 1

Read the brief scenario description below, followed by a number of potential actions the APS might take in response to the situation described. Rate the effectiveness of each separate action, independent of the other potential actions, using the rating scale provided. Be sure to rate the effectiveness of all of the potential actions. You may use the same rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Ineffective) for multiple actions within a single scenario. Further, within any given scenario, you are not required to use every effectiveness rating; there may be no listed actions to which you give a rating of Ineffective, for example, or no actions to which you give a rating of Highly Effective.

Scenario

APS Miller is reviewing a Parole Violation Report (PVR) from PO Smith regarding a parolee who returned late for curfew to the residential program. The parolee also provided a positive test for fentanyl to program staff and was subsequently discharged from his program. PO Smith cited only the termination from the program on the PVR and did not detail the additional violations.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Effective | Highly Effective |
| Potential Actions | | Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue | Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue |
| A) | APS Miller sends the report back to PO Smith and asks him to provide the missing violations and resubmit immediately. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| B) | APS Miller leaves the PVR as is, as the critical information is that the parolee was terminated from the program. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| C) | APS Miller conducts a staff meeting to discuss PVRs and the need to address all violations in each report. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| D) | APS Miller corrects the report herself without advising PO Smith. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |

In APS Example 1 listed on the previous page

- Option A is considered Highly Effective (4; Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue) because APS Miller is making sure that PO Smith knows what was wrong with the report, takes responsibility for correcting the mistakes, and the report ultimately gets corrected. This resolves most or all of the issue.
- Option B is considered Highly Ineffective (1; Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue) because APS Miller is taking no action. This is very unlikely to resolve the issue as the report does not get corrected. It may in fact be likely to worsen the situation because PO Smith is not made aware of the mistake and may continue to make similar mistakes in the future.
- Option C is considered Effective (3; Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue) because APS Miller is addressing to all staff the need for PVRs to be thorough and accurate. This is helpful and is likely to resolve some or part of the issue. However, she does not address this particular report directly with PO Smith and there is no indication that the report ultimately gets corrected.
- Option D is considered Ineffective (2; Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue) because, although the report is getting corrected, this is not how APS Miller should be spending her time. Further, PO Smith is not made aware of the mistake nor asked to take responsibility for fixing it. This may lead to him continuing to make similar mistakes in the future. This response therefore ultimately does more harm than good and should be rated Ineffective.

Parole Supervisor (PS) Example 2

Read the brief scenario description below, followed by a number of potential actions the PS might take in response to the situation described. Rate the effectiveness of each separate action, independent of the other potential actions, using the rating scale provided. Be sure to rate the effectiveness of all of the potential actions. You may use the same rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Ineffective) for multiple actions within a single scenario. Further, within any given scenario, you are not required to use every effectiveness rating; there may be no listed actions to which you give a rating of Ineffective, for example, or no actions to which you give a rating of Highly Effective.

Scenario

PS Jones is informed by PO Adams that a parolee has a sponsor who no longer wants to house the parolee. The parolee has no violations. PO Adams reports that the parolee has no other support or place to go. PO Adams is struggling to find placement for the parolee.

| Potential Actions | | 1 Highly Ineffective | 2 Ineffective | 3 Effective | 4 Highly Effective |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue | Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue | Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue |
| A) | PS Jones advises PO Adams to coordinate with the Re-entry Navigator to assist with placement of the parolee. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| B) | PS Jones tells PO Adams that this is simply part of the job and Adams will just have to keep looking. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| C) | PS Jones tells PO Adams to contact resources within their district for placement. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| D) | PS Jones instructs PO Adams to advise the parolee he will be returned to jail if he does not find a place to live. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |
| E) | PS Jones says that she will take care of it for PO Adams. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ |

In PS Example 2 listed on the previous page

- Option A is considered Highly Effective (4; Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue) because PS Jones is connecting PO Adams with the proper resources to help Adams find placement for the parolee. This is likely to resolve most or all of the issue, as the PS is providing helpful advice and leadership, and the PO is likely to receive the needed help for the parolee.
- Option B is considered Highly Ineffective (1; Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue) because PS Jones is providing no help or advice for Adams, who has already been attempting to find placement and is having no luck. PS Jones is doing nothing to provide good leadership or assistance, and the PO is likely to continue to struggle, leaving the parolee with no placement. This is very unlikely to resolve the issue.
- Option C is considered Effective (3; Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue) because PS Jones is providing helpful advice and is pointing PO Adams in the right direction. However, without specifying the resources Adam needs, PS Jones is not being as helpful as she could. This is therefore likely to resolve only some or part of the issue.
- Option D is considered Highly Ineffective (1; Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue) because PS Jones is advising PO Adams to take an action that is unwarranted. The parolee has done nothing that would cause him to be returned to jail. This response therefore would come across as threatening and unjustified, and is very likely to worsen the situation.
- Option E is considered Ineffective (2; Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue) because, although PS Jones may take care of the placement, this is not how she should be spending her time. By taking over the action, PS Jones is not allowing PO Adams the opportunity to learn from the experience, nor is she providing good leadership or mentorship. This response is therefore likely to hurt more than it helps, as it sets a bad precedent and may cause PO Adams to expect PS Jones to take care of all issues herself in the future.

CONCLUSION

We hope that this Guide gives you a better understanding of what to expect for the Situational Judgment Test (including the logistics and scoring procedures) and provides you with some suggestions for preparation. The suggestions provided here are not exhaustive; we encourage you to engage in additional preparation strategies that you believe will enhance your chances of performing effectively on the Situational Judgment Test.

BEST OF LUCK!