

INTERPRETATION GUIDE FOR THE TECHNICAL PROFESSIONAL REPORT

ASSESSMENT REPORT IN THE CONTEXT OF RECRUITMENT

This guide was designed to enhance the interpretation of the report and to put into perspective the scores obtained by an individual against the possible scores for each element being evaluated.

IT CONTAINS:

1. A review of the key competencies for a technical professional position.
2. Concrete examples illustrating the behaviours associated with each competency.
3. The interpretation of the overall fit score.

REVIEW OF GENERAL INFORMATION:

- It is **impossible** to have a perfect profile. We all have some areas that can be developed further.
- The strengths (indicated in green) help to identify certain characteristics of the person under evaluation that can be used to their advantage in their current and future role.
- The areas requiring development (indicated in red) will help the person under evaluation identify what needs to be worked on.
- The person's performance will be enhanced if they learn to build on their strengths and work on areas that need to be developed.

WITH WHOM ARE YOUR CANDIDATES BEING COMPARED?

They are being compared with workers who have been identified as high-potential employees by firms in various sectors and industries. Specifically, the averages used for this report are based on a sample of high-potential candidates who have participated in an assessment process with experts at Humance, a firm specializing in organizational psychology.

THE CONTENT OF THIS REPORT IS BASED ON:

- Four personality inventories
- A cognitive abilities test

This section of the guide reviews the behaviours associated with each of the competencies measured in your assessment report for the position of technical professional. For each competency, we provide examples of behaviours that would lead to a low or high score, and we illustrate with examples how this could be manifested on a daily basis. In order to support the progress of the person being evaluated, we remind you that the assessment report contains onboarding advice on each of the indicated areas of development.

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT

STRENGTHS

ABSTRACT REASONING SKILLS

- Assimilates new and abstract information more slowly
- Likes concrete examples and learning on the job

For example: When Sara is being trained on the use of a new IT product for which she will coordinate the launch, she needs to set aside time to review the product documentation, experiment with the product on her own, and refer regularly to the manual during the new stages of managing this project.

- Can handle abstract concepts and is very logical
- Learns effortlessly

For example: William is responsible for coordinating the implementation of a new product on which he has been trained. After the training, he soon becomes familiar with its many possible uses and quickly draws parallels with similar projects he has led in the past. He thereby establishes a logical process, allowing his team to carry out this project.

CONCEPTUAL THINKING

- Likes resolving simple and known problems
- Prefers to use established problem solving methods

For example: When Nathalie is informed of a drop in revenues within the company, she uses various tried and tested strategies (e.g., boosting advertising, participating in corporate events, etc.) to address well-defined problems without doing any in-depth analysis of the underlying causes.

- Likes solving complex problems
- Enjoys complex environments

For example: Nancy enjoys participating in discussions with her team members to develop hypotheses that would explain the company's decreasing revenues. She then considers the long-term consequences of the strategies they plan to put in place in order to deal with this more trying time for the company.

DEPTH OF ANALYSIS

- Takes a position even with limited information
- Loses interest in complex issues and analyzes them superficially

For example: Jarod responds quickly to clients' insurance claims. However, sometimes he realizes he didn't collect all the information necessary to understand the scope of the client's situation. At times his hasty decisions have meant that he needs to completely review the resources assigned to resolving the client's situation, wasting considerable time and money for the company.

- Likes to tackle complex problems
- Identifies and analyzes different facets of a situation before acting

For example: When Marie receives an insurance claim, she ensures she has asked the client questions about the important aspects of the situation. She then develops a detailed action plan to respond to the client's claim, fostering an effective resolution to the problem.

INNOVATION

- Appreciates tradition
- Prefers the conventional and known

For example: As part of a discussion group on new practices in human resource management, Kelly spends little time exploring her colleagues' approaches. She recognizes the potential benefit of new practices discussed during these meetings, but she believes that they are unsuited to her organization's services. She believes it better to use traditional approaches that are tried and true.

- Helps call into question processes
- Proposes original, innovative solutions

For example: Anne regularly attends discussion groups on new practices in human resource management to stay up to date on what is happening in the field and to promote her ideas. After a meeting with these groups, she readily explores with her colleagues and supervisor how they can integrate the fruit of these discussions into the organization's existing procedures.

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT

STRENGTHS

INDICATOR TRACKING

- Does little follow-up with colleagues on key indicator
- Fails to intervene when there are shortfalls on objective

For example: After Ariane, an organizational psychologist, writes a report following an intervention in an organization, she notes that clients rarely use her recommendations. When she talks to clients about the reason for their limited use of her recommendations, they report that her conclusions are based on a limited number of observations and do not take into account all of the organization's performance indicators.

- Puts in place rigorous follow-up mechanisms for key indicator
- Intervenes with colleagues when there are shortfall

Example: When Robin sees a drop in net profits in the sales department, he immediately informs the department supervisor so that he can take the necessary steps to ensure the situation doesn't recur next month.

COLLABORATION

- Tends to maintain individuality in a group
- Prefers to work alone

For example: In her work, Rebecca tends to stand by her opinion and rarely reaches a consensus with the team, although she doesn't try to undermine the common objectives. She enjoys tasks that require her to focus on her work without having to interact with too many others.

- Tends to go along with the group's opinions
- Likes working as part of a team

For example: At work, when Peter is given a task to do by himself, he still seeks the opinions of other team members to improve the quality of the work. He likes to discuss ideas with others. He easily reaches a consensus with the team.

CONSIDERATION FOR CLIENTS

- Not very concerned about the workplace climate
- Stays focused on the task

For example: Laura works in a marketing firm and likes to quickly dive into new projects that are put forward by her clients. However, she sometimes has to revise certain marketing strategies that she has put in place for her clients since they do not adequately reflect their expressed needs.

- Is very interested in people
- Seeks to promote the well-being of people

For example: Melina likes to use various strategies so that the products she offers clients are personalized to their needs. She doesn't hesitate to set up a number of meetings with her clients to ensure they are on the same wavelength. She therefore has no difficulty in maintaining cordial relations with them.

GROUP INFLUENCE

- Does not seek to be the centre of attention
- Prefers to follow guidelines

For example: Larry likes to lay down guidelines that he has received from his supervisor in order to get the projects for which he is responsible completed. He rarely speaks up during discussions with other members of his department that are aimed at improving procedures.

- Likes to lead discussions
- Tries to rally support for their own ideas

For example: When Myriam makes suggestions to review processes in place for managing a large project, she presents her ideas with ease at meetings and knows how to rally support from her team for her new proposals.

PERSUASIVENESS

- Is cautious and hesitant in their arguments
- Can give up easily when faced with opposition

For example: When Marco, a social worker, believes that specific interventions are needed by members of his team to ensure their safety and that of users, he often doesn't present his point of view. Fearing that colleagues doubt his ability to assess situations, he often misses opportunities to limit the intensity and consequences of unfortunate incidents.

- Is confident and knows how to rally others to their ideas
- Puts together arguments taking into account the other person's motivations

For example: Félix, a social worker, considers the safety of his team members and of users a critical part of his duties. To convince his colleagues to introduce new safety practices, he points to the value added of his proposed interventions to stakeholders.

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT

STRESS MANAGEMENT

- Takes situations to heart
- Is a worrier

For example: Michelle, an engineer, is very concerned about her performance at work. During times when there are lots of contracts, she finds it hard to stay focused, having so many plans to review. She loses sight of her objectives and has difficulty detaching herself from the situation. She really feels the pressure.

AGILITY

- Likes clear procedures
- Prefers stability and routine activities

For example: Adam has just joined a new organization that he finds very chaotic. He decided to implement the work system he was using at his old job, even if it is ill suited to his new position. He knows he has a very good command of that system and is confident that it will eventually work.

RIGOUR

- Prefers to have minimal procedures to follow
- Is flexible with respect to methods

For example: When Martin's supervisor asks him to create a new type of report for the firm, he likes to have a lot of flexibility in structuring it and can adapt its content based on the elements that inspire him at the time of writing it.

STRENGTHS

- Puts situations into perspective
- Rarely worries

For example: Marvin is an engineer known for his ability to stay focused. Even during really busy periods, he manages to be efficient in carrying out his inspections and in writing his numerous reports. He seems to be little affected by the pressure applied by his supervisor.

- Adapts quickly
- Likes a changing environment and deals well with uncertainty

For example: Luke is comfortable working in his new environment, which he finds rather unpredictable, even chaotic. He is very flexible with the various project management methods and tools he uses and can easily adjust them to respond to his employer's requests, which are often unclear.

- Likes to have a structure in place
- Is methodical

For example: When Martha has to draw up a document for her work, she makes a list of the main items she wishes to address, looks at the structure of similar documents created in the past, and determines the steps and time required to complete this project.

INTERPRETING THE OVERALL FIT SCORE

This section of the guide is intended to help you interpret the overall fit score provided in the Technical professional report, by answering three frequently asked questions.

1. WHAT IS THE OVERALL FIT SCORE?

The goal of the overall fit score is to support your decision making by providing an indication of the fit between a candidate's score and the desired skills profile for the position being assessed. This fit can be poor, somewhat below average, somewhat above average or good.

2. HOW WAS THE OVERALL FIT SCORE DESIGNED?

By combining information from a review of the scientific literature, client surveys and the analysis of data from some 100 assessments conducted by Humance senior assessment experts, the key competencies for an advisory **professional** position were identified.

Then each key competency assessed was weighted based on its relative importance to the profile, as identified by many organizations for this type of position. This weighting was determined by a committee of assessment experts using the **Delphi method**. This method was designed to increase the rigour of the scientific approach by allowing experts to take positions and independently answer a questionnaire that evaluates the relative importance of each of the competencies assessed. Then a directed discussion provides a forum for sharing different viewpoints and achieving consensus about the relative weight of each of the competencies.

3. WHAT IS THE RELATIVE WEIGHT OF EACH OF THE COMPETENCIES ASSESSED?

Our assessment experts used the legend below to determine the relative weight of each of the competencies assessed for a typical technical professional position.

2 = Critical for the position 1,5 = Very important for the position
1 = Important for the position 0,5 = An asset for the position

Competencies assessed	Weight	Competencies assessed	Weight	Competencies assessed	Weight
Conceptual thinking	1,5	Collaboration	1	Agility	1
Depth of analysis	2	Consideration for clients	1	Rigour	1,5
Innovation	1,5	Influence	1	Stress management	1
Indicator tracking	1				

Additional rule: For the competency “**Abstract reasoning skills**”, we used a minimum score rather than relative weight. The score is 10 (as a percentile), i.e., 90% of the population scores higher than the candidate according to the test designer's validity studies. Scientific studies suggest that the likelihood that candidates perform well in the position being assessed is considerably lower if they score below the minimum threshold. Given that a score below this minimum threshold is a predictor of poor on-the-job performance, for the overall fit score, candidates who score below this threshold for the “**Abstract reasoning skills**” competency are automatically a poor fit for the position being assessed.

There may be situations in which candidates being assessed have most of the skills for an technical professional position, but they are still a poor fit because they score below the minimum threshold for “**Abstract reasoning skills**”. As such, when you use this general indication of fit, it is important to take into account the context, culture and requirements of your organization and the position being assessed, because the relative importance of each of the competencies assessed may depend on your situation.