INTERPRETATION GUIDE FOR THE
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT IN DEVELOPMENT REPORT

ASSESSMENT REPORT IN THE CONTEXT OF DEVELOPMENT

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 an administrative support in development 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:

- Three personality inventories
- A cognitive abilities test
- A skills test
- A development readiness questionnaire

HUMANCE

COMPETENCIES

This section of the guide reviews the behaviours associated with each of the competencies measured in your assessment report for the position of administrative support in development. 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

AGILITY

- Appreciates clear procedures
- Prefers stability and routine activities

Example: Adam has just joined a new organization and finds it chaotic. He decides to use tools he was using with his former employer, even though they are ill-suited to his new job. He knows them inside and out and believes that they will eventually be right for his new job.

LEARNING ABILITY

- Assimilates new information more slowly
- Prefers concrete examples

Example: Richard needs to set aside time to review documentation, repeat steps from the training manual a number of times and refer to the manual frequently to learn to use new software.

COLLABORATION

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

Example: At 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 interacting with several other stakeholders.

STRENGTHS

AGILITY

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

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

LEARNING ABILITY

- Absorbs information
- Learns effortlessly

Example: Laura quickly learns to use new software. She quickly familiarizes herself with processes and draws parallels between commands in the new and the old software.

COLLABORATION

- Tends to get behind the group's opinions
- Likes to work as part of a team

Example: At work, when Pierre is assigned an individual mandate, he still gets his colleagues' opinion to improve the quality of his work. He likes to discuss his ideas with others. He also easily gets behind team consensus.

COMPETENCIES (cont.)

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT **STRENGTHS**

COMMUNICATION OF INFORMATION

- Fails to convey key information
- Uses ineffective means of communication

Example: Julien often uses paper memos to inform members of his organization about changes to internal policies and procedures, even though employees who sometimes work remotely find out about changes belatedly.

- Disseminates information appropriately to the people who need it
- Uses the right approaches to effectively reach their audience

Example: Michel uses internal discussion networks (e.g., Yammer) to improve the circulation of information. He ensures that everyone concerned can quickly access the information he shares.

ORGANIZATION

- Is flexible in their work structure
- Prefers mandates that require little organization and a summary action plan

Example: When Sophia has to organize the monthly department meeting, she outlines activities that need to be done. But sometimes she neglects to invite key players to these meetings and forgets to reserve or bring essential resources along (e.g., projectors, forms).

- Establishes a clear work structure
- Organizes their work through detailed action plans

Example: When David is asked to organize a department meeting, he quickly sets out the sequence of activities (e.g., reserving a room), assesses the time required for the execution of each activity and sets a timetable.

DECISION MAKING

- Has difficulty making decisions alone
- Hesitates to take action when there are constraints or uncertainty

Example: Aurélie works as an administrative assistant for an airline. Because of the unpredictability of the weather, she regularly has to deal with changing demands (e.g., flight cancellations, schedule changes, etc.). To ensure she is handling the most urgent cases, she prefers to ask her supervisor's advice.

- Makes their positions known
- Takes initiative even in the face of obstacles

Example: Sylvie is an administrative assistant for an airline. Sometimes she has a hard time reaching the chief pilot and her supervisor, who are often travelling. However, she is comfortable taking a position on certain files she has to draft, even if she hasn't had the opportunity to get all the necessary information.

ATTENTION TO DETAIL

- Prefers mandates that require little accuracy
- Considers the overall aspects of a task

Example: Noémie is a receptionist for a car dealer and is responsible for improving the call handling process. She had no trouble proposing a summary action plan for changes. However, having neglected to systematically note the details of each of the activities related to calls processed, she failed to consider certain key steps and had to review the proposed process.

- Is diligent and meticulous
- Applies themselves and is careful in completing their tasks

Example: When Normand, a receptionist at a car dealer, ends a call with a customer, he takes the time to clearly note the request, the people concerned, the action taken and the time spent. He believes he will then be able to use this detailed information to improve call processing.

INTERPRETING THE OVERALL FIT SCORE

HUMANCE

This section of the guide is intended to help you interpret the overall fit score provided in the Administrative support in Development 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 administrative support **in development** 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 administrative support in development 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
Agility	1,5	Organization	2
Collaboration	1	Decision making	
Communication of information	1,5	Attention to detail	2

Additional rule: For the competency "**Learning ability**", 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 "Learning ability" 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 administrative support in development position, but they are still a poor fit because they score below the minimum threshold for "Learning ability". 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.