INTERPRETATION GUIDE FOR THE
TECHNICAL PROFESSIONAL IN DEVELOPMENT 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 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 development readiness questionnaire

HUMANCE

COMPETENCIES

HUMANCE

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 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

STRENGTHS

ABSTRACT REASONING SKILLS

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

Example: When Francis, an engineer, receives training on new processes and technologies to use at work, he has to set aside time to review the documentation provided, experiment with the new processes and refer regularly to the manual between each stage of a project.

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

Example: After training on a new process, Armand, a civil engineer, easily draws parallels with similar ideas that he has already mastered and as such familiarizes himself quickly with the ideas addressed. He therefore quickly applies what he has learned, without having to spend a long time reviewing the ideas presented.

CONCEPTUAL THINKING

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

Example: When Noémie is confronted with a technical problem on a server and doesn't know what is causing it, she introduces simple solutions that temporarily address the problem. Then, given that she generally doesn't take the time to explore in depth the underlying causes of technical issues, sometimes she has to get an external technician involved to correct situations, the consequences of which are escalating.

- Likes solving complex problems
- Enjoys complex environments

Example: Julie likes to talk to colleagues to develop theories that explain a technical problem on a server. She then considers the short-, medium- and long-term consequences of strategies they intend to introduce to respond to the computer bug, which has a company-wide impact.

DEPTH OF ANALYSIS

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

Example: Normand responds quickly to the computer issues of clients who call the IT service centre. However, sometimes he realizes he didn't collect all the information necessary to resolve the computer bug. His hasty decisions have sometimes meant that he needs to completely review his action plan, wasting considerable time and money.

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

Example: When Rodrigue receives a call at the IT service centre, he makes sure he has asked the client all the questions about anything that could be related to the bug (e.g.: the last thing the user did, software affected, etc.). He then identifies a limited number of actions that can respond to the client's problem, fostering an effective resolution.

INNOVATION

- Likes tradition
- Prefers the conventional and the known

Example: As part of a discussion group on new engineering practices, Christian spends little time exploring the new tools his colleagues use. He recognizes the potential benefit of these tools, but he believes they are unsuited to organization's services. He believes it better to use traditional approaches that are tried and true.

- Likes to question approaches
- Proposes original, innovative solutions

Example: Odette regularly attends discussion groups on new engineering practices 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 team how it can integrate the fruit of these discussions into the organization's existing procedures.

COMPETENCIES (cont.)

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT

STRENGTHS

INDICATOR TRACKING

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

Example: When George, an accountant, writes quarterly financial reports, he notices a drop in net profits in the sales department. But since he hasn't done systematic follow-ups on progress in the department's performance targets, he has a hard time making recommendations to his superior to correct the situation.

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

Example: When Robin notices 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 quarter. Having collected data about achieving the department's performance targets, he has no difficulty drawing correct, fleshed-out conclusions about the possible cause for this drop, effectively supporting this supervisor's efforts.

COLLABORATION

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

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

Example: Laura works in an architecture firm and likes to dive quickly into new client projects without fully exploring their needs. Sometimes she has to review plans for these clients because they do not match their stated needs.

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

Example: Mélina uses a number of strategies to ensure her architectural plans reflect clients' needs. She will schedule several meetings with her clients to ensure they are on the same page. She has no difficulty maintaining cordial relations with them.

GROUP INFLUENCE

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

Example: Laurent likes to carry out his clients' directives on projects he is responsible for. He tends not to present new ideas or take an active part in discussions with clients to improve existing processes.

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

Example: When Myriam has suggestions for reviewing processes for a major project, she is comfortable presenting her ideas to clients during meetings and knows how to rally them around her suggestions.

STRESS MANAGEMENT

- Takes situations to heart
- Is a worrier

Example: Michelle, a computer technician, cares a great deal about her performance at work. During busy times of the year, she has a hard time staying focused, because she has a lot of programs to review. She loses sight of objectives and has a hard time taking a step back from the situation. The pressure really gets to her.

- Puts situations into perspective
- Rarely worries

Example: Maxime is a computer technician known for his focus. During busy periods, he is efficient at programming and report writing. The pressure from his supervisor doesn't seem to affect him too much.

COMPETENCIES (cont.)

HUMANCE

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT

AGILITY

- Likes clear procedures
- Prefers stability and routine activities

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

Example: When Maxime's supervisor asks him to create a new type of inspection report, he wants a great deal of flexibility in its structure to adapt content based on what is inspiring him when he is writing.

STRENGTHS

- 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 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

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

HUMANCE

This section of the guide is intended to help you interpret the overall fit score provided in the Technical Professional 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 a **technical professional** 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 technical professional in development position. Unlike our other assessment reports, our experts suggest that to meet the requirements for this type of position, all skills assessed are of equal importance. As a result, all skills received the same score, i.e. 1 "Important for this 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	Group influence	1	Stress management	1
Indicators 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 a technical professional in development 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.