

Candidate: **Betty Penske**
Assessment: Workplace Simulation - Driver
Completed: September 1, 2024
Prepared for: Susan Bookman
HR Avatar Data Collection Account

Test Results and Interview Guide

The Workplace Simulation - Driver assessment measures key factors related to high performance and tenure in this job. Attribute types measured vary by test, but can include cognitive ability, skills, knowledge, personality characteristics, emotional intelligence, and past behavioral history. This report includes a one page summary, followed by detailed results with an embedded interview guide. Note that these results should always be used as a part of a balanced candidate selection process that includes independent evaluation steps, such as interviews and reference checks.

Detail

Candidate:	Betty Penske, bettypenske@yourcompany.org
Assessment:	Workplace Simulation - Driver
Authorized:	September 1, 2024, by Susan Bookman, HR Avatar Data Collection Account, sue.bookman@richardson.biz
Started:	September 1, 2024, 12:53:43AM EST
Completed:	September 1, 2024, 12:53:43AM EST
Overall Score:	86

Cognitive Abilities Detail


This section contains a list of job-related cognitive abilities that have been evaluated in a job-like context using simulation technology. Studies have demonstrated that cognitive abilities are highly correlated with job performance for many jobs. Abilities also correlate with problem-solving and the ability to learn quickly.

Detail	Interview Guide
<div>Analytical Thinking and Attention to Detail</div> <div>Score: 86</div> <div><div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div><div>020406080100</div></div> <div><i>Description:</i></div> <div>This scale indicates both the capacity to think in a thoughtful, discerning way, to solve problems, utilize resources, analyze data, and apply attention to detail. Individuals who demonstrate high amounts of analytical thinking are able to recognize patterns rapidly, navigate through problems, and resolve difficult problems systematically. Individuals who demonstrate high attention to detail produce work products that are consistently accurate and require little checking. They rarely forget schedule commitments or overlook even the smallest details.</div> <div><i>Interpretation:</i></div> <div>High scores in this area correlate with superior performance for many jobs.</div> <div>Able to think in a thoughtful, discerning way. Can often solve difficult problems, plan many-featured tasks and projects, organize multiple resources, and analyze complex data. Able to quickly recall and use information when needed or appropriate. Additionally, able to achieve a high degree of thoroughness and accuracy in a work task. Concerned for all areas involved. Work products require little or no review or checking to maintain consistency.</div>	<div>Can you give me an example of where your attention to detail or your thoughtful analysis of a situation helped make a project successful?</div> <div><div><div>★</div><div>1</div><div>Poor example. Does not show attention to detail or analytical ability.</div></div><div><div>★</div><div>2</div><div></div></div><div><div>★</div><div>3</div><div>Moderately relevant or impactful example.</div></div><div><div>★</div><div>4</div><div></div></div><div><div>★</div><div>5</div><div>Strongly relevant and clear example.</div></div></div> <div><hr/></div> <div>How do you handle a situation when you've messed up due to overlooking an important detail?</div> <div><div><div>★</div><div>1</div><div>Is unable to handle the situation.</div></div><div><div>★</div><div>2</div><div></div></div><div><div>★</div><div>3</div><div>Demonstrates the ability to admit to their error and quickly fix the error, but didn't put preventative systems in place.</div></div><div><div>★</div><div>4</div><div></div></div><div><div>★</div><div>5</div><div>Demonstrates the ability to admit to their error, put preventative systems in place and quickly fix the error.</div></div></div>


Identity Confirmation Photos

The following photos of the candidate and any identification were uploaded during the assessment session.


Photo Analysis Results	
- Risk:	Medium risk of cheating based on image inconsistencies
- Percent match among processed faces	100%
- Total images processed	17
- Total images with valid faces	14 (82%)
- Total pairs of faces compared	13
- Pairs in which faces matched	13 (100%)




Pre/Post-Test Photo




ID Photo




In-Test Error Detected (No Face Detected)




In-Test Error Detected (No Face Detected)




In-Test Error Detected (No Face Detected)




In-Test Photo




In-Test Photo



In-Test Photo



In-Test Photo



Pre/Post-Test Photo

Report Preparation Notes

- Hiring decisions should never be based on a single source of information. The most effective use of this assessment report is as a part of a multi-faceted program of candidate evaluation that includes resume review, interviews, and reference checks.
- Overall vs Percentiles Scores: The overall score reflects the success in the test, based on the mean (average) and standard deviation of the test scores. The percentile score reflects the percentage of test-takers who scored equal or below this overall score. We recommend you use the Overall Score as your primary evaluation criteria. However, percentile scores can often be useful in comparing specific candidates against one another and with a group, such as for test takers in a certain organization or within a certain account.
- Note that comparison information is calculated based on completed instances of this assessment at that time the assessment is scored. As additional instances are completed, the comparative data may change. You can always update a report to the current values by clicking on 'Recalculate Percentiles' within the online results viewing pages at www.hravatar.com.
- Most competency scores are norm-based, which means that they can be interpreted in terms of their distance from the average or mean score. For all scales, a score equal to the mean receives a score of 65 and scores above and below this value are set so that a score change of 15 equals one standard deviation.
- For linear competencies, higher is better across the entire scale. For these scales a score between 65 and 80 (light green) represents 0 to 1 standard deviation above the mean and a score above 80 (dark green) represents more than one standard deviation above the mean. Similarly, a score of 50 - 65 (yellow) represents 0 to 1 standard deviation below the mean, while a score of 35 - 50 (orange) equates to 1 to 2 standard deviations below the mean, and a score below 35 represents more than 2 standard deviations below the mean.
- Sim ID: 15945-1, Key: 0-0, Rpt: 13, Prd: 6808, Created: 2024-09-01 05:53 UTC
- UA: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3; Trident/7.0; Touch; rv:11.0) like Gecko

Score Calculation Detail

The following table provides a summary of how the overall score was calculated from the individual competency scores. Competency scores are calculated on a 0-100 scale by first calculating a Z statistic based on test-taker responses and then transforming the Z value to a scale with target mean and standard deviation. Certain competencies have a normal score distribution where it is best to be closest to the mean. For these competencies we modify the Z statistic by multiplying its absolute value by minus 1 for the overall score calculation. Next, to calculate the overall score, a weighted average of all modified competency Z statistics is computed and this weighted average is itself transformed to a Z statistic, which is then transformed to a score with the same target mean and standard deviation. Finally outlier scores are adjusted if they are below 0 or above 100.

Competency	Score	How applied to overall	Score Value Used	Weight (%)
Analytical Thinking and Attention to Detail	86.0769	Z-Statistic	1.4051	100.0000
Weighted Average of Competency Z-Scores:				1.4051
Mean applied to Raw Weighted Avg:				0.0000
Standard Deviation applied to Raw Weighted Avg:				1.0000
Normalized Raw Score:				1.4051
Mean:				65.0000
Standard Deviation Used:				15.0000
Final Overall Score:				86.0769

Notes

(This area is intentionally blank - it's reserved as space for your notes.)