



HR DELIVERY

Making Sure HR Delivers

HR DELIVERY WORKSHOP SERIES

Psychometric Testing

An introduction to responsible psychometric testing at work

Build informed questions about psychometric testing at work. Explore purpose, evidence quality, score interpretation and participant experience, using fictional materials to understand when qualified test users and specialist review are needed before selecting or interpreting an instrument.



01 DAY

Introductory taster

IN-HOUSE

Your people. Your context.

PRACTICAL

Explore, discuss and apply

A PRACTICAL STARTING POINT

Understand the topic. Try it in practice.

Psychometric reports can appear precise while leaving important questions about purpose, interpretation and suitability unanswered. Choosing a test requires more than an appealing profile or memorable type description. This introductory awareness workshop helps HR colleagues understand the questions to ask and recognise the boundaries of their own competence.

Develop informed awareness of responsible test use. Participants distinguish common assessment purposes, examine simplified evidence and fictional score reports, and practise briefing a qualified specialist about intended use, relevant populations, accessibility, feedback and the limits of conclusions that a test can support.

WHO IS IT FOR?

HR practitioners, recruiters, learning colleagues and managers who commission or encounter workplace psychometric assessments and want to ask better questions. Prior test-user training is not required for this awareness workshop.

BY THE END OF THE DAY, PARTICIPANTS CAN:**01****Clarify intended use**

Distinguish development and selection purposes and explain why the intended decision shapes the evidence and safeguards needed for a workplace test.

02**Ask about test evidence**

Describe introductory questions about reliability, validity and relevant comparison groups without claiming competence to evaluate a technical manual independently.

03**Interpret score uncertainty**

Explain why a fictional test score should be read with measurement limitations and relevant context rather than as a fixed personal label.

04**Check suitability questions**

Identify language, accessibility and population questions that require specialist review before assuming an instrument is appropriate for a particular employee group.

05**Recognise user boundaries**

Identify when administration, interpretation, feedback or consequential decision-making requires specific competence, publisher authorisation or referral to a qualified specialist.

06**Prepare a specialist brief**

Draft a bounded brief describing purpose, users, population, evidence questions and participant arrangements for discussion with a qualified assessment specialist.

**A useful first
application**

This awareness workshop does not qualify participants to administer, score or interpret restricted tests. It uses fictional materials and refers instrument selection, consequential use and individual feedback to appropriately qualified specialists.

THE FRAMEWORK / WORKSHOP FOCUS

Responsible test-use enquiry — workshop working model

The workshop working model uses six enquiries: purpose, evidence, population fit, administration, interpretation and review. It supports conversations with qualified test users; no actual instrument is administered or treated as validated through workshop participation.

A PRACTICAL LEARNING AID FOR THIS TASTER

01 Purpose

What decision should this test inform, and what remains outside scope?

02 Technical evidence

What evidence supports the proposed interpretation and intended use here?

03 Population and access

How suitable are language, comparison groups and access arrangements for participants?

04 Competent administration

Who is qualified to administer this instrument under its required conditions?

05 Interpretation and feedback

How will uncertainty, context and limitations be explained to the participant?

06 Review and governance

Who reviews usefulness, fairness, data access and concerns about test use?

These questions are a learning aid, not a test or professional qualification. Examples illustrate uncertainty and responsible commissioning; actual instrument requirements, user competence and suitability must be checked with qualified specialists and publishers.



LEARN BY DOING

Explore. Challenge. Make the ideas useful.

Short explanations lead into lively exercises, paired discussion and small-group challenges. Participants test ideas, share experience and build a draft together. The tone is engaging and enjoyable, with time to reflect and connect learning to real work.

01 Match purposes and boundaries

Teams sort fictional assessment requests into development, selection and out-of-scope uses, then identify what a qualified specialist would need to know before advising on an appropriate instrument.

02 Question the supplier brief

Groups inspect simplified fictional product descriptions and technical summaries, identify unsupported claims and prepare questions about purpose, relevant evidence, comparison groups and the qualifications required of users.

03 Read a fictional score report

Participants compare two invented score summaries with uncertainty notes and background context, rewrite overconfident interpretations and identify which conclusions cannot reasonably be drawn from the information provided.

04 Commission a responsible assessment

Teams role-play a client briefing a qualified test user, agreeing purpose, population, participant information and decision boundaries while an observer checks unresolved questions and referral responsibilities.

DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU ACT

Evidence > shared feedback > agreed priorities

Use selected diagnostic prompts to distinguish known facts from assumptions. Discuss the findings and agree their meaning before proposing a solution. Feedback is part of diagnosis, not an afterthought.

ONE CASE, DEVELOPED THROUGH THE DAY

A manager wants to use a popular personality profile to reject applicants who appear insufficiently resilient. HR has a colourful sample report but no clear account of relevant validity evidence, comparison groups or user requirements. Candidates would receive automated labels, and the intended feedback and review process remain undefined.

Groups identify the unsupported uses and missing evidence, then prepare a specialist briefing that clarifies the job-related decision, participant needs and conditions that must be resolved before considering any instrument.

THE FACILITATOR WILL

Invite different perspectives.

Make assumptions visible.

Welcome constructive debate.

Capture practical learning.



SAMPLE WORKSHOP AGENDA

A working day, with room to think.

09:00-16:30 | Six hours of facilitated learning, plus lunch and breaks. The agenda, emphasis and timings are always agreed with the client, including local scheduling needs.

09:00-09:20	Clarify what testing can support Explore workplace assessment purposes and distinguish useful questions from claims that a test reveals a complete or fixed picture of a person.
09:20-10:15	Understand evidence and score limitations Introduce reliability, validity and comparison groups in plain language, using fictional examples to show why a precise number still requires careful interpretation.
10:15-10:30	Break
10:30-11:30	Examine suitability and participant access Explore language, context and accessibility questions, and identify why a qualified specialist must check suitability for the proposed population and intended use.
11:30-12:30	Challenge claims in a supplier brief Review fictional product material, identify missing evidence or exaggerated promises and prepare specific questions about instrument purpose, interpretation and test-user requirements.
12:30-13:30	Lunch
13:30-14:30	Explore administration and participant care Map competence, briefing, conditions, data access and feedback responsibilities, keeping restricted test administration and individual interpretation within appropriately qualified professional practice.
14:30-14:45	Break
14:45-15:30	Read fictional reports with caution Compare invented score summaries, explain uncertainty and rewrite unsupported labels while identifying what additional evidence or specialist interpretation would be necessary.
15:30-16:10	Practise the commissioning conversation Present a bounded assessment brief to peers acting as qualified advisers, clarify decision boundaries and record unresolved suitability or governance questions.
16:10-16:30	Plan an informed specialist enquiry Choose one current testing question and identify the relevant specialist, existing documentation and intended decision needed for a useful follow-up conversation.

Move from an appealing test claim to informed questions about purpose, evidence, participant experience and professional competence.

FROM THE SESSION TO YOUR DESK

Useful models. Practical working records.

The day combines reference materials with drafts developed in the exercises. Each has a clear use beyond the workshop; the work reflects the evidence and perspectives available in the room.

01 Purpose and boundary worksheet

A draft statement of the assessment decision, intended population and limits of use, distinguishing a developmental conversation from a consequential selection or progression decision.

Clarify the question before approaching a publisher or assessment specialist.

02 Test evidence question sheet

An introductory set of questions about reliability, validity, comparison groups and interpretation, designed for discussion with qualified professionals rather than independent approval of technical evidence.

Ask clearer questions when reviewing a proposed assessment service.

03 Fictional interpretation examples

Annotated invented reports showing how uncertainty, context and limited evidence constrain conclusions, including revised wording that avoids fixed personality labels or unsupported predictions about work performance.

Recognise when a report claim needs qualified interpretation or challenge.

04 Participant experience checklist

A commissioning checklist covering briefing, language, access, administration, feedback and data responsibilities, with space for the specialist to specify instrument requirements and suitable arrangements for participants.

Discuss responsible participation before an assessment programme is agreed.

05 Specialist commissioning brief

A practice brief describing purpose, population, intended decisions, available evidence and unresolved questions, with named areas requiring advice from appropriately qualified test users or other specialists.

Prepare a structured conversation about appropriate and competent test use.

06 Governance enquiry plan

A focused follow-up record identifying the instrument documentation, responsible professional, decision owner and concerns to resolve before any proposed test use is considered locally for implementation.

Keep unresolved evidence and competence questions visible to decision-makers.

CONTINUE EXPLORING

Continue with the models, diagnostic manuals and development resources on the HR Delivery website. Workshop exercises provide a first application; a full organisational diagnostic or implementation assignment can be agreed separately.

[Open the framework >](#)

[Explore diagnostic resources >](#)

MAKE THE LEARNING COUNT

A better conversation. A practical next step.

Choose one proposed or existing workplace test and clarify its intended use with the owner. Gather the available documentation and discuss outstanding evidence, competence, access and feedback questions with a qualified specialist before recommending any change.

YOUR FIRST 30 DAYS

01

Days 1-7

Clarify purpose and ownership

Identify one workplace assessment question and speak with its owner. Confirm the intended decision, participant group and instrument, then establish who is qualified to advise on its suitability and interpretation locally.

02

Days 8-21

Prepare specialist questions

Review the available publisher or service documentation at an awareness level. Record questions about relevant evidence, user requirements, participant arrangements and score interpretation, without attempting to administer or reinterpret individual test results.

03

Days 22-30

Agree specialist referral

Discuss the commissioning brief with a qualified specialist and the decision owner. Record which questions remain unresolved, what additional review is needed and whether the proposed use should proceed for further evaluation.

Follow-through is participant-led. Additional facilitation, a full diagnostic or specialist support can be agreed separately.

AVAILABLE IN-HOUSE

Shaped around your organisation

The workshop uses entirely fictional test extracts and score reports. The client may describe an assessment commissioning question, but participants should not bring restricted test content, personal profiles or individual results for interpretation during the day.

PLAN YOUR IN-HOUSE WORKSHOP

Talk to Dr Phillip Welsh

drphillip@hr.delivery

+974 7226 1481

Discuss your workshop

www.hr.delivery