

The Assessment That Doesn't Stop at "Here's Who You Are"

A director called me in for a reason I hear a lot: her team had good people. Real talent. But the work kept stalling anyway. Meetings ran long, decisions sat in limbo, and some projects moved fast while others never seemed to get off the ground.

She didn't want another report her team would skim once and forget. She wanted the Six Types of Working Genius assessment and debrief to change how the team worked starting that week.

That's the part that sets Working Genius apart from most assessments I've seen. It doesn't just tell people who they are and leave them to figure out what to do with it. It connects straight to the meetings, decisions, and projects they're already sitting in, so the team can put it to use the same day, not sometime after a follow-up report gets filed away.

That mattered for a reason beyond morale. Stalled projects, work that has to get redone, and people who eventually leave because they're stuck doing work that never fits them. All of that carries a real cost. Most teams never trace it back to something as fixable as a mismatch between the work and the people doing it.

The team could put it to use the same day.

The Assessment Revealed an Imbalance

The team map told the story before anyone said a word. One Working Genius showed up again and again. A couple of the other five barely showed up at all.

That gap explained a lot. The team had energy to burn on certain parts of a project and hit a wall on others because the work still needed all six types of genius and the team simply didn't have people who lit up for every stage.

That's an expensive way to run a team, even when nobody's tracking it as a cost. Every project that stalls at the same stage is time and budget slipping quietly out the door. Every person carrying work that never fits their genius is a turnover risk you won't see coming until they've already handed in notice.

Once that clicked, the conversation stopped being about individual scores. The team started mapping their actual work: who owned each stage, where decisions kept stalling, and which pieces of the process didn't have anyone driving them at all.

The conversation stopped being about individual scores and started mapping the actual work.

The Workshop Uncovered a Second Problem

A few people had a genius that matched their role almost perfectly. On paper, they were exactly where they should be. But they didn't have the authority to act on it.

They could see the next move. They were expected to make it happen. And then they'd wait for someone else to sign off.

That's when the real question surfaced: were some of these employees doubting their results because the genius didn't fit, or had the organization built a structure that kept them from using it in the first place?

That distinction matters, and it's the kind of thing that never comes up when an assessment stops at identification. Traits on a page don't tell you where authority is missing. A conversation built around real projects does.



By the end of the workshop, this team wasn't holding a stack of individual profiles. They had a clear picture of where the work was breaking down and exactly what to change on Monday, because Monday had already started.



Where This Goes Next

The workshop gave this team a way to fix what was already broken. But the same map also pointed somewhere else: hiring.

Every open role on that team was still written the old way: a list of duties with no mention of which Working Genius the work actually required. That's how they'd ended up lopsided in the first place. They kept hiring for skills and experience but never once asked whether a candidate brought energy to the stage of work the team was missing.

That's the piece most assessments never touch. They'll tell you who's already on your team. They won't tell you who to hire next so the gap doesn't reopen in six months.

Once a team understands its Working Genius map, that map doesn't retire after the workshop. It becomes part of how the organization writes job descriptions, screens candidates, and builds the next role around the work that's actually missing, not just the work that's easiest to describe in a posting.

That's really what closes the gap this team started with. The stalled work, the rework, the quiet turnover risk, none of that goes away just because a team had one good conversation. It closes when the fix shows up in how the organization runs every day after, starting with the very next person they hire.



*They knew exactly
what to change on
Monday, because
Monday had already
started.*



*The map becomes part of
how the organization
writes roles, screens
candidates, and hires next.*

