

# ADVISIA TALENT AUDIT

ASSESSMENT

Advisia Inc | [info@advisiaglobal.ai](mailto:info@advisiaglobal.ai)

# Advisia Talent Audit Assessment

## *A 3-Minute Diagnostic to Measure Your Organization's AI Human Firewall*

By assigning explicit point values to options A, B, and C, users can tally their subtotals for **AI-IQ** and **AI-EQ** and instantly map themselves to one of the four corporate archetypes.

**Purpose:** Technology alone cannot secure an AI-driven enterprise. This audit evaluates your organization's real-world behavioral posture across two critical axes: **AI-IQ** (Technical & Operational Capability) and **AI-EQ** (Ethical & Governance Intelligence).

### **How to Take This Assessment:**

For each scenario-based question below, select the option (**A, B, or C**) that most honestly reflects your organization's current state. Write the corresponding points in the space provided:

- **Option A = 1 Point**
- **Option B = 2 Points**
- **Option C = 3 Points**

# Section 1: Measuring AI-IQ (Technical & Operational Capability)

**Q1: How does your workforce currently interact with public Generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude) for daily tasks?**

- **A)** It's entirely banned or blocked by IT.
- **B)** People use it freely, but there is no formal prompt training or approved use-case framework.
- **C)** We have designated corporate sandboxes, approved enterprise licenses, and structured guidelines on technical use.
- **Q1 Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Q2: When engineering or product teams procure a third-party AI model/API, what does the technical validation look like?**

- **A)** They just sign up and integrate it; there is no formal data-pipeline review.
- **B)** IT reviews it for standard cybersecurity (uptime, encryption), but not for model-specific behavior or data drift.
- **C)** We run formal technical stress-tests, evaluate training data origins, and map API data-retention policies.
- **Q2 Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Q3: How well does your non-technical staff understand the operational limitations of AI (e.g., hallucinations, data-bias pitfalls)?**

- **A)** They largely treat AI outputs as absolute truth without verification.
- **B)** They are aware it can make mistakes, but verify outputs on an ad-hoc, inconsistent basis.
- **C)** They are systematically trained in output validation; human-in-the-loop verification is a mandatory operational step.
- **Q3 Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Q4: Does your organization have an updated inventory of all AI systems currently used across various departments (HR, Marketing, Sales)?**

- **A)** No, shadow AI is likely rampant across different teams.
- **B)** We have a partial list of primary software tools, but no central registry of specific algorithmic models.
- **C)** Yes, we maintain a living AI System Registry that tracks the deployment status and ownership of every tool.
- **Q4 Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL AI-IQ SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_ *(Add Q1 + Q2 + Q3 + Q4 | Range: 4 to 12)*

## Section 2: Measuring AI-EQ (Ethical & Governance Intelligence)

**Q5: If an employee discovers that an internal AI tool is showing significant bias (e.g., favoring specific resumes in HR), what is the protocol?**

- **A)** There is no clear reporting channel; it would likely be handled informally or ignored.
- **B)** They would report it to their direct manager, but we lack a documented incident response playbook for AI.
- **C)** We have a whistleblowing/reporting mechanism and a designated AI Trust/Ethics lead to handle algorithm remediation.
- Q5 Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q6: To what extent are your organization's core values integrated into your AI development or procurement cycle?**

- **A)** Ethics aren't discussed; our only metrics are speed, cost, and output efficiency.
- **B)** We talk about "responsible AI" conceptually, but we don't have actionable ethical boundaries written into project scope documents.
- **C)** Every AI project requires an upfront AI Impact Assessment covering fairness, transparency, and societal impact.
- Q6 Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q7: How prepared is your leadership team to handle the evolving global regulatory landscape (like the EU AI Act or upcoming local frameworks)?**

- **A)** We are completely reactive; we will worry about laws when they affect us directly.
- **B)** Leadership is aware of the regulatory shift but hasn't mapped how these laws apply to our current product roadmap.
- **C)** We practice active horizon scanning; our governance framework is designed to adapt to global compliance shifts seamlessly.
- Q7 Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q8: Who ultimately holds the legal and ethical liability for algorithmic outcomes in your company?**

- **A)** It is ambiguous; responsibility is blurred between the engineering teams and vendors. *(1 Point)*
- **B)** The IT or Legal department covers it generally, but it isn't their dedicated focus. *(2 Points)*
- **C)** We have defined C-suite accountability (e.g., an AI Trust Officer, Governance Committee, or specialized Advisory Board). *(3 Points)*
- Q8 Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL AI-EQ SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_ (Add Q5 + Q6 + Q7 + Q8 | Range: 4 to 12)**

# Find Your Archetype Matrix

To discover your organization's profile, match your **AI-IQ** score and **AI-EQ** score thresholds to the grid below:

	Low AI-EQ (4 to 8 Points)	High AI-EQ (9 to 12 Points)
High AI-IQ  (9 to 12 Points)	<b>The Rogue Innovators</b>  Your team is technically brilliant but ethically exposed. You are building powerful tools on a fragile foundation, creating massive hidden liability.	<b>The Trust Champions</b>  Your human firewall is robust. You balance technical velocity with structural governance. <i>(Perfect candidates for rapid ISO 42001 Certification).</i>
Low AI-IQ  (4 to 8 Points)	<b>The Inert Spectators</b>  Your team is falling behind technically and lacks the governance structure to safely adopt AI. You risk operational obsolescence and accidental non-compliance.	<b>The Paralyzed Academics</b>  You have great ethical intentions and understand the risks, but your team lacks the technical maturity to securely scale AI solutions.

# Next Steps & Strategic Alignment

If you scored as a...

- **Rogue Innovator:** Most Rogue Innovators have severe gaps in Clause 5 (Leadership) and Annex A (AI Controls) of ISO 42001. Your technical speed is outpacing your safety net.
- **Paralyzed Academic:** Your governance intentions are excellent, but your operational friction is stalling innovation. You need automated, scalable workflows.
- **Inert Spectator:** Your immediate priority is foundational creating an inventory of your baseline assets and building an initial corporate AI policy.
- **Trust Champion:** You are in an elite tier. Your next phase is formalizing your mature systems to achieve global validation.

## Ready to Turn Your Score into an Actionable ISO 42001 Roadmap?

These 8 questions are an excellent baseline, but achieving formal ISO 42001 certification requires an organization-wide deep dive.

Share your final score with us at [info@advisiaglobal.ai](mailto:info@advisiaglobal.ai). We will evaluate your initial benchmarks and reach out to schedule a brief consultation. Together, we will map out a detailed organizational assessment and design the exact roadmap your company needs to achieve compliance.