

HR04 · STEP 2 · INTERIM

Interview Prep (Questions & Guides)

Draft Evaluation Rubric

Strong/Partial/Weak scoring guide for each interview question, translating role criteria into observable evidence standards.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Interview Prep (Questions & Guides)** workflow (HR04) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

Draft Evaluation Rubric: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Role: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Department: Data & AI Advisory

Plan ID: DAA-01

Scale: Strong / Partial / Weak — observable evidence only (aligned to approved question bank).

Technical Skills: GenAI / LLM Deployment

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Q1: Production deployment walkthrough | Cites specific model, deployment architecture, trade-offs, and measurable outcomes | Describes a deployment but lacks specifics on trade-offs or outcomes | Cannot describe a production deployment; references only prototypes or coursework |
| Q2: Deployment failure diagnosis | Identifies failure mode, uses structured debugging, explains corrective action with evidence | Describes an issue but the diagnostic approach is vague or outcome is unclear | Cannot recall a production failure or gives a generic answer with no specifics |
| Q3: Production readiness criteria | References specific readiness gates (testing, monitoring, rollback, sign-off) | Mentions some criteria but misses key elements like monitoring or rollback | Uses subjective measures ("it felt ready") with no structured framework |

Technical Skills: Cloud Platform Expertise (Azure AI)

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|--|---|--|--|
| Q1: Azure AI project walkthrough | Names specific Azure AI services, explains selection rationale tied to project requirements | Mentions Azure but cannot articulate why specific services were chosen | Cannot name specific Azure AI services or describes non-Azure platforms only |
| Q2: Azure performance/cost troubleshooting | Describes a specific issue, diagnostic steps, and quantified improvement | Describes an issue but the resolution is vague or unquantified | Cannot recall a troubleshooting scenario in Azure |

Technical Skills: Programming (Python)

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Q1: Complex Python application | Discusses design decisions (structure, testing, dependencies) with clear rationale | Describes an application but focuses only on output, not maintainability | Cannot describe a complex Python project or gives a trivial example |
| Q2: Production bug resolution | Describes the debugging process, root cause, and a concrete practice change | Describes a bug but the learning or practice change is vague | Cannot recall a production bug or describes a minor issue with no learning |

Technical Skills: Certifications

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|---|--|---|---|
| Q1: Certification influence on practice | Names active certification, gives a concrete example of applied knowledge | Names a certification but cannot connect it to daily practice | No active certification, or certification is expired/irrelevant |
| Q2: Staying current with Azure | Cites specific resources and gives an example of applying new platform knowledge | Mentions staying current but resources are generic ("I read blogs") | No evidence of ongoing learning beyond the certification exam |

Experience: Industry Experience

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|---|--|---|---|
| Q1: Balancing client expectations vs. feasibility | Describes competing priorities, communication approach, and resolution with client | Describes a scenario but the resolution approach is unclear | Cannot provide a consulting-specific example; references only internal projects |

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|---|---|---|--|
| Q2: Professional services vs. in-house delivery | Identifies structural differences with a concrete illustrative scenario | Notes some differences but lacks a specific example | Cannot articulate how consulting delivery differs from product teams |

Experience: Project Leadership

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Q1: End-to-end engagement leadership | Describes scope ownership, client cadence, team coordination, and delivery accountability | Describes some leadership activities but gaps in end-to-end ownership | Describes technical contribution only; no evidence of engagement leadership |
| Q2: Off-track project recovery | Explains early warning signs, corrective actions, and measurable outcome | Describes a problem but the recovery approach is reactive or incomplete | Cannot describe a project recovery; blames external factors without personal action |
| Q3: Knowledge transfer approach | Describes structured approach (docs, training, transition plan) | Mentions handover but the approach is ad-hoc | No evidence of deliberate knowledge transfer |

Core Competencies: Stakeholder Management

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Q1: C-suite presentation | Explains business-impact framing, audience adaptation, and decision influence | Describes a presentation but the adaptation for the audience is limited | Cannot provide an example of presenting to senior stakeholders |
| Q2: Stakeholder disagreement | Demonstrates evidence-based persuasion and willingness to adapt | Describes the disagreement but resolution approach is one-sided | Insisted on technical correctness without engaging with business concerns |

Core Competencies: Adaptability

| Question | Strong | Partial | Weak |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Q1: New team productivity ramp | Outlines deliberate 30/60/90-day approach with specific actions at each stage | Describes general onboarding but lacks a structured ramp-up plan | No evidence of a deliberate approach; waited to be told what to do |
| Q2: Mid-project technology change | Describes the change, learning approach, time to effectiveness, and team support | Describes adapting but the learning approach or timeline is vague | Resisted the change or cannot describe how they adapted |