

HR05 · STEP 2 · INTERIM

Interview Debrief & Consolidation

Agreement and Disagreement Analysis

Structured readout of strong panel agreement, significant disagreement, and insufficient evidence before concerns are escalated.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Interview Debrief & Consolidation** workflow (HR05) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

Agreement and Disagreement Analysis: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Role: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Department: Data & AI Advisory

Plan ID: DAA-01

Inputs: Cross-Interviewer Evidence Map (all eight must-have criteria represented).

Strong agreement

- **GenAI / LLM Deployment — consensus Strong**

The Senior Consultant documented consistent Strong ratings across all Stage 1 questions with specific production deployment, failure-mode diagnosis, and readiness-gate evidence. No conflicting interviewer input on this criterion.

- **Stakeholder Management — consensus Strong**

The HR Director and L&D Manager (legacy label mapped) both rated Strong, citing C-suite business framing and clear explanation of complex AI topics.

- **Industry Experience — majority Strong with caveat**

The Practice Head rated both questions Strong. The Senior Consultant rated Q1 Strong and Q2 Partial due to timeline inconsistency under probing. Collective assessment supports Strong with a minor accuracy caveat on engagement duration detail, not a fundamental consulting-gap signal.

Significant disagreement

- **Project Leadership — two-or-more-level spread; conflicting narratives**

- **Practice Head:** Strong across all three questions — scope ownership, steering cadence, budget control, structured knowledge transfer, positive client feedback.

- **Senior Consultant:** Q1 Partial, Q2 Partial, Q3 Weak — leadership scope unclear vs. delivery manager; reactive scope recovery; knowledge transfer lacking concrete artefacts.

Evidence driving the split: Same engagement stories interpreted as full engagement leadership vs. technical execution-heavy participation with weak ownership signals. This criterion is must-have for the role; disagreement is material to the hiring decision.

Insufficient evidence

- **Adaptability (90-day productivity ramp)**

The HR Director could not complete ratings (absence during questions). The L&D Manager provided Partial/Strong evidence under a legacy scorecard label. Panel cannot claim a complete, calibrated view of ramp behaviour against Northbridge's structured 90-day programme from interview data alone.

- **Programming (Python) — cross-stage inconsistency (watch item)**

Not classified as "insufficient" for volume of evidence (multiple ratings exist), but Stage 1 vs Stage 2 signals differ enough that engineering standards should be confirmed in onboarding rather than treated as fully closed from interviews.