

HR05 · STEP 1 · INTERIM

Interview Debrief & Consolidation

Cross-Interviewer Evidence Map

Criterion-level comparison of each panelist's ratings, evidence, and notes, showing where interview feedback converges or diverges.

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**.

Cross-Interviewer Evidence Map: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Role: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Department: Data & AI Advisory

Plan ID: DAA-01

Panel: Four interviewers across three stages (scorecards mapped to current criteria; legacy ATS labels noted where applicable).

Technical Skills: GenAI / LLM Deployment

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
Senior Consultant — Data & AI Advisory	Strong (all mapped questions)	Production RAG document Q&A for a financial services client; structured diagnosis of hallucination issues (rate reduced from ~8% to under 1%); concrete readiness checklist (automated regression tests, Azure Monitor latency monitoring, rollback procedure, stakeholder sign-off).	Strongest technical signal in the assessment.

Convergence: Strong agreement — single interviewer with direct criterion coverage in Stage 1; ratings consistently Strong with specific, repeatable evidence.

Technical Skills: Cloud Platform Expertise (Azure AI)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
Senior Consultant — Data & AI Advisory	Strong / Partial	Q1: Designed an Azure ML pipeline; chose Azure over AWS citing client EA agreement and data residency. Q2: Token consumption issue — described looking at logs but did not specify monitoring tools or structured diagnostic steps.	Capability confirmed; infrastructure-level cost optimisation and diagnostic depth uneven.

Convergence: Partial agreement — Strong evidence on solution design; weaker specificity on troubleshooting methodology.

Technical Skills: Programming (Python)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
Senior Consultant — Data & AI Advisory	Partial / Strong	Stage 1: Partial — limited mention of formal testing or CI/CD ("some unit tests but nothing formal"). Stage 2: Strong — production pandas type-coercion bug; introduced property-based tests (Hypothesis); tightened type annotation practice.	Mixed signals across stages; later evidence suggests improved discipline.
Practice Head — Data & AI Advisory	Not rated (time)	Stage 2 Python probe not completed due to time.	—

Convergence: Partial agreement — ratings differ by stage; narrative supports growth rather than flat deficiency.

Technical Skills: Certifications (Azure Data Engineer or Azure AI Engineer)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
Senior Consultant — Data & AI Advisory	Strong / Partial	Holds Azure AI Engineer Associate (recent renewal); cited responsible AI module influencing LLM content filtering. Staying current: Microsoft Learn and lunch-and-learns but no named preview feature adopted early.	Certification verified; ongoing learning adequate, not exceptional.

Convergence: Partial agreement — Strong on credential and application; Partial on depth of continuous learning.

Experience: Industry Experience (professional services / tech consulting)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
Practice Head — Data & AI Advisory	Strong (both questions)	Phased approach to managing unrealistic client timeline on insurance underwriting engagement.	Compelling consulting judgment narrative.
Senior Consultant — Data & AI Advisory	Strong / Partial	Q1 Strong. Q2 Partial — timeline detail inconsistent under follow-up ("3 months" vs "closer to 5 months").	Minor factual consistency caveat.

Convergence: Majority agreement toward Strong with a documented inconsistency on engagement timeline detail.

Experience: Project Leadership (independent client engagements)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
Practice Head — Data & AI Advisory	Strong (all three questions)	Six-month insurance AI strategy engagement; weekly CTO steering committees; ~10% budget variance; structured knowledge transfer (documentation repo, three-session training, 30-day support, strong client feedback).	Full leadership narrative.
Senior Consultant — Data & AI Advisory	Partial / Partial / Weak	Emphasis on technical execution vs. leadership; steering committee ownership shared with delivery manager — unclear client relationship owner; scope recovery described as reactive; knowledge transfer "sounded theoretical" — could not name concrete artefacts; "team handled most of the documentation."	Direct challenge to scope-of-ownership story.

Convergence: Significant disagreement — same sessions interpreted as Strong leadership vs. Partial/Weak leadership and unclear ownership.

Core Competencies: Stakeholder Management (C-suite presentation)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
HR Director — People & Culture	Strong	AI strategy roadmap framed in business impact (\$2.1M projected claims-processing savings); evidence-based resolution of CTO build-vs-buy objection (TCO analysis).	
L&D Manager — People Development	Strong	Scorecard used legacy "Communication Skills" label; confirmed candidate articulate and able to simplify complex AI concepts.	Mapped to Stakeholder Management for debrief.

Convergence: Strong agreement — both Stage 3 interviewers rated Strong with complementary evidence.

Core Competencies: Adaptability (90-day productivity ramp)

Interviewer	Rating	Key evidence cited	Notes
HR Director — People & Culture	Not rated	Called away during adaptability questions; both items blank on scorecard.	Incomplete assessment from this interviewer.
L&D Manager — People Development	Partial / Strong	Scorecard used legacy "Learning Agility" label. Q1 Partial — informal onboarding ("dive in and figure it out"). Q2 Strong — coached team through waterfall-to-agile transition with retrospectives.	Mapped to Adaptability.

Convergence: Insufficient panel coverage for HR Director; L&D evidence mixed — informal ramp style vs. strong methodology-change example.