

Interview Debrief Summary: Senior Data & AI Consultant

Role: Senior Data & AI Consultant **Department:** Data & AI Advisory **Plan ID:** DAA-01 **Interview Period:** Stage 1 through Stage 3 in the current interview cycle **Debrief Date:** Post-panel debrief in the current interview cycle **Debrief Facilitator:** Talent Acquisition Lead, Talent Acquisition

Candidate Overview

The candidate was assessed for the Senior Data & AI Consultant role within the Data & AI Advisory practice at Northbridge Advisory Partners. The interview consisted of three stages: Technical Screen (45 min, conducted by the Senior Consultant from Data & AI Advisory), Case & Competency (60 min, conducted by the Practice Head and the Senior Consultant from Data & AI Advisory), and Leadership & Fit (45 min, conducted by the HR Director and the L&D Manager). The panel evaluated the candidate against eight must-have criteria derived from the finalized role requirements (HR01). Five scorecards were submitted by four unique interviewers.

Strengths (Panel Agreement)

- **GenAI / LLM Deployment** □ **Consensus: Strong** All three questions rated Strong by the Senior Consultant in Stage 1. The candidate demonstrated specific production deployment experience (RAG-based document Q&A system for a financial services client), a structured approach to diagnosing hallucination issues (reduced rate from 8% to under 1%), and a concrete production readiness checklist (automated regression tests, latency monitoring via Azure Monitor, rollback procedure, stakeholder sign-off). This is the strongest technical evidence in the assessment. *Source: Scorecard 1, Senior Consultant, Data & AI Advisory.*
- **Stakeholder Management** □ **Consensus: Strong** Both Stage 3 interviewers rated this area Strong. The HR Director cited the candidate's C-suite presentation of an AI strategy roadmap framed in business impact terms (\$2.1M projected claims processing savings) and evidence-based resolution of a CTO's build-vs-buy objection using total cost of ownership analysis. The L&D Manager (using legacy "Communication Skills" label) confirmed the candidate was "very articulate, good at explaining complex AI concepts in accessible terms." *Source: Scorecard 4, HR Director; Scorecard 5, L&D Manager.*
- **Industry Experience** □ **Consensus: Strong (majority)** The Practice Head rated both questions Strong, citing a compelling phased approach to managing an unrealistic client timeline on an insurance underwriting engagement. The Senior Consultant rated Q1 Strong but Q2 Partial, noting the engagement timeline was inconsistent under probing ("initially said 3 months, then said it might have been closer to 5 months"). The weight of evidence supports a Strong assessment with a minor consistency caveat on detail accuracy. *Source: Scorecard 2, Practice Head; Scorecard 3, Senior Consultant.*
- **Cloud Platform Expertise (Azure AI)** □ **Consensus: Strong/Partial** Stage 1 ratings were Strong for Q1 (designed an Azure ML pipeline, selected Azure over AWS based on client EA agreement and data residency requirements) and Partial for Q2 (vague diagnostic steps for a token consumption issue □ "we looked at the logs" without specifying monitoring tools). Overall capability confirmed; gap in infrastructure-level cost optimisation. *Source: Scorecard 1, Senior Consultant, Data & AI Advisory.*
- **Certifications** □ **Consensus: Strong/Partial** The Senior Consultant rated the Stage 1 question Strong (holds Azure AI Engineer Associate, recently renewed, cited responsible AI module influencing LLM content filtering). The Stage 2 question on staying current was rated Partial (mentioned Microsoft Learn and lunch-and-learns but could not name a specific preview feature adopted early). Active certification confirmed; depth of ongoing learning is adequate but not exceptional. *Source: Scorecard 1, Senior Consultant; Scorecard 3, Senior Consultant.*

Concerns and Risks

1. Project Leadership □ Significant Panel Disagreement [HIGH]

- **Practice Head (Stage 2):** Rated all three questions Strong. Cited a 6-month insurance AI strategy engagement with direct scope ownership, weekly CTO steering committees, 10% budget variance, and a structured knowledge transfer framework (documentation repository, 3-session training programme, 30-day support window, 4.5/5 client feedback).
- **Senior Consultant (Stage 2):** Rated Q1 Partial, Q2 Partial, Q3 Weak. Noted the candidate's day-to-day answers "focused heavily on technical execution rather than leadership." Steering committee management appeared shared with a delivery manager □ "unclear who actually owned the client relationship." The scope creep recovery was "reactive rather than proactive" with no evidence of scope management discipline before the issue escalated. The knowledge transfer framework "sounded theoretical" □ the candidate could not name specific documentation or training materials and said "the team handled most of the documentation."
- **Impact:** Project leadership is a must-have criterion for this role. The panel cannot reach consensus on the candidate's actual engagement leadership scope based on interview evidence alone. This is the primary blocking concern.
- **Suggested Resolution:** Conduct a targeted reference check with the client or delivery manager from the insurance engagement to verify the candidate's scope of ownership.

2. Adaptability (90-day productivity ramp) □ Incomplete Assessment [MEDIUM]

- The HR Director was unable to assess this criterion (called out of the room during the adaptability questions). Both Adaptability ratings are blank on Scorecard 4.
- The L&D Manager covered the questions under the legacy "Learning Agility" label. Rated Q1 Partial (candidate "doesn't usually plan it that formally □ I just dive in and figure it out as I go") and Q2 Strong (strong example of coaching a team through waterfall-to-agile transition with retrospectives).
- **Impact:** The candidate's informal onboarding approach may conflict with Northbridge's structured 90-day programme for new consultants, but the methodology change evidence demonstrates underlying adaptability. Not a blocking concern.
- **Suggested Resolution:** Discuss the 90-day programme expectations explicitly during the offer conversation. No additional assessment required.

3. Programming (Python) □ Mixed Signals Across Stages [LOW]

- The Senior Consultant rated the Stage 1 question Partial (no mention of testing framework or CI/CD □ "we did some unit tests but nothing formal").
- The same interviewer rated the Stage 2 question Strong (described a production bug involving pandas type coercion, implemented property-based tests with Hypothesis, and established explicit type annotation practices).
- The Practice Head did not ask the Python question in Stage 2 due to time constraints.
- **Impact:** The Stage 2 evidence suggests the candidate has adopted stronger testing practices since the earlier project. The gap appears to reflect professional growth rather than a current deficiency.
- **Suggested Resolution:** No follow-up required. Include a review of the practice's engineering standards in the onboarding plan.

Process Notes

- **Legacy scorecard labels:** The L&D Manager's scorecard (Scorecard 5) used deprecated prior-cycle ATS competency labels ("Communication Skills" and "Learning Agility") instead of the approved criteria ("Stakeholder Management" and "Adaptability"). Ratings have been mapped to the current criteria for this debrief. Change request CR-2026-0041 to update the ATS template remains outstanding □ assigned to the HRIS Administrator.
- **Incomplete scorecard:** The HR Director's scorecard (Scorecard 4) has blank ratings for both Adaptability questions due to an unplanned absence during that portion of the interview. Per Section 3 of the Interview Format Guidelines, incomplete scorecards should be flagged before debrief scheduling. This was noted but the debrief proceeded using the L&D Manager's coverage.
- **Scoring calibration:** The upcoming scoring calibration exercise has not yet taken place. The disagreement between the Practice Head and Senior Consultant on Project Leadership may partly reflect uncalibrated rating standards. This is noted but does not change the recommendation to conduct a reference check.

Open Questions

1. **Reference check □ Project Leadership:** The Practice Head and Senior Consultant have a fundamental disagreement on the candidate's engagement leadership capability based on the same interview session. A reference from the insurance AI strategy engagement (client-side or delivery manager) is required before finalising the recommendation. **Owner:** Talent Acquisition Lead. **Deadline:** 5 business days.
2. **ATS template update:** The L&D Manager's scorecard labels do not match the approved criteria. Change request CR-2026-0041 remains open. **Owner:** HRIS Administrator. **Deadline:** Before next interview cycle.
3. **Certification validity check:** Confirm the candidate's Azure AI Engineer Associate certification (recent renewal) has not expired before proceeding to the offer stage. **Owner:** Talent Acquisition Lead. **Deadline:** Before offer generation.

Hiring Recommendation: Hire With Conditions

The panel recommends **Hire With Conditions** for the Senior Data & AI Consultant role. The candidate demonstrated strong technical depth in GenAI/LLM deployment (all three Stage 1 questions rated Strong), confirmed stakeholder management capability (Strong from both Stage 3 interviewers), and solid consulting experience across professional services engagements. Cloud platform and certification evidence is adequate.

The primary blocking concern is the unresolved disagreement on Project Leadership. The Practice Head assessed the candidate's engagement leadership as Strong across all three questions, while the Senior Consultant assessed the same evidence as Partial/Weak, citing unclear ownership, reactive scope management, and theoretical knowledge transfer claims. This disagreement cannot be resolved from interview evidence alone and requires external validation.

Conditions before proceeding to offer:

1. Complete a targeted reference check on the insurance AI strategy engagement, specifically verifying the candidate's scope of ownership, client relationship management, and knowledge transfer deliverables.
2. If the reference supports Strong leadership: proceed to offer (HR06).
3. If the reference supports Partial/Weak leadership: reconvene the panel to determine whether the candidate can develop into the leadership requirements within the 90-day ramp, or whether the role requires a more experienced hire.

Additional offer conversation topics (non-blocking):

- Discuss Northbridge's structured 90-day onboarding programme and set expectations for the candidate's ramp-up approach.
- Note the engineering standards review as an onboarding action item for the Python testing gap.

Panel Sign-Off

Role	Department	Individual Recommendation	Signed
Practice Head	Data & AI Advisory	Hire	Yes
Senior Consultant	Data & AI Advisory	Hire With Conditions	Yes
HR Director	People & Culture	Hire With Conditions	Yes
L&D Manager	People Development	Hire With Conditions	Yes

Hiring Manager Decision: Hire With Conditions approved pending reference check on engagement leadership scope. **Next Step:** Talent Acquisition Lead to initiate reference check and report findings within 5 business days. Upon clearance, proceed to HR06 (Offer Email & Negotiation Talking Points).