

HR11 · STEP 4 · INTERIM

Performance Goals & Review Narrative

Capability Gap Summary

Prioritized gap table linking goals, evidence of shortfall, capability area, and development action type for targeted follow-up.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Performance Goals & Review Narrative** workflow (HR11) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

Capability Gap Summary

Employee Role: Senior Data & AI Consultant **Department:** Data & AI Advisory — Applied AI Sub-Team **Organisation:** Northbridge Advisory Partners
Review Period: Current performance review cycle **Prepared By:** Practice Head, Data & AI Advisory (with GenAI drafting assistance) **Date:** Current review-cycle close

Summary: Four capability gaps were identified across the review period, drawn from goals rated Partially Meets or Below. The overall development priority level is **Moderate** — none of the gaps represent a critical performance risk, but targeted action is needed in business development and stakeholder communication before the next review cycle.

| Gap ID | Related Goal(s) | Capability Area | Evidence of Gap | Development Action Type | Priority |
|--------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------|
| GAP-1 | G2 | Executive Communication | Steering committee presentation ran 8 minutes over time; data residency question deferred to engagement lead (Evidence Log, Entry 5). VP of Technology feedback: "Steering presentations could be tighter." | Coaching | High |
| GAP-2 | G3 | Proposal & Commercial Writing | Sole proposal contribution required two revision rounds to meet Northbridge standards — timeline restructuring and risk mitigation language were the primary issues (Evidence Log, Entry 7). No second proposal contribution in the review period. | Stretch Assignment | High |
| GAP-3 | G4 | Sustained Knowledge Sharing | One formal session delivered in the first half of the review period; none in the second half. Follow-up session deprioritised during delivery peak (Self-Assessment, Section 4). Informal mentoring not formalised. | Self-Directed Learning | Medium |
| GAP-4 | G2 | Cross-Practice Relationship Building | Relationships limited to Applied AI sub-team. Self-assessment notes systematic cross-practice networking has not been pursued (Self-Assessment, Section 2). | Mentoring | Low |

Development Action Context

GAP-1 — Executive Communication: The consultant has already adopted pre-read documents as a mitigation. Coaching from a senior engagement lead who regularly presents to C-suite clients would build structured presentation skills. Target: confidently deliver a 15-minute steering update with 5 minutes of Q&A by the next review cycle.

GAP-2 — Proposal & Commercial Writing: Assign the consultant as a named contributor on two upcoming proposals in the next planning window, paired with a senior consultant who is experienced in Northbridge proposal standards. The Practice Head should review first drafts before the final submission round.

GAP-3 — Sustained Knowledge Sharing: The consultant should schedule knowledge-sharing sessions at the start of each quarter rather than reactively. Written formats (case study write-ups, internal wiki contributions) count toward the target and can be maintained during delivery peaks.

GAP-4 — Cross-Practice Relationship Building: Pair with a consultant from another sub-team (e.g., Data Engineering or Strategy & Analytics) for a monthly cross-practice check-in. The L&D Manager can facilitate an introduction.