

HR13 · STEP 3 · INTERIM

Promotion / Calibration Panels

Justification Strength Report

Assessment of each promotion rationale for evidence quality, specificity, and risk of inconsistency before the panel finalizes decisions.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Promotion / Calibration Panels** workflow (HR13) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

Justification Strength Report

Cycle: Current promotion review **Organisation:** Northbridge Advisory Partners **Prepared By:** HR Business Partner, People & Culture (with GenAI drafting assistance) **Date:** Current panel analysis date **Confidentiality:** Internal — Restrict Access

This report flags every candidate-criterion pair where the evidence is Partial or No Evidence, identifies candidates whose overall case relies on fewer than half the criteria having Strong evidence, and highlights inconsistencies where strength ratings on related criteria contradict each other.

1. Weak Evidence Flags

Candidate	Criterion	Current Strength	Risk Note
Senior Data & AI Consultant	C2: Stakeholder & Client Management	Partial	Steering committee over-run and deferred data residency question indicate executive-level presentation readiness is not yet at Principal Consultant standard. VP of Technology feedback explicitly flags this.
Senior Data & AI Consultant	C3: Business Development	No Evidence	One proposal contribution with two revision rounds and no second contribution. The current two-proposal threshold requires two proposals. At Principal Consultant level, proactive commercial contribution is a core expectation.
Senior Data & AI Consultant	C4: Knowledge Sharing	Partial	One brown-bag session in the first half of the review period with none in the second half. Three informal mentoring sessions not formalised. Falls below the two-contribution threshold.
Senior Data & AI Consultant	C5: Leadership & Team Development	Partial	Peer feedback is positive on helpfulness but no formal delegation, coaching, or cross-practice leadership evidence is documented.
Senior Management Consultant	C4: Knowledge Sharing	No Evidence	No formal knowledge-sharing sessions, published case studies, or methodology contributions. Informal mentoring is undocumented. For Principal Consultant, internal contribution is expected alongside client delivery.
Senior Management Consultant	C6: Professional Development	Partial	One of two planned electives completed. Second elective deferred. While the completed elective is relevant, the incomplete plan suggests development follow-through is inconsistent.
Senior Cloud Infrastructure Engineer	C3: Business Development	Partial	One proposal contribution (\$120K, won) but no second contribution. The managed services upsell was identified but not advanced. Manager notes: "could have owned the upsell conversation but waited for the Engagement Manager to initiate."
Senior Cloud Infrastructure Engineer	C5: Leadership & Team Development	Partial	Formal mentoring is a strength, but peer feedback notes: "defaults to doing the work rather than delegating to the team." This contradicts the delegation expectation for Lead Engineer.
Engagement Manager	C4: Knowledge Sharing	Partial	One case study published but no brown-bag sessions or methodology contributions. Self-assessment acknowledges a preference for written formats, which limits reach.
Engagement Manager	C5: Leadership & Team Development	Partial	360-degree feedback summary not included in the review pack (incomplete submission). Peer feedback and manager narrative both flag a pattern of holding decisions close rather than empowering team leads. This is a recurring theme from prior review cycles.

2. Below-Threshold Cases

Per the Promotion Criteria Framework, candidates with fewer than half their criteria (i.e., fewer than 3 of 6) rated Strong are flagged as below the promotion readiness threshold.

Candidate	Strong Count	Total Criteria	Status
Senior Data & AI Consultant	2 of 6	6	Below threshold — only Technical Excellence (C1) and Professional Development (C6) are rated Strong. Four criteria are Partial or No Evidence.

Detail: The Senior Data & AI Consultant has one No Evidence rating (Business Development) and three Partial ratings (Stakeholder Management, Knowledge Sharing, Leadership). Under the framework's overall readiness rules, this maps to "Not Ready" (Strong on fewer than 3 of 6 criteria). However, the candidate's technical delivery is the strongest on the Applied AI sub-team, and the nominating manager's narrative argues the commercial readiness gap is partly attributable to the onboarding period. The panel should discuss whether the circumstances justify a Defer with Development Plan rather than Not Ready.

3. Inconsistency Alerts

Candidate	Criteria Pair	Inconsistency	Explanation
Senior Data & AI Consultant	C1 (Strong) vs. C2 (Partial)	Related	Technical Excellence is Strong — deliverables are consistently high-quality and client-rated. However, Stakeholder Management is Partial — the same client engagement that produced a 4.3/5.0 satisfaction rating also produced the steering committee over-run. The inconsistency suggests that the candidate's working-level client relationships are strong, but executive-level communication is a separate and weaker capability.
Senior Management Consultant	C1 (Strong) vs. C4 (No Evidence)	Contradictory	Delivery excellence is well-evidenced, but no knowledge was shared back to the organisation from those delivery experiences. A Principal Consultant who delivers strong client work but does not contribute to the practice's collective capability creates a sustainability concern.
Senior Cloud Infrastructure Engineer	C4 (Strong) vs. C5 (Partial)	Contradictory	Knowledge Sharing is the strongest rating in this cycle (two sessions, a published runbook, formal mentoring). However, Leadership & Team Development is Partial because peer feedback identifies a pattern of doing work rather than delegating. Sharing knowledge is not the same as developing others through delegation and empowerment — the panel should probe whether the knowledge-sharing rating masks a delegation gap.
Engagement Manager	C2 (Strong) vs. C5 (Partial)	Related	Stakeholder Management with external clients is Strong — no escalations, successful scope extension. But Leadership & Team Development with the internal team is Partial — the delegation and decision-sharing pattern is the mirror image. This suggests the candidate prioritises client-facing relationships over team empowerment, which is a risk at Senior Engagement Manager level where both are expected.

Summary

- **1 candidate** (Senior Data & AI Consultant) is below the promotion readiness threshold with 2 of 6 criteria rated Strong.
- **3 candidates** (Senior Management Consultant, Senior Cloud Infrastructure Engineer, Engagement Manager) meet the minimum threshold of 4 of 6 criteria rated Strong, but each has at least one Partial rating and the Senior Management Consultant has one No Evidence.
- **4 inconsistency alerts** were identified that the panel should address during calibration discussion.
- **1 incomplete submission** (Engagement Manager — missing 360-degree feedback) affects the reliability of the Leadership assessment.
- **1 threshold change** (Business Development — current criteria update from one to two proposals) affects two candidates and the panel should confirm retrospective applicability.