

Panel Interview and Scoring Summary

PANEL INTERVIEW & SCORING SUMMARY	
Post:	
Candidate's Name	
Date of Interview	

Presentation Question/Assessment if applicable:

Scoring of Presentation/Assessment if applicable

Presentation Scoring Matrix	Rating
General Quality of Presentation/Assessment (Use of technology; visual impact; clarity; articulation; personal demeanour, body language, engaging with the audience, etc)	/30
Content (Relevance of responses to question set; all elements covered; Directorate; Council and National Level context discussed, etc.)	/70
TOTAL	/100

Summary Comments on Presentation

Panel Interview and Scoring Summary

Interview Questions & Scoring

Competence	Question	Question Asked by	Rating
State Competencies identified for the post	1. Key questions identified relating to competency		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
	6.		
	7.		
	8.		
	9.		
	10.		
	11.		
	12.		
	13.		
	14.		
	15.		
	16.		
TOTAL			/

Summary Comments Supporting Recommendation

Panel Interview and Scoring Summary

QUESTIONS COMPETENCE (One form to be used per competency)	
Question No.: Insert question here and outline feedback below	
Competency definition	
Positive Indicators:	Negative Indicators:
Rating Scale (circle the appropriate number)	
Significantly above the required standard - The candidate demonstrated all or most of the positive indicators related to the competency with no evidence linked to negative indicators. Very strong evidence provided. No obvious development needs.	8
Meets required standard - Demonstrated more positive indicators than negative ones, or the general quality of evidence was acceptable, but not strong enough to push into the top category. Any negative indicators evidenced do not raise concerns regarding ability to perform in the role and could be addressed through relatively basic advice or developmental activity.	5
Below the required standard - The candidate demonstrated more negative indicators than positive ones, or individual pieces of evidence gave cause for concern. Development needs are such that the individual would need quite a lot of support to be effective in the role.	3
No evidence, or significantly below the required standard - The candidate demonstrated a significant number of negative indicators with few, if any positive ones. Development needs are such that it would not be realistic to attempt to address them in the role.	1
Evidence:	
Rating:	