

Automated AI-Powered Audition Analysis – POC Proposal

Overview

In traditional casting and interview workflows, evaluating 100+ Candidate audition can be time-consuming, subjective, and inconsistent. Each audition demands attention, energy, and coordination across creative teams or evaluators. Our solution aims to significantly reduce that load by offering an AI-powered audition assessment platform that automates the first layer of talent evaluation — helping you quickly shortlist top-tier candidates with objective, consistent, and detailed feedback.

This Proof of Concept (POC) demonstrates how modern AI models can assist casting directors, production teams, or creative leads in making more efficient, faster, and sharper talent decisions — without compromising the nuances of performance.

What Does the Solution Do?

The platform accepts **video auditions (up to 10 minutes)*** and delivers a comprehensive performance evaluation based on predefined artistic criteria.

Input Options

- A candidate's video audition (MP4)
- Optionally:
 - A **reference performance video** (to act as a benchmark)
 - Or a **written script or scenario** (to guide contextual scoring)

Output

- A structured **report card** for each candidate, broken down into categories such as:
 - Facial expressions and emotional accuracy
 - Body language and gesture quality
 - Voice clarity, modulation, and pacing
Timing, delivery, and synchronization
 - Screen presence, authenticity, and emotional impact
- Scores (out of 10) per metric
- Professional feedback with rationale and improvement tips
- A downloadable report (JSON/Text format) for internal review or discussion

Overall Candidate Summary

Full Evaluation Report | Score Overview Table

Detailed Evaluation

Facial Expressions & Emotions

Detected Emotions (Score: 8/10)
Rationale : The actor effectively portrays a range of emotions, from initial anger and indignation to playful amusement and finally, assertive confidence. Expressions are mostly well-matched to the dialogue.
Improvement : Subtlety could be explored further. While expressions are present, some could be less exaggerated to feel more natural and believable.

Micro-expressions (Score: 7/10)
Rationale : Fleeting expressions, particularly around the eyes, hint at underlying emotions and add depth. However, opportunities for more nuanced micro-expressions exist.
Improvement : Focus on incorporating more subtle shifts in facial muscles to reveal complex internal states, especially during moments of contemplation or inner conflict. Consider using the eyes to convey more.

Consistency (Score: 9/10)
Rationale : Emotional transitions are largely smooth and consistent throughout the scene. The character arc is believable.
Improvement : Maintain consistency while subtly varying the intensity of expressions. Avoid overly dramatic shifts that might feel jarring.

Gestures & Body Language

Gesture Quality (Score: 7/10)
Rationale : Gestures are generally purposeful, but at times, they feel a bit stiff and lack fluidity.
Improvement : Work on loosening up the body and using more natural, less deliberate movements. Explore more subtle gestures to enhance the message.

Brief Metrics Table

Full Evaluation Report | Score Overview Table

Section	Metric	Score
0 Facial Expressions & Emotions	Detected Emotions	8
1 Facial Expressions & Emotions	Micro-expressions	7
2 Facial Expressions & Emotions	Consistency	9
3 Gestures & Body Language	Gesture Quality	7
4 Gestures & Body Language	Expressiveness	8
5 Gestures & Body Language	Physical Coordination	8
6 Voice & Speech	Clarity	9
7 Voice & Speech	Modulation	7
8 Voice & Speech	Pacing & Rhythm	7
9 Voice & Speech	Emotional Inflection	8

[Download JSON Report](#)

[Download Text Report](#)

Download and Save Results (Analytics)

Audition Analysis (up to 100 Candidates)

Filter by Score Range

Parameter: Facial Expressions & Emotions | D

Score Range: 0 to 60

50 candidates match

Scores Table

Candidate	Facial Expressions & Emotions Detected [Gestures & Body Langua	Voice & Speech	Stage Presence & Character Engagemen
candidate_41.json	6	6	7	9
candidate_67.json	6	6	7	8
candidate_32.json	6	5	6	9
candidate_34.json	6	6	7	9
candidate_26.json	6	6	6	9

Total Candidates by Score

Score	Count
1	35
2	35
3	35
4	35
5	35
6	35
7	22
8	18
9	18
10	18
10	35

Number of Candidates

Business Value

- **Cut Evaluation Time by 80%:** Instead of manually watching and rating every video, focus only on shortlisted, high-scoring candidates.
- **Consistency Across Evaluations:** Every audition is judged on the same criteria — no bias, no fatigue.
- **Supports Different Evaluation Modes:** Use benchmark videos, scripts, or scenes to customize what “good” looks like for each role.
- **Instant Feedback:** Output generated within ~30–60 seconds per video — reducing weeks of review to hours.

Pricing (Example - Based on Free & Paid Model Usage)

Metric	Estimate (Assuming 10-min Videos)
Avg. Processing Cost per Video	\$0.40–\$0.60 (Paid Tier)*
Assumed Evaluation Volume	100 videos
Assumed Processing Cost (AI)	~\$15–\$30 (Free Tier) / ~\$40–\$60 (Paid)
Traditional Manual Cost	~\$600–\$1,000+ (based on evaluator hours)
Total Processing Time (Model)	~30–50 hours per 100 auditions

Pricing is based on current usage estimates of Google Gemini models for ~10-min inputs. Can scale affordably for higher volumes.

Why This Matters

This solution doesn’t aim to replace creative judgment — it enhances it. By automating the heavy lifting of first-round screening, teams can:

- Focus on human storytelling, not mechanical shortlisting
- Bring structure to an otherwise subjective process
- Reduce project timelines and operational overhead
- Build a performance-first casting process — powered by AI, directed by human vision

Next Steps

This POC is live and functional. We are ready to:

- Run your internal video samples through the platform
- Customize scoring criteria for specific roles or genres
- Discuss integration with your talent pipelines or audition platforms

Let's reimagine how creative evaluation works — faster, sharper, smarter.