

## **new Candidate**

### **21 April 2025**

#### **Assessment**

Total Score: 26

#### **Qualitative Analysis - Positive**

- You effectively introduced the new tool and its purpose, making it clear that it's a video analysis tool that provides automatic feedback to learners.
- You showed enthusiasm and interest in the tool, stating that it will be useful for learners and save time, which is a positive aspect of your presentation.
- You also demonstrated a willingness to receive feedback and improve the tool, which is a great attitude to have, and you invited the learners to try it out and provide their feedback.

#### **Qualitative Analysis - Areas of Improvement**

- You could improve by providing more specific details about the tool, such as how it works and what kind of feedback it provides, to give learners a better understanding of its capabilities.
- You used vague phrases such as 'I guess it will be useful' and 'I think it will be good', which could be replaced with more confident and assertive language.
- You didn't provide a clear timeline for when the demo will be arranged, stating 'in a few days, a day or two maybe', which could be clarified to give learners a more specific idea of when to expect it.
- You could benefit from providing more examples or scenarios of how the tool can be used, to help learners visualize its potential applications.
- You ended the presentation abruptly with 'Thank you', which could be replaced with a more conclusive statement or a call to action, such as 'I look forward to hearing your feedback and working together to improve the tool.'
- Facial expressions were moderate. While present at times, increasing expressiveness could make the talk more dynamic.
- The speaker rarely used any gestures. Incorporating some body language could significantly boost engagement.



### Detailed Evaluation Metrics

No.	Individual Parameters	5 Point scale: Excellent(5), Good(4), Satisfactory(3), Needs Improvement(2), Poor(1)	Feedback
1.	Did the speaker speak with confidence? <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Posture</li><li>• Smile</li><li>• Eye Contact</li><li>• Energetic Start</li></ul>	4 3 3 3	<b>Good</b> <b>Satisfactory</b> <b>Satisfactory</b> <b>Satisfactory</b>
2.	Was the content interesting and as per the guidelines provided?	1	The content was somewhat interesting, but it lacked depth and specific details, and did not fully follow the guidelines provided.
3.	Did they use any gesture with thier hands or body while speaking?	4	The speaker rarely used any gestures. Incorporating some body language could significantly boost engagement.
4.	Did they have expression on their face?	4	Facial expressions were moderate. While present at times, increasing expressiveness could make the talk more dynamic.
5.	Who are you and what are your skills, expertise, and personality traits?	3	You are an individual with basic presentation skills, and you performed well in introducing the topic, but struggled to provide engaging and detailed information.
6.	Why are you the best person to fit this role?	1	You are a potential fit for the role, but you performed poorly in showcasing your unique strengths and qualifications.
7.	How are you different from others?	1	You are different from others in your ability to introduce new tools, but you performed poorly in highlighting what sets you apart from others.
8.	What value do you bring to the role?	1	You bring a basic understanding of the tool and its potential benefits to the role, but you performed poorly in demonstrating how you can effectively utilize and promote it.



9.	Did the speech have a structure of Opening, Body, and Conclusion?	3	The speech had a loose structure, starting with an introduction, transitioning into a brief explanation, and concluding with a vague call to action.
10.	Did the speaker vary their tone, speed, and volume while delivering the speech/presentation?	3	You maintained a generally consistent tone, but your delivery speed was often rushed, and you could have benefited from varying your volume to add emphasis to key points.
11.	How was the quality of research for the topic? Did the speech demonstrate good depth? Did they cite sources?	1	The quality of research for the topic was limited, and the speech lacked proper citations and credible sources to support the claims made about the tool. The depth of knowledge was also superficial, and more specific examples and details would have strengthened the presentation. Overall, the research and preparation for the topic seemed inadequate.
12.	How convinced were you with the overall speech on the topic? Was it persuasive? Will you consider them for the job/opportunity?	1	I was not fully convinced by your overall speech on the topic, as it lacked persuasive power and failed to effectively demonstrate the tool's value and benefits. While you showed some potential, the presentation was not engaging or memorable, and I would need to see more to consider you for the job or opportunity.