

# ■ CANDIDATE RANKING REPORT

*Generated on February 09, 2026 at 19:31*

■ Job Description:	Elitz_JD.pdf
■ Total Candidates:	5
■ Recommended for Hire:	1
■ Recommended for Interview:	2
■ Talent Pool:	0
■ Not Recommended:	2

## ■ OVERALL CANDIDATE RANKING

Rank	Candidate	Score	Tier	Decision
#1	Python_dev.pdf	0.7308	Excellent	SELECT FAST TRACK
#2	SrivatsavAuswin.pdf	0.5568	Good	SCHEDULE INTERVIEW
#3	jack.pdf	0.4834	Marginal	SCHEDULE INTERVIEW
#4	java.pdf	0.3913	Marginal	REJECT WITH REASON
#5	cpp.pdf	0.2941	Rejected	REJECT WITH REASON

## ■ DETAILED CANDIDATE ANALYSIS

### #1 | Python\_dev.pdf | Score: 0.7308

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.605	35%	0.2117
Domain Compatibility (DCS)	1.000	25%	0.2500
Capability Strength (CSS)	0.345	20%	0.0690
Execution Language (ELC)	1	15%	0.1500
Growth Potential (GPS)	1.000	5%	0.0500

**Decision:** SELECT FAST TRACK

**Rationale:** Strong candidate with excellent role fit (0.605), capability (0.345), and domain compatibility (1.0). Has required programming language. Recommended for fast-track hiring.

**Tier:** Excellent

---

### #2 | SrivatsavAuswin.pdf | Score: 0.5568

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.000	35%	0.0000
Domain Compatibility (DCS)	1.000	25%	0.2500
Capability Strength (CSS)	0.588	20%	0.1176
Execution Language (ELC)	1	15%	0.1500
Growth Potential (GPS)	0.784	5%	0.0392

**Decision:** SCHEDULE INTERVIEW

**Rationale:** Strong ML/Python developer with excellent domain fit (1.0) and capability (0.588). Growth potential: 0.784. Skills are highly transferable to this role. Recommend interview to assess specific project alignment.

**Tier:** Good

---

### #3 | jack.pdf | Score: 0.4834

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
--------	-------	--------	--------------

Role Fit (RFS)	0.000	35%	0.0000
Domain Compatibility (DCS)	1.000	25%	0.2500
Capability Strength (CSS)	0.167	20%	0.0334
Execution Language (ELC)	1	15%	0.1500
Growth Potential (GPS)	1.000	5%	0.0500

**Decision:** SCHEDULE INTERVIEW

**Rationale:** Promising candidate with high growth potential (1.0) and strong domain fit (1.0). Has required programming language. Recommend interview to assess potential and cultural fit.

**Tier:** Marginal

---

## #4 | java.pdf | Score: 0.3913

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.000	35%	0.0000
Domain Compatibility (DCS)	1.000	25%	0.2500
Capability Strength (CSS)	0.652	20%	0.1304
Execution Language (ELC)	0	15%	0.0000
Growth Potential (GPS)	0.217	5%	0.0109

**Decision:** REJECT WITH REASON

**Rationale:** Not recommended: missing required programming language (e.g., Java/C++ developer for Python role).

**Tier:** Marginal

---

## #5 | cpp.pdf | Score: 0.2941

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.000	35%	0.0000
Domain Compatibility (DCS)	0.833	25%	0.2082
Capability Strength (CSS)	0.312	20%	0.0624
Execution Language (ELC)	0	15%	0.0000
Growth Potential (GPS)	0.469	5%	0.0234

**Decision:** REJECT WITH REASON

**Rationale:** Not recommended: missing required programming language (e.g., Java/C++ developer for Python role).

**Tier:** Rejected

# ■ SCORING METHODOLOGY

## Composite Score Calculation:

The final ranking score is calculated using a weighted average of five key metrics:

- **Role Fit Score (35%)**: Measures how well the candidate's experience matches the job requirements based on semantic analysis.
- **Domain Compatibility Score (25%)**: Evaluates technical stack alignment and domain expertise.
- **Capability Strength Score (20%)**: Assesses professional experience, expertise level, and demonstrated capabilities.
- **Execution Language Score (15%)**: Binary check for required programming language proficiency (including equivalents like ML for Python).
- **Growth Potential Score (5%)**: Evaluates learning indicators, certifications, and adaptability.

## Tier Definitions:

- **Excellent ( $\geq 0.7$ )**: Top-tier candidates recommended for immediate action
- **Good ( $\geq 0.5$ )**: Solid candidates worth interviewing
- **Marginal ( $\geq 0.3$ )**: Edge cases, consider for specific needs or talent pool
- **Rejected ( $< 0.3$ )**: Not suitable for current role

## Tiebreaker Rules:

When candidates have identical composite scores, ranking is determined by:

1. Action priority (HIRE > INTERVIEW > POOL > REJECT)
2. Domain Compatibility Score (higher first)
3. Role Fit Score (higher first)
4. Capability Strength Score (higher first)
5. Alphabetical order (last resort)

---

■■■ End of Ranking Report ■■■

*This analysis is based on AI-powered evaluation with PII protection.  
All personal identifiable information has been redacted for privacy compliance.*