

■ CANDIDATE RANKING REPORT

Generated on February 09, 2026 at 22:19

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

■ OVERALL CANDIDATE RANKING

Rank	Candidate	Score	Tier	Decision
#1	SrivatsavAuswin.pdf	0.8168	Excellent	SELECT FAST TRACK
#2	Python_dev.pdf	0.7790	Excellent	SELECT FAST TRACK
#3	jack.pdf	0.7434	Excellent	SCHEDULE INTERVIEW
#4	java.pdf	0.6513	Good	REJECT WITH REASON
#5	cpp.pdf	0.5457	Good	REJECT WITH REASON

■ DETAILED CANDIDATE ANALYSIS

#1 | SrivatsavAuswin.pdf | Score: 0.8168

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.700	35%	0.2450
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: SELECT FAST TRACK

Rationale: Strong candidate with excellent role fit (0.7), capability (0.588), and domain compatibility (1.0). Has required programming language. Recommended for fast-track hiring.

Tier: Excellent

#2 | Python_dev.pdf | Score: 0.7790

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.700	35%	0.2450
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 (0.7), capability (0.345), and domain compatibility (1.0). Has required programming language. Recommended for fast-track hiring.

Tier: Excellent

#3 | jack.pdf | Score: 0.7434

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.700	35%	0.2450

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: Excellent

#4 | java.pdf | Score: 0.6513

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.700	35%	0.2450
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: Good

#5 | cpp.pdf | Score: 0.5457

Metric	Score	Weight	Contribution
Role Fit (RFS)	0.700	35%	0.2450
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: Good

■ 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 (≥ 0.7)**: Top-tier candidates recommended for immediate action
- **Good (≥ 0.5)**: Solid candidates worth interviewing
- **Marginal (≥ 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.*