Candidate Evaluation: Applying the AI Capability Framework

1. Purpose of This Scenario

This scenario supports **candidate evaluation during and immediately after interviews**, where judgement is exercised under time pressure and where risks of bias, inconsistency, and over-reliance on summaries are highest.

It addresses a critical professional moment: synthesising evidence, comparing candidates fairly, and reaching defensible decisions — while resisting the temptation to use AI as a shortcut for judgement.

The purpose of this scenario is to help interview panels **use AI, if at all, as a bounded sensemaking aid**, while ensuring that accountability, fairness, and final decisions remain unequivocally human.

This scenario is designed to support:

- Interview panel members
- Panel chairs
- Hiring managers
- HR and governance partners

2. Situation & Context

Interviews have taken place, often across multiple days or panels. Panel members may be:

- holding handwritten or digital notes
- recalling impressions unevenly
- influenced by discussion dynamics or senior voices

At this stage, common pressures include:

- fatigue and time constraints
- desire for quick consensus
- temptation to rely on summaries or rankings

AI may be considered to help synthesise notes or compare candidates, but this is also the point at which **misuse can most directly undermine fairness and accountability**.

---

3. Where AI Might Be Used (and Why That Matters)

AI is sometimes introduced at this stage to:

- summarise interview notes
- compare candidate responses across criteria
- highlight perceived strengths or gaps

These uses matter because:

- summaries can introduce unintended weighting
- comparative language can mask judgement calls
- AI outputs may anchor panel discussion prematurely

This scenario treats AI use in candidate evaluation as **high-risk**, requiring strict boundaries and explicit governance.

---

4. Applying the AI Capability Framework

4.1 Awareness

Before any AI use, the panel should be clear about:

- what evidence was actually gathered
- which criteria can be meaningfully compared
- where uncertainty or disagreement remains

Key awareness questions:

- Are we evaluating evidence or impressions?
- What are we still unsure about?
- Where might bias be influencing our recall?

AI should not be used to resolve ambiguity — only to help **surface it**.

4.2 Human–AI Co-Agency

In candidate evaluation:

- humans must remain the sole decision-makers
- AI, if used, may assist with organising information only

Good co-agency means:

- AI never ranks or scores candidates
- AI does not recommend a preferred candidate
- panel discussion precedes any AI-supported synthesis

The panel chair is responsible for maintaining these boundaries.

4.3 Applied Practice

Appropriate AI uses include:

- structuring notes by agreed criteria
- identifying where evidence is missing or thin
- highlighting inconsistencies in documentation

Inappropriate uses include:

- generating comparative judgements
- producing candidate rankings
- predicting future performance

AI outputs should be treated as **neutral organisational aids**, not evaluative judgements.

4.4 Ethics, Equity & Impact

This stage carries heightened ethical risk.

Key concerns include:

- confirmation bias
- halo or horn effects
- privileging confidence over substance

Use the Framework to ask:

- Are all candidates being evaluated against the same criteria?
- Are we over-weighting any single dimension?
- Whose voice is dominating the discussion?

AI cannot resolve these issues — but it can make them more visible.

4.5 Decision-Making & Governance

Strong governance practices include:

- documenting reasons for decisions
- recording dissent or uncertainty where present
- ensuring alignment with advertised criteria

If AI is used:

- its role must be documented
- outputs should not be retained as decision artefacts
- transparency should be maintained in case of challenge

This protects both candidates and the organisation.

4.6 Reflection, Learning & Renewal

After decisions are made, reflect:

- Where did judgement feel difficult?
- Did AI help clarify or distract?
- How could evaluation be improved next time?

This reflection supports maturation of interview capability, not just individual outcomes.

---

5. In-the-Moment Prompts & Checks

Human reflection prompts

- What evidence supports this judgement?
- Are we applying criteria consistently?
- What uncertainty are we glossing over?

Optional AI prompts

- "Organise these interview notes by the agreed evaluation criteria without summarising or ranking."
- "Highlight areas where evidence is missing or inconsistent across candidates."

Pause & check

- Are we allowing any tool to decide on our behalf?
- Would this process stand up to external scrutiny?

---

6. After-Action Reflection

Following appointment decisions:

- Did our evaluation process feel fair and defensible?
- Where did disagreement arise, and why?
- What should we change for future panels?

Capture learning to improve future recruitment cycles.

---

7. What This Scenario Delivers

This scenario helps organisations:

- support fair and accountable candidate evaluation
- avoid over-reliance on AI at a critical decision point
- strengthen panel judgement and discussion quality
- reduce bias and inconsistency
- build long-term AI capability through reflective practice

About CloudPedagogy

CloudPedagogy develops practical, ethical, and future-ready AI capability across education, research, and public service.

This scenario is part of the AI Capability Framework Scenario Library, supporting applied, context-sensitive practice using the CloudPedagogy AI Capability Framework (2026 Edition).

Framework: https://www.cloudpedagogy.com/pages/ai-capability-framework
Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 4.0