

Product Sense Interview Evaluation Framework

Scoring Scale Overview

- 1 = Major gaps/issues
- 2 = Below expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations (passing)
- 4 = Above expectations
- 5 = Exceptional

Evaluation Dimensions

1. Product Motivation & Mission (Weight: 20%)

5/5 Score Requirements:

- Clear description of product/experience fundamentals
- Strong connection to company mission
- Compelling articulation of market gaps/needs
- Deep insight into why this matters now
- Specific, actionable mission statement

Common Issues:

- Generic mission statements
- Missing status quo analysis
- Weak connection to company strategy
- Insufficient market context

2. Target Audience (Weight: 25%)

5/5 Score Requirements:

- Comprehensive ecosystem player identification
- Clear rationale for selected group
- Well-defined, mutually exclusive segments
- Strong prioritization framework
- Vivid, specific persona development

Common Issues:

- Overlapping segments
- Missing key stakeholders
- Weak segment prioritization rationale
- Overly broad/generic segments

3. Problem Identification (Weight: 25%)

5/5 Score Requirements:

- Complete user journey mapping
- Distinct problems tied to journey steps
- Clear severity/frequency scoring
- Problems align with target segment
- Strong prioritization rationale

Common Issues:

- Listing needs instead of problems
- Similar/overlapping problems
- Missing journey steps
- Weak problem prioritization

4. Solution Development (Weight: 20%)

5/5 Score Requirements:

- Three distinct solution approaches
- Clear impact/effort evaluation
- Solutions directly address chosen problem
- Detailed MVP description
- Thoughtful risk analysis

Common Issues:

- Solutions don't solve core problem
- Similar solutions with minor variations
- Missing technical feasibility consideration
- Weak MVP definition

5. Communication Structure (Weight: 10%)

5/5 Score Requirements:

- Clear section transitions
- Regular interviewer check-ins
- Efficient time management
- Structured thinking demonstration
- Clear prioritization frameworks

Common Issues:

- Poor time management
- Missing check-ins with interviewer
- Unclear structure
- Rambling/unfocused responses

Example Evaluation

Strong Response Indicators

- Starts with clear structure outline
- Makes specific, relevant assumptions
- Demonstrates deep understanding of target users
- Shows clear prioritization rationale
- Maintains logical flow throughout
- Provides specific examples
- Considers business value
- Identifies key risks

Weak Response Indicators

- Jumps straight into solutions
- Makes vague/generic statements
- Misses key stakeholders
- Lacks clear prioritization
- Shows circular/confused thinking
- Provides surface-level analysis
- Ignores business context
- Overlooks major risks

Evaluation Best Practices

1. Score each dimension independently

2. Look for specific signals in each section
3. Consider both content and structure
4. Evaluate against level-appropriate expectations
5. Provide specific improvement areas
6. Consider overall narrative coherence
7. Look for demonstration of key PM skills:
 - Structured thinking
 - Prioritization ability
 - User empathy
 - Business acumen
 - Risk awareness

Common Pitfalls to Watch For

1. ****Motivation/Mission:****
 - Missing market context
 - Weak company mission alignment
 - Vague value proposition
2. ****Target Audience:****
 - Non-exclusive segments
 - Missing ecosystem players
 - Poor segment selection rationale
3. ****Problem Identification:****
 - Needs vs problems confusion
 - Missing user journey steps
 - Weak prioritization
4. ****Solution Development:****
 - Solutions don't address core problem
 - Missing feasibility consideration
 - Weak MVP definition
5. ****Communication:****
 - Poor time management
 - Missing check-ins
 - Unclear structure

Final Notes

- A score of 3/5 in each dimension is passing
- Strong responses maintain consistent quality across all dimensions
- Look for demonstration of PM fundamentals throughout
- Consider both tactical execution and strategic thinking
- Evaluate communication effectiveness separately from content