Frontend Developer Interview Scorecard



Candidate Name: Role Interviewed: Interviewer: Date:	
Dimensions	
• Systems & OS Fun	damentals — Score (1–5):
1-2: Cannot navigat	e Linux shell or basic commands; unclear about processes, files, or permissions
3: Comfortably uses	Linux commands, inspects processes, filesystems, and basic networking tools.
4: Diagnoses syster	m-level issues quickly and explains OS behavior using logs and metrics. 5:
Proactively tunes O	S/service configuration to prevent issues and teaches others system internals.
• Monitoring & Alertin	ng — Score (1–5):
1-2: Cannot interpre	et metrics or reacts only to noisy alerts without mapping to service impact. 3:
Reads dashboards,	recognizes key metrics, and triages alerts appropriately. 4: Designs or refines
alerts to reduce nois	se and improve signal-to-noise ratio. 5: Implements SLI/SLO-driven alerts and
automates escalation	on to prevent incidents.
• Incident Response	& Troubleshooting — Score (1–5):
Follows runbooks, in troubleshooting for	during incidents; lacks a structured troubleshooting approach or runbook use. 3: dentifies root cause for common incidents, and resolves with guidance. 4: Leads non-trivial incidents and documents effective remediations. 5: Drives ments long-term fixes, and mentors others during incidents.
Automation & Scrip	ting — Score (1–5):
reproducible scripts	ability or creates brittle one-off commands without validation. 3: Writes clear, to automate routine operational tasks. 4: Creates idempotent automation with and simple tests. 5: Builds reusable tooling or libraries that eliminate recurring eams.
• CI/CD & Deployme	nts — Score (1–5):
Performs and trouble pipelines for safer re	estand deployment flow or causes unsafe deployments without rollback plans. 3: eshoots standard deployments and rollbacks using CI/CD tools. 4: Configures ollouts and automated rollback criteria. 5: Designs deployment strategies
(canary/blue-green)	and improves pipeline reliability.

zythr.com Page 1 of 1

ZYTHR

1-2: Cannot identify performance bottlenecks or reason about capacity and resource usage. 3: Measures basic performance metrics and suggests reasonable scaling actions. 4: Optimizes resources and recommends architecture changes to improve reliability. 5: Anticipates capacity issues, implements autoscaling, and reduces cost while improving reliability.

Communication & Collaboration — Score (1–5):

1-2: Poorly communicates status, misses follow-ups, or cannot work constructively with engineers and ops. 3: Documents work clearly, shares status during incidents, and collaborates with peers. 4: Coordinates cross-team fixes and writes clear postmortems and runbooks. 5: Leads knowledge sharing, mentors juniors, and aligns teams on reliability priorities.

Overall Evaluation

Strengths Observed:

Concerns / Weaknesses:

Recommendation (Yes / No / With Reservations):

Final Score (Avg / Weighted):

zythr.com Page 1 of 2