

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Role Interviewed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

## Dimensions

- **System & Solution Architecture — Score (1–5): \_\_\_\_\_**  
1-2: Produces incomplete or inconsistent designs and misses major requirements or constraints. 3: Delivers clear component diagrams and addresses primary requirements and trade-offs. 4: Creates modular, extensible architectures and documents interactions, APIs, and failure modes. 5: Defines long-term architecture strategy, anticipates cross-system impacts, and sets standards.
- **Technical Leadership & Decision Making — Score (1–5): \_\_\_\_\_**  
1-2: Avoids owning decisions or cannot justify choices with evidence. 3: Makes defensible decisions and explains trade-offs when asked. 4: Drives decisions, balances short/long-term needs, and gains stakeholder buy-in. 5: Leads cross-team strategy, mentors others on decisions, and influences technical direction.
- **Scalability & Performance — Score (1–5): \_\_\_\_\_**  
1-2: Ignores capacity, bottlenecks, or provides solutions that won't scale. 3: Identifies likely bottlenecks and suggests pragmatic scaling approaches. 4: Designs for throughput and latency targets with measurable metrics and mitigations. 5: Anticipates scale limits, defines capacity plans, and optimizes cost-performance trade-offs.
- **Code Quality & Maintainability — Score (1–5): \_\_\_\_\_**  
1-2: Proposes brittle or opaque implementations and neglects testing or modularity. 3: Advocates for readable code, tests, and reasonable layering. 4: Designs for observability, testability, and clear module boundaries. 5: Establishes coding standards, review patterns, and measurable quality goals.
- **Security & Compliance — Score (1–5): \_\_\_\_\_**  
1-2: Overlooks common security controls and compliance constraints. 3: Identifies relevant security risks and recommends standard mitigations. 4: Integrates threat models, data protection, and access controls into designs. 5: Proactively embeds compliance requirements and drives risk-reduction programs.

1-2: Communicates unclearly and fails to engage stakeholders or incorporate feedback. 3: Explains designs clearly to engineers and accepts reasonable feedback. 4: Facilitates cross-functional discussions and resolves conflicts on trade-offs. 5: Aligns multiple teams, evangelizes architecture, and mentors peers effectively.

• **Delivery & Execution — Score (1–5): \_\_\_\_\_**

1-2: Proposes designs that are impractical to deliver or ignores delivery constraints. 3: Balances design with delivery timelines and proposes phased implementations. 4: Breaks work into deliverable increments and defines acceptance criteria. 5: Orchestrates roadmaps, removes blockers, and ensures reliable delivery of architecture goals.

---

## Overall Evaluation

Strengths Observed:

Concerns / Weaknesses:

Recommendation (Yes / No / With Reservations):

Final Score (Avg / Weighted):