

Engineering Interview Scorecards

Evidence-anchored scoring for five engineering disciplines

Interview scores diverge because interviewers rate impressions. These scorecards anchor every rating to evidence: which systems, which phase, which document, which decision the candidate personally made.

Assign dimensions to interviewers before the panel so coverage is deliberate, and require a written evidence note for any rating above or below the midpoint.

How to score

Use a five-point scale where the anchors are evidence, not enthusiasm.

- 1 — No direct exposure; describes the activity in general terms only
- 2 — Observed or supported the work; cannot describe decisions made
- 3 — Executed the work under supervision; describes their own tasks accurately
- 4 — Owned the work; describes decisions, trade-offs and failures specifically
- 5 — Owned and improved the work; can teach it and can describe what they would change
- Any rating of 4 or 5 requires a named system, phase and document in the evidence note

Commissioning and field engineering

Probe the boring detail. Depth shows up in how a candidate describes documentation and failures.

- Commissioning level experience: pre-functional, functional, integrated systems testing
- Test script authorship versus execution
- Issue and punchlist management, including holds and retests
- Failure narrative: a test that failed and how root cause was established
- Client and contractor interface under schedule pressure
- Safety behaviour during energised or partially energised work

Controls, automation and PLC

Separate platform familiarity from architectural understanding.

- Platforms configured personally, with versions and scale
- Control narrative and sequence-of-operation authorship
- Network architecture and protocol integration experience
- Troubleshooting method on a live line or facility
- Change control and backup discipline
- Handover to operations and maintenance

Electrical power, protection and relay

Ask what the candidate is allowed to sign, and what they have actually calculated.

- Voltage classes and equipment worked on directly
- Coordination and arc-flash study involvement, and which software
- Relay platforms configured and settings applied
- Outage planning and switching experience
- Standards applied and jurisdictional licensing
- Field testing and acceptance criteria

Project delivery, controls and scheduling

Test ownership of the number, not familiarity with the tool.

- Schedule ownership: developed, maintained, or reported only
- Tools used and depth: logic, resource loading, progress measurement
- Change and claims exposure
- Cost and forecast responsibility
- Interface management across contractors and disciplines
- Evidence of a schedule recovery they personally led

Instrumentation and reliability

Calibration and loop-check discipline separates practitioners from bystanders.

- Instrument types installed, calibrated and commissioned
- Loop check and calibration record ownership
- Hazardous area and classification awareness
- Reliability method exposure: failure analysis, criticality, maintenance strategy
- Data and historian familiarity
- Documentation quality standards applied



Panel debrief protocol

Run this within 24 hours while detail is still recoverable.

- Each interviewer states their lowest-confidence dimension first
- Evidence notes read aloud for any 4 or 5
- Disagreements resolved by returning to evidence, not by averaging
- Accepted gaps recorded explicitly with an onboarding mitigation
- Decision recorded with the reason, whichever way it goes

Published by Gridline Engineering Workforce as a working template. Adapt it to your program. No client data is included, and nothing here constitutes legal, tax or employment advice.