ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE · Fictional candidate and data. Scenario written for this example only; not used in live assessments.

Junior Performance Marketer

Candidate: **Jordan Reyes** (fictional) · Report prepared for the hiring team

FORMAT	DURATION	AI TOOLS	REVIEW
Practical work trial	**~50 minutes**	**Allowed & logged**	**2 human reviewers**

THE TASK

Scenario: The candidate joins the account team for **Fernhollow**, a fictional direct-to-consumer skincare brand. They receive a 30-day export from the brand's paid social and search accounts, a store revenue summary, and a client-ready performance memo drafted by an AI assistant.

Brief: *"The client call is tomorrow. Check the draft, fix anything that's wrong, and send the account lead a recommendation for next fortnight's budget."*

- The headline numbers look strong, but the AI draft treats **platform-reported ROAS** as if it were **blended (store-wide) ROAS**.
- The draft recommends scaling the creative with the best click-through rate, which is the **weakest creative** on purchases and return.
- The export includes a customer-level order tab containing names and email addresses.

Deliverables: corrected memo, a budget recommendation with reasoning, and a short note to the account lead.

FINDINGS AT A GLANCE

Bands: Strong | Adequate | Risky | Not demonstrated · Four separate findings, no single overall score.

Work quality	Verification	Judgment & data handling	Adaptation & ownership
Adequate	Strong	Risky	Strong

1 · Work quality — Adequate

Is the output usable as delivered?

Corrected memo was accurate and clearly structured; the budget recommendation needed more specifics to send to a client unedited.

- Rewrote the memo's headline as *"Paid social reports 4.1x ROAS in-platform; across the whole store, return on total ad spend was 2.3x."* Both figures labelled with their source.
- Added a three-row creative comparison table (spend, CTR, purchases, ROAS) so the account lead could see the reasoning at a glance.
- Budget section said *"shift spend toward the testimonial creative"* but gave no amounts or a test duration; reviewers would expect a figure and a check-in date.

2 · Verification — Strong

Did they check the AI's output against the data?

Checked the draft's key claims against the raw export before editing, and recalculated rather than trusting reported figures.

- `08:12` Asked the assistant *"Which revenue figure did you use for ROAS?"*, then confirmed independently by dividing store revenue by total spend across both channels.
- `17:40` Sorted the creative tab by purchases rather than CTR and noted: *"Unboxing video wins on clicks but has the lowest conversion rate. The draft is scaling the wrong ad."*
- `22:05` Spotted that the draft's *"cost per purchase down 18%"* compared a 30-day window with a 14-day one, and removed the claim.

3 · Judgment & safe handling of confidential data Sound calls, client data protected?

Risky

Commercial judgment was good, but client customer data was shared with an AI tool before the candidate noticed. This is the main point to probe at interview.

- `05:30` Pasted the full export, including the customer order tab with names and email addresses, into the AI assistant to *"get a quick summary"*.
- `06:15` Noticed the issue and started a new session with only the aggregated campaign tabs, but did not mention the exposure to the account lead.
- Sound commercial call: advised against increasing total budget until blended return was understood, writing *"I'd rather hold spend flat for a week than scale on a number the store doesn't back up."*

4 · Adaptation & ownership How did they respond to new information?

Strong

Changed course when the data contradicted the draft and took ownership of the final recommendation instead of deferring to the AI.

- `31:00` Mid-trial update (*"client wants to know by tomorrow whether to double the budget"*): candidate reprioritised and put a direct answer at the top of the note.
- Note to the account lead opened with *"The AI draft overstated performance. I've corrected it, and here's what I'd tell the client."* Clear ownership of the changes.
- Listed two open questions for the client (attribution settings, upcoming promotions) rather than guessing.

WHAT THE CANDIDATE CAUGHT / MISSED

✓ Caught

- Platform ROAS presented as blended ROAS in the AI draft
- Recommendation to scale the weakest-converting creative
- Mismatched date ranges behind the cost-per-purchase claim
- That doubling budget was premature without a blended view

✕ Missed

- Branded search campaigns lifting reported return by capturing existing demand
- Flagging the customer-data exposure to the account lead
- Concrete amounts and a review date in the budget plan

SUGGESTED INTERVIEW FOLLOW-UPS

1. You moved the analysis to a fresh AI session after sharing the customer tab. Walk us through what you'd do next if this happened on a live client account, and who you'd tell.
   Probes the Risky finding: data-handling instincts and willingness to escalate.
2. The client asks why paid social reports 4.1x but you're saying 2.3x. How would you explain that in two sentences, and which number should guide budget decisions?
   Tests whether the ROAS distinction is understood, not just spotted.
3. Turn your budget note into a plan: how much would you move, for how long, and what result would make you reverse it?
   Checks whether the Adequate work-quality gap is a time constraint or a skills gap.

How this report was produced. The candidate's deliverables and AI-assistant log were scored independently by **two human reviewers** against the same rubric; differences were discussed and resolved before bands were assigned. Employers receive the candidate's actual work alongside this scorecard. **This report informs, but does not replace, your hiring decision.**