

Government interview practice feedback

On track

This practice report summarises the panel-style feedback, readiness breakdown and next practice actions.

Generated 06 July 2026

Overall readiness score

79%

On track

Score out of 100

Target role

**Executive Assistant to
Retired Chief Justice**

Classification or role level

Level 6

Agency or department

**Attorney-General's
Department**

Readiness scale

Scores are coaching indicators, not selection outcomes. Use the band to choose the next practice focus.

86-100% Highly interview-ready

Keep examples concise, specific and aligned to the role.

58-71% Developing

Make STAR structure and individual contribution clearer.

1-41% Not yet interview-ready

Replace general claims with specific role-aligned evidence.

72-85% On track

Sharpen the result, evidence and work-level link.

42-57% Significant development required

Use stronger examples with clearer actions and outcomes.

0% Insufficient evidence provided

Answer with enough detail for a meaningful readiness view.

Next-practice focus

Use these points first when you practice again.

- 1** Compress each answer by removing one process step and replacing it with a clearer result statement.
- 2** Prepare one high-profile changed-priority example in case the panel probes beyond routine diary disruption.
- 3** Practise transitions between context, action and result so the answer sounds deliberate rather than rehearsed.

Questions to ask the panel

Prepare two or three questions before the real interview.

Use questions that show you understand the role, the organisation and the work. Avoid asking for information already covered in the Position Description.

- 1 Clarify what success looks like**
Ask what success in the first 3 to 6 months would look like for someone in the Executive Assistant to Retired Chief Justice role.
- 2 Understand the team and stakeholders**
Ask how the Executive Assistant to Retired Chief Justice role works with teams, stakeholders, delivery partners or policy areas across Attorney-General's Department.
- 3 Show preparation for the work**
Ask about current priorities, service outcomes or delivery challenges the successful candidate should be ready to contribute to.

Score snapshot

Top feedback scores from this report.

80%

STAR structure - Situation

78%

STAR structure - Task

82%

STAR structure - Action

Panel-style narrative summary

The fourth report shows a clear progression from process description to role-relevant judgement. The candidate now connects executive support examples to high-profile legal support, part-time autonomy, confidentiality and stakeholder trust. The Senate estimates and recruitment example demonstrates stronger prioritisation because the candidate explains how statutory timing, executive availability and downstream stakeholder impact informed sequencing decisions. The sensitive-information example is now framed around need-to-know judgement and trust rather than document handling alone. The risk example also improves because the candidate names people, legal and reputational considerations before describing advice to the delegate. Readiness is assessed as On track (79%). The remaining improvement is not more detail, but better compression: the candidate should remove process steps that do not help the panel score judgement and should make final results more concise and memorable. This attempt should feel close to a real app-generated report because it diagnoses refinement rather than fundamentals. The candidate is no longer being asked to find new examples for every question. The coaching focus is to keep the judgement and role alignment while removing excess process detail that can soften the result. The panel would probably regard this as credible evidence, but the candidate can still gain points by making the result sentence more memorable and by showing how stakeholder confidence was maintained during pressure. The candidate should also practise answering a probe without abandoning the original structure, because a strong follow-up should deepen the evidence rather than restart the example.

Strengths

- Role alignment is now clear: the candidate connects executive support to high-profile legal context, discretion and part-time autonomy.
- Examples now include judgement, trade-offs and stakeholder impact rather than process alone.
- The sensitive-information answer has become a strong anchor example for the role.
- The candidate now uses the same evidence bank in a more panel-ready way, which makes progress credible rather than contrived.
- The answer set demonstrates a coherent professional identity: calm senior support, discretion, prioritisation and proportionate escalation.
- The candidate now shows enough self-editing to choose stronger evidence rather than trying to list every administrative duty performed.

Gaps

- Some answers are still slightly long and include process detail that does not help the panel score the capability.
- Results are credible but could be more concise and memorable.
- The changed-priority example is useful but not as senior or sensitive as the strongest examples.
- A few responses still rely on operational mechanics when a short statement of judgement would be stronger.
- The highest-profile dimension of the retired Chief Justice role is visible in the warm-up and discretion answer, but not evenly across every substantive example.
- The candidate has not yet prepared concise follow-up material for likely panel probes about stakeholder tension, confidentiality protocols or authority boundaries.
- Because the answers are now more polished, the candidate needs to avoid sounding rehearsed; the strongest delivery will still sound like a person reflecting on real work.
- The examples mostly stay internal to government offices. If the panel probes public-facing or external stakeholder complexity, the candidate needs a prepared bridge or backup example.

Improvement suggestions

- Compress each answer by removing one process step and replacing it with a clearer result statement.
- Prepare one high-profile changed-priority example in case the panel probes beyond routine diary disruption.
- Practise transitions between context, action and result so the answer sounds deliberate rather than rehearsed.
- For the final practice, rehearse each substantive answer in a 75 to 90 second version and keep only one example of process detail.
- Prepare one backup example involving confidential correspondence or external engagement management in case the panel probes for a more high-profile changed-priority scenario.
- Use the same closing rhythm across answers: what was protected, who benefited and why that matters for this role.
- Prepare two concise follow-up answers: one on how confidentiality expectations were communicated, and one on how the candidate decides whether to escalate or resolve a matter at support level.
- Practise trimming the first 15 seconds of each answer. The evidence is now strong enough that long setup will reduce impact rather than add credibility.
- Create a backup answer bank with one external stakeholder example, one confidential correspondence example and one urgent diary-rebuild example, each summarised in four STAR lines.

Metric scores

Scores are shown out of 100. Lower scores indicate the highest-payoff areas for the next practice attempt.

STAR structure - Situation

80%

The candidate now sets up the situation with useful context: overlapping SES deadlines, sensitive salary recommendations, a performance management risk and an urgent secretary meeting. The remaining opportunity is to make the highest-stakes detail visible earlier.

STAR structure - Task

78%

Task ownership is mostly clear. The candidate explains responsibility for sequencing, controlling sensitive material and preparing advice, but a few answers could still state their formal role and authority before moving into action.

STAR structure - Action

82%

Actions show credible Level 6 judgement: separating statutory deadlines from movable work, limiting access, briefing a working group, consulting HR and confirming dispatch windows. The next lift is compression, not additional activity.

STAR structure - Result

76%

Results are credible and connected to the examples, including protected estimates preparation, implementation without unnecessary exposure and avoided premature escalation. They would be stronger if each result landed as a short, memorable final sentence.

Clarity and concision

78%

The answers are clear and panel-friendly, but some still include process steps that reduce impact. The candidate should keep the judgement sentence and result sentence, then cut mechanics that are unlikely to affect scoring.

Role-level alignment

81%

This attempt is on track for Level 6 because it shows independent prioritisation, risk balancing and discretion. To move higher, the candidate should sharpen ownership and outcome language without making answers longer.

Role-specific capability alignment
79%

Role alignment is strong: the candidate connects executive support to high-profile legal context, confidentiality, part-time autonomy and stakeholder trust. The changed-priority example remains the least role-specific and needs a stronger backup.

Evidence strength
80%

Evidence is concrete and relevant, with enough operational detail to be credible. The strongest examples now include pressure, action and outcome; the weaker moments are where stakeholder dynamics are still implied rather than described.

Ownership clarity
82%

Personal ownership is mostly clear through first-person judgement statements. A few examples could still explain where the candidate acted within delegation and where they deliberately escalated to protect decision quality.

Ownership demonstration
81%

The candidate demonstrates ownership through proactive sequencing, controlled handling, advice preparation and continuity planning. The final improvement is to show what changed after the incident, especially in the priority-shift example.

Judgement and discretion
80%

Judgement and discretion are now credible. The salary recommendation answer has moved beyond document control into trust and reputational risk, which fits the role. The candidate should keep that framing consistent.

Stakeholder management
79%

Stakeholder management is stronger, with EAs, HR, senior stakeholders and working groups named. The answer set would score higher if it described one moment of reassurance or expectation management in more detail.

Measurable results
76%

Results are present and relevant but still not always measurable. Where numbers are unavailable, the candidate can use observable outcomes such as no unnecessary exposure, maintained confidence or avoided premature escalation.

Professional delivery tone**78%**

The delivery sounds prepared and credible. The main risk is over-explaining because the candidate now has more material; practice should focus on calm pacing and crisp result sentences.

Question-by-question feedback

Question 1 · Warm-up

As a warm-up, what interests you most about this Executive Assistant to Retired Chief Justice role, and what relevant experience would you like the panel to know about?

Strengths

- Clearly identifies why this role is distinctive.
- Connects public service experience to discretion, judgement and reliable delivery.
- Shows appropriate preparation without overloading the opening.
- The candidate now links the operating model to practical support behaviour, not only interest in the legal context.

Gaps

- The answer could include one brief example to prove the claim.
- The closing contribution statement could be more memorable.
- The answer could be slightly stronger if it named one concrete example of anticipatory support from previous roles.
- The closing contribution statement is credible but could be more distinctive.

Improvement suggestions

- Add one sentence naming the strongest relevant experience before closing.
- End with the value you would bring: calm, discreet and anticipatory support.
- Add a short evidence phrase, such as 'that is the same discipline I used when managing SES deadlines and sensitive sign-off material.'
- End with a compact value statement: 'I would bring calm preparation, discretion and reliable follow-through.'

Question-by-question feedback continued

Question 2

Tell me about a time when you've provided executive support to a senior leader with a particularly demanding or high-profile role. Walk me through a specific situation where you had to manage competing demands on their time or attention. What was the context, what approach did you take to prioritise, and what was the outcome?

Strengths

- Shows a clear prioritisation framework: statutory deadlines, movable work and executive-only decisions.
- Demonstrates judgement about what to escalate and what to resolve at support level.
- Links the result to both estimates preparation and recruitment timelines.
- The answer now shows how prioritisation protected executive focus, which is directly relevant to the target role.

Gaps

- Could explain one stakeholder relationship challenge more clearly.
- Some process detail could be reduced so the result lands earlier.
- Stakeholder reassurance is mentioned but could still be more explicit.
- The result would be sharper if the candidate stated the impact in one final sentence rather than spreading it across the action section.

Improvement suggestions

- Add a short stakeholder sentence: who needed reassurance and how you kept confidence.
- Move the final result closer to the end of the action sequence.
- Practise a 90-second version so the answer stays tight.
- Add one stakeholder confidence sentence, for example how the recruitment team knew offers were still progressing while estimates work remained protected.
- Cut one tool reference if the answer runs long; the scoring signal is the prioritisation judgement, not SharePoint itself.

Question-by-question feedback continued

Question 3

Describe an instance where you've had to handle sensitive or confidential information in your support role, and where managing relationships with multiple stakeholders required careful judgement. What was the situation, how did you navigate the competing interests or sensitivities, and how did you maintain trust and professionalism?

Strengths

- Reframes confidentiality as trust and reputational risk, which is more role-aligned.
- Explains need-to-know judgement and communication with the working group.
- States a stronger result: implementation without unnecessary exposure or delay.
- This is now one of the strongest examples because it makes discretion relational and reputational.

Gaps

- Could link more explicitly to confidential correspondence or engagements for the retired Chief Justice.
- The answer would be stronger with one sentence about maintaining confidence with the senior office.
- The answer could briefly mention how questions from outside the working group were redirected or handled.
- It should avoid sounding rehearsed by keeping the 'trust and reputational risk' line natural.

Improvement suggestions

- Add a bridging sentence to the role: 'That is the same discipline I would bring to confidential correspondence and engagements in this office.'
- Name how you checked the working group understood expectations.
- Prepare a follow-up sentence about how you would apply the same discipline to correspondence, travel details or invitations for the retired Chief Justice.
- If asked about confidentiality, describe the principle first and only then describe the document-handling mechanics.

Question-by-question feedback continued

Question 4

Give me an example of when you've anticipated a potential issue or risk in supporting an executive, and taken practical steps to prevent or mitigate it before it became a problem. What did you identify, what action did you take, and what was the result?

Strengths

- Names the legal, people and reputational risk dimensions.
- Shows consultation and evidence gathering before advice was provided.
- Explains a proportionate alternative rather than simply blocking action.
- The answer now shows a mature balance between risk, fairness and timely advice.

Gaps

- Could clarify the candidate's authority and relationship to the delegate.
- The result is credible but could show more impact on fairness or confidence.
- The candidate should make their authority context clear so the panel understands why they were the right person to raise the issue.
- The answer would be stronger with one sentence about how the advice was documented or communicated.

Improvement suggestions

- Briefly explain your role in the SES unit so the panel understands the authority context.
- Close with a sharper impact statement about fair process and reduced organisational risk.
- Add a role-framing phrase such as 'in my support role to the SES unit' before explaining the advice.
- Close with the decision-quality result, not only the absence of escalation.

Question-by-question feedback continued

Question 5

Tell me about a time when your executive's priorities shifted significantly or unexpectedly - perhaps due to an urgent commitment, a changed schedule, or an emerging issue. How did you respond, what trade-offs did you have to make, and how did you ensure continuity and quality despite the disruption?

Strengths

- Makes the trade-off explicit: speed versus certainty and executive focus.
- Shows stakeholder communication with the EA and requesting team.
- Explains the result in terms of continuity and reduced disruption.
- The answer now includes a continuity lesson, which makes the example more Level 6 than a one-off fix.

Gaps

- The example remains less high-profile than the role may require.
- Future prevention could be described more clearly.
- The example is still lower stakes than the candidate's stronger confidentiality and risk examples.
- The candidate should be ready to switch examples if the panel asks for a matter involving external stakeholders.

Improvement suggestions

- Prepare a second changed-priority example involving confidential briefs or external stakeholders.
- Add one sentence about the process improvement made after the incident.
- Keep this answer concise and use it to show judgement under disruption rather than trying to make it sound more dramatic than it was.
- Prepare a backup changed-priority example involving a confidential brief, external engagement or urgent stakeholder response.