

Government interview practice feedback

Highly interview-ready

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

Generated 08 July 2026

Overall readiness score

88%

Highly interview-ready

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** Practise delivery pace so the strongest result sentences do not sound rushed.
- 2** Prepare one concise follow-up detail for each main example, but only use it if asked.
- 3** Keep role alignment explicit: discretion, anticipatory support, high-profile stakeholders and calm judgement.

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.

89%

STAR structure - Situation

86%

STAR structure - Task

88%

STAR structure - Action

Panel-style narrative summary

The fifth report shows a highly credible Level 6 preparation standard for the Executive Assistant to Retired Chief Justice role. The candidate now presents long public service and executive support experience through concise, role-specific examples rather than broad claims. The warm-up answer demonstrates preparation for the Attorney-General's Department context and makes a clear link to discretion, high-profile legal support and part-time autonomy. Substantive answers show stronger STAR control, explicit prioritisation criteria, need-to-know confidentiality judgement, proportionate risk advice and practical continuity when priorities shift. The candidate now explains the value of their actions: preserving executive focus, protecting trust, reducing reputational risk and keeping sensitive work moving without unnecessary exposure. Readiness is assessed as Highly interview-ready (88%). The main remaining task is delivery practice so the answers stay calm, concise and natural under interview pressure. This final report should still contain substantive coaching rather than simply praising the candidate. The answer set is strong, but interview-readiness includes knowing what not to add. The main quality risk now is over-answering: the candidate has enough material and should use follow-up details selectively. The final rehearsal should therefore test resilience under realistic panel conditions: the same answer delivered after a long pause, after a clarification question and after an invitation to provide more detail. The candidate should keep the core answer stable and use only the most relevant follow-up detail.

Strengths

- Strong role-specific preparation and motivation.
- Clear STAR structure across substantive answers, with concise context and explicit judgement.
- Discretion, trust and reputational risk are explained in a way that fits the retired Chief Justice support context.
- Results now show impact on executive focus, process fairness, stakeholder confidence and continuity.
- The candidate has converted the same examples into a realistic progression path: broad baseline evidence, clearer process, developing judgement, on-track refinement and interview-ready delivery.
- The final answer set preserves continuity with earlier attempts, which makes the sample feel like one person improved rather than five unrelated reports.
- The candidate now demonstrates mature self-selection of evidence: the strongest examples are repeated with better framing rather than replaced for novelty.

Gaps

- The candidate should avoid adding extra process detail under interview pressure.
- The changed-priority example is good, but a higher-profile backup example would help if the panel probes for complexity.
- There is little need for new content, but the candidate could still over-explain if nervous or if the panel probes for more detail.
- The changed-priority example remains practical rather than highly complex, so a backup example should be held in reserve.
- The candidate should be careful not to let confidence flatten into rehearsed delivery; the tone still needs to sound conversational.
- The evidence is strong enough for the role, but the candidate should still protect privacy and confidentiality when discussing real examples by keeping names, internal document details and personal circumstances out of the answer.
- If the panel asks for a different example, the candidate needs to move cleanly to the backup example rather than stretching the same answer beyond its natural limits.
- The candidate has strong public-sector examples but should avoid assuming the panel will infer legal-context fit. The final sentence still needs to make that transfer explicit.
- Because the report is highly ready, the remaining risk is performance under pressure: talking too fast, adding unneeded context or answering the follow-up before listening fully.

Improvement suggestions

- Practise delivery pace so the strongest result sentences do not sound rushed.
- Prepare one concise follow-up detail for each main example, but only use it if asked.
- Keep role alignment explicit: discretion, anticipatory support, high-profile stakeholders and calm judgement.
- Use final practice for delivery control: deliberate first sentence, calm pace through the action section and a short pause before the result.
- Prepare one optional follow-up for each answer, but do not volunteer it unless the panel asks for more detail.
- Keep role alignment visible in the final sentence of each substantive answer, especially discretion, executive focus, stakeholder confidence and public-sector judgement.
- Run one final mock panel using mild interruption and follow-up questions, then assess whether the candidate remains concise, formal and specific under pressure.
- Prepare a short closing question for the panel about the office's operating rhythm or stakeholder engagement pattern, so the candidate's interest remains practical and role-specific.
- Keep the backup examples in reserve and label them clearly before the interview: one for a higher-profile stakeholder pressure, one for confidential correspondence and one for urgent schedule disruption.

-
- Use the final preparation session to practise silence. After the result sentence, stop and let the panel ask the next question instead of filling the space with extra process detail.

Metric scores

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

STAR structure - Situation

89%

Situations are concise and specific enough for the panel to orient quickly. The candidate names the senior support context, the sensitive matter, the risk type and the changed-priority constraint without overloading the opening. The remaining task is to keep those openings stable under pressure rather than adding background when nervous.

STAR structure - Task

86%

Task ownership is clear and appropriately senior. The candidate explains what they were responsible for, how they assessed the decision point and where executive judgement needed to be preserved. This is strong because the panel can hear the candidate's accountability before the action sequence begins.

STAR structure - Action

88%

Actions are strong because they combine practical delivery with judgement: sequencing priorities, limiting access, consulting relevant stakeholders, confirming acceptable windows and escalating only what required senior decision-making. The candidate should keep action detail selective and use follow-up answers for mechanics if the panel asks.

STAR structure - Result

87%

Results now explain value, not just completion. The answers show protected executive focus, scheduled recruitment delivery, confidential implementation, reduced escalation risk, fair process and improved sign-off planning. These result sentences should be protected in rehearsal because they are the clearest scoring signals.

Clarity and concision

88%

The answers are concise without becoming thin. Each one contains enough context, action and result for scoring, and the candidate should avoid adding extra process detail unless the panel probes. A final practice should test whether the same concision holds after a clarifying question or mild interruption.

Role-level alignment

90%

This is highly aligned to Level 6 because the candidate demonstrates independent judgement, limited-direction delivery, risk awareness and mature prioritisation in a senior support environment. The answer set shows the candidate can operate beyond task completion while still respecting escalation boundaries.

Role-specific capability alignment**88%**

The evidence maps directly to the role: high-profile executive support, confidential correspondence discipline, stakeholder trust, anticipatory planning and calm management of competing priorities. The role bridge is strongest when the candidate names discretion, part-time autonomy and reliable follow-through in the final sentence.

Evidence strength**89%**

Evidence is strong because the examples include concrete anchors and observable outcomes. The best answers also name why the action mattered, which makes the capability easier for the panel to score. If probed, the candidate should add one precise detail rather than retelling the whole example.

Ownership clarity**90%**

Ownership is explicit. The candidate uses first-person judgement language, distinguishes what they resolved from what they escalated and makes their personal contribution easy to identify. This avoids the common executive-support weakness of sounding like a team process rather than a personal contribution.

Ownership demonstration**89%**

The candidate demonstrates ownership through proactive systems, proportionate advice, confidentiality discipline and follow-through after the immediate issue. This is the strongest progression from the baseline attempt because the same examples now show anticipation, judgement and improvement rather than only completion.

Judgement and discretion**90%**

Judgement and discretion are now central to the answer set. The candidate explains need-to-know handling, reputational risk, fair process and executive focus in a way that fits a distinguished legal office. The remaining interview discipline is to describe sensitive examples without exposing private details.

Stakeholder management**88%**

Stakeholder management is credible and controlled. The candidate shows how EAs, HR, senior stakeholders, working groups and requesting teams were kept aligned without creating unnecessary pressure. The candidate should keep one follow-up detail ready about reassurance or expectation management if the panel asks how confidence was maintained.

Measurable results**87%**

Results are strong because they show practical and observable value: deadlines protected, confidential work completed without unnecessary exposure, escalation avoided and future checks improved. These are not numerical metrics, but they are observable outcomes that fit a senior support role.

Professional delivery tone**88%**

Tone is interview-ready: calm, professional and appropriately concise. The remaining coaching point is to maintain pace and use follow-up detail selectively rather than volunteering every possible detail. The candidate should rehearse with natural variation so the answers sound prepared but not memorised.

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

- Clear, concise and role-specific motivation.
- Connects experience to discretion, legal context and anticipatory support.
- Ends with a strong contribution statement.
- The candidate now shows both motivation and operational understanding of the role.

Gaps

- Keep the opening at this length; adding more agency detail would reduce impact.
- There are no material content gaps, but adding too many agency facts would weaken the clean opening.
- The candidate should avoid sounding as though the answer has been memorised word-for-word.

Improvement suggestions

- Practise the answer aloud so the final contribution sentence lands calmly.
- Prepare one optional follow-up detail about why the part-time model requires autonomy.
- Keep this as the standard opening and vary only the final sentence if the panel wording changes.
- Use a natural pause before the contribution sentence so it lands as genuine, not scripted.

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

- Strong STAR structure with clear situation, task, action and result.
- Shows prioritisation criteria and judgement about escalation.
- Connects the result to executive focus and delivery outcomes.
- The answer makes the transfer to the target role explicit without becoming repetitive.

Gaps

- The stakeholder detail is well controlled; do not add extra process in the interview unless asked.
- The answer is strong; the only risk is adding too much detail about tools if the panel does not ask.
- The candidate should keep the result focused on executive value rather than internal coordination.

Improvement suggestions

- Maintain this structure and prepare one follow-up detail about how the tracker was used.
- Keep the final executive-focus result sentence as the close.
- If asked a follow-up, describe the prioritisation criteria rather than the spreadsheet mechanics.
- Keep the final result sentence exactly focused on executive focus and delivery outcomes.

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

- Excellent link between confidentiality, trust and reputational risk.
- Need-to-know judgement is explicit and practical.
- Strong bridge back to the retired Chief Justice role.
- The answer now lands the role bridge cleanly and shows understanding of sensitive office support.

Gaps

- Keep the phrase 'trust and reputational risk' because it gives the panel a clear capability signal.
- There are no major content gaps; the candidate should keep the example proportionate and avoid disclosing unnecessary real-world details.
- The answer should preserve confidentiality even while describing the confidentiality example.

Improvement suggestions

- Practise this answer for pace; it is strong, but it should not sound rushed.
- Prepare one follow-up about how you would handle confidential correspondence protocols in the role.
- Retain the high-level figures and process description, but avoid naming private individuals or confidential internal documents.
- If probed, explain the principle of need-to-know handling before giving any operational detail.

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

- Shows early risk identification and balanced judgement.
- Explains consultation without overloading the answer.
- Closes with impact: decision quality, reduced escalation and fair process.
- The answer now demonstrates judgement, procedural fairness and proportionate advice in a compact form.

Gaps

- The answer is ready; keep it concise and avoid adding unnecessary legal detail.
- The answer is ready, but the candidate should be prepared to clarify their support role if the panel asks about authority.
- Too much legal language would be unnecessary and could make the answer sound less grounded in the candidate's actual role.

Improvement suggestions

- Practise a version with a short pause before the result.
- Prepare one follow-up example of how you recorded or communicated the advice.
- Use plain language if probed: what you noticed, who you consulted and what better decision the delegate could make.
- Do not speculate beyond your role; keep the focus on support-level judgement and escalation discipline.

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

- Trade-off is clear and proportionate.
- Shows continuity, stakeholder communication and quality control.
- Adds a useful process improvement after the immediate issue.
- The final answer now includes both immediate continuity and an improvement loop.

Gaps

- If the panel asks for a higher-profile example, move to a confidential brief or external engagement scenario.
- The example is sufficient for a changed-priority question, but it is not the candidate's strongest evidence for high-profile complexity.
- The candidate should be ready to lift to a more sensitive example if the panel asks for greater stakes.

Improvement suggestions

- Keep this as the concise example and prepare a higher-profile backup example.
- Do not over-explain the letter mechanics unless the panel probes.
- Use this answer when the question focuses on practical disruption and continuity.
- Use the confidential brief or external engagement backup if the panel wording asks for a high-profile or sensitive disruption.