

GENERAL CHECKUP REPORT FOR PHIL EXAMPLE, COMPLETED ON: NOV 30, -0001

Top Line Summary

Probability of re-hire:	Overall performance:
92%	87%
The probability of rehiring or advising to rehire PHIL EXAMPLE by the surveyed individuals is 92%	PHIL EXAMPLE averages 87% among respondents who answered the question, "How would you rate PHIL EXAMPLE's overall performance?"
Reasons mentioned not to re-hire:	Reasons mentioned for average or below average job performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in team turnover during the first quarter of 2010

Strengths/Accomplishments/Improvement

TOP 3 STRENGTHS*

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

TOP 3 AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT*

Others view

1. Excellent project leader who takes initiatives and completes projects efficiently and promptly
 2. Extensive knowledge of the product and industry
 3. Excellent team player

He was instrumental in organizing a comprehensive team building / learning program for our team.

-Delegation skills
 -Time management
 -Organization skills

1) Phil was a self-starter and saw that tasks were completed in a manner that was both thorough and timely. Whatever task he was given, he could do it with minimal supervision and the quality of his work was always first-rate.

Developed our first healthcare specific tools.

Marketing and leadership skills. He could also improve upon his computer skills as he is not very tech savvy.

2) He is both intelligent and has immense people skills, a combination that is extremely important for any job. Part of this is that he is articulate and also exudes a warmth that shows people he is genuinely interested in them.

3) His positive attitude helped improve employee morale.


<p>Organization, Communication and Innovation</p>	<p>Helped his team be one of the most successful in the division while achieving personal success as well.</p>	<p>His written communication could be more thorough. He could better follow through on projects in a timely manner. He should not be afraid to take on a leadership role.</p>
<p>Reliable, motivated, quick learner</p>	<p>He implemented new techniques for office productivity improvement measurement. The employee satisfaction index target was reached in 6 months as against the planned 1 year. He also implemented the new software package for tracking employee turnover rate</p>	<p>leadership skills, writing skills, and patience</p>
<p>He is committed fully to everything he does, setting high standards and matching it with a strong and consistent work ethic. He interacts well with his peers, giving thoughtful responses, helpful suggestions, and respectful feedback. He is intelligent and creative, willing to take risks and persist for originality.</p>	<p>He helped manage the support team.</p>	<p>Be able to change gears when necessary, try multiple techniques to determine most effective, and deal more effectively with stressful situations</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Energizing his team -Positive outlook -Great customer service and account management 	<p>Turned around a badly managed department and produced stellar results within 6 months.</p>	<p>The sales department was not a good fit for Phil. I believe he would excel in product development.</p>

* Can be more than 3, as it lists all the answers given by all respondents.

Specific Relative Ranking


What are Phil Example's strongest and weakest attributes?

This chart represents the aggregated answers to the question: 'Do you respect Phil Example for his/her' and the list of attributes displayed below.










Qualification Of Raters

This chart represents the combination of four qualifying questions to make sure the raters are the most qualified. At a glance, if you have most individuals of the right shape that are green or yellow in the green and yellow zone, you have raters that know enough about Phil Example to be meaningful.



How to read the chart

Each icon represents a rater.

						
Peer	Friend	Professor	Subordinate	Supervisor	Client	Other

The color of the people indicates the closeness of the relationship.

1. **The rater and you work/worked in direct contact. (green)**
2. **The rater and you work/worked sometimes on the same projects. (yellow)**
3. **The rater and you work/worked rarely on the same projects. (orange)**
4. **Other (red)**

The axis represent:

1. **Horizontal axis: 'Freshness of relationship' shows how recently the raters have worked with or known the candidate.**
2. **Vertical axis: 'Length of relationship' shows how long the relationship lasted.**

LIST OF RATERS

The following raters have participated in this Checkup:

Name	Email	Phone	Current Organization	Current Position	Relation
Anthony Martinez	support+app@checkster.com	+1(415)1234567	Checkster	Client Success Executive	Peer
John Giles	support+les@checkster.com	+1(415)7654321	Checkster	CEO	Supervisor
Chloe Smith	support+oran@checkster.com	+1(415)4567890	Checkster	Product Development Manager	Subordinate (**)
Jaqueline Ray	support+ges@checkster.com	+1(415)0987654	Checkster	Sales executive	Peer (**)
Kelly Lively	support+kiw@checkster.com	+1(415)7654321	Checkster	Client success executive	Peer
Stefan Alb	support+i@checkster.com	+1(415)3456789	Checkster	Client Success Executive	Supervisor

(**) = This relation was selected by the rater. The individual selected a different relation.

Rater's professional history with the candidate:

Name	Email	Organization	Position	Relation
Anthony Martinez	support+app@checkster.com	Checkster	Client Success Executive	Peer
John Giles	support+les@checkster.com	Checkster	CEO	Supervisor
Chloe Smith	support+oran@checkster.com	Checkster	Product Development Manager	Subordinate
Jaqueline Ray	support+ges@checkster.com	Checkster	Sales executive	Peer
Kelly Lively	support+kiw@checkster.com	Checkster	Client success executive	Peer
Stefan Alb	support+i@checkster.com	Checkster	Client Success Executive	Supervisor