

How to use the Interview Evidence File

Use the two-page file to choose one check before investing more in a career option. Record the evidence, choose an action and review it after checking.

Start with the action

Write one action to review and one constraint. Choose at most three neutral questions about recent work and its context. The person can skip any topic. Keep one decision-relevant statement at a time; extra records are optional.

Keep the source and its limits

E means reported firsthand experience; O a preference or recommendation; F an external document statement; I your interpretation; Q the next question to check. Verify document statements against their source. Split mixed statements. Keep the workplace alias, role level, region and period. Record conflicting evidence separately from questions to check.

Choose the next check

Name one fact, a source or small action, a date and a time or spending ceiling. State your action for each result: supporting evidence, different evidence or another check. Add the result later and keep the earlier record.

Using existing university resources

Use Berkeley's guide and question page to prepare, follow up and choose a next step. Keep the setting, source and next question in your own notes. UCSF's guide includes priorities and follow-up questions; open its original file and check editing and saving before using it.

Using the file

Replace [Write here] in the DOCX, or copy the text into your notes. Add paragraphs as needed; added text changes pagination. Print the PDF for handwriting. Personal use follows Telokind's current Terms; institutional service use and embedding require written authorization. University resources retain their own rights and do not endorse this file.

Optional career conversation invitation draft

Hi [name or alias], I am exploring [role and level] in [region] and want to understand [one question]. Are you open to a [15-20 minute] conversation about your experience? I am gathering information. You can decline or skip any topic. Thank you.

Copy and edit only if useful. This file does not send an invitation.

UCSF informational interview guide

https://career.ucsf.edu/sites/g/files/tkssra15591/files/2025-11/Informational%20Interviews_A%20Guide%20to%20Preparing%20for%20the%20Conversation_Fillable%20Version.pdf

Berkeley six-step guide

<https://career.berkeley.edu/start-exploring/informational-interviews/>

Berkeley sample questions

<https://career.berkeley.edu/start-exploring/informational-interviews/questions/>

Telokind current Terms

<https://telokind.com/terms>

Example A Checking actual tasks

Work through this course decision by comparing tasks at different role levels.

The action to review

Action before the conversation: Spend ten evenings on a customer success course before exploring an entry role.

Original assumption: Entry work centres on onboarding. Check the task mix at the level I am targeting before choosing a course.

My target and constraint: An entry individual contributor role where I work. I can give this first check 45 minutes and spend no money.

Conversation context: Practitioner A, a mid-level employee at Workplace A; focus on one recent week, the role level and date. Plan 20 minutes.

At most three interview questions

1. What tasks filled a recent ordinary week in your role?
2. Which tasks did a recent newcomer do, and at what level?
3. Which parts of this account differ at another company?

E = reported firsthand experience O = opinion or recommendation F = external document statement

I = my inference Q = next question to check. Check document statements against the source. Split mixed statements.

Evidence record 1

Statement and source type: Practitioner A's account includes drafting renewal messages during one recent week. | E, reported firsthand experience.

Scope: Workplace A; mid-level role; where I work; one week in September 2026.

Basis and check: A paraphrase of the speaker's account. Record the role level and week before comparing it with an entry role.

Supports and limits: Check renewal communication as a task in the role I want. / One employee's week does not establish the usual entry tasks or that this course is suitable.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Record 2 describes a different level. Next question: How much renewal work is listed in comparable entry roles?

Evidence and the next check

Evidence record 2

Statement and source type: An entry role description lists ticket triage, onboarding and escalations. | F, external document statement.

Scope: Workplace B; entry role; where I work; October 2026 role description.

Basis and check: Record the role description's URL, date and exact task list before using it.

Supports and limits: Compare this entry role's task mix with Practitioner A's mid-level account. / One role description does not establish an industry pattern or a hiring opportunity.

Contrary or limiting evidence: This task list does not mention renewals. Next question: Do comparable current employer pages include renewal work?

Evidence record 3

Statement and source type: I choose a short renewal writing exercise to explore this task. | I, my interpretation.

Scope: My proposed practice task; not an employer assessment.

Basis and check: My inference from Record 1. Compare the different role levels in Record 2 before choosing a course.

Supports and limits: Use a short practice task to explore one part of the work. / It does not establish job readiness, qualification or enjoyment of the whole role.

Contrary or limiting evidence: If current entry roles seldom include renewals, choose a task sample that matches their stated work.

My next check

Action now: Pause the ten-evening course plan while checking tasks at the level I am targeting.

Fact and check: Find two current employer vacancy pages for comparable entry roles in my target region. Save their links and dates and compare the listed tasks. If renewal work appears, draft one original practice message without private customer data.

Owner and date: I will make the first check by 8 October 2026.

Maximum investment: At most 45 minutes and 0 in my currency for this first check; at most 15 further minutes for the optional practice message.

If supported: If comparable entry postings include renewal work, try the short practice message before reconsidering a course.

If evidence differs or needs another check: If the task mix differs, choose a closer small task. If suitable postings are unavailable, record the next question to check and defer payment.

Review after checking: Add the actual links, observations and revised action after the check; keep the earlier record.

Example B Senior advice and entry requirements

Here is a portfolio decision. Compare advice from a senior role with current junior requirements.

The action to review

Action before the conversation: Spend four weekends on a portfolio to enter a junior analyst role.

Original assumption: A senior worker's entry route applies to the junior roles I am targeting. Compare it with current local requirements before committing four weekends.

My target and constraint: A junior analyst role where I work. I can spend one hour checking public requirements before committing four weekends.

Conversation context: Practitioner B, a senior analyst at Workplace C; their entry route began in 2016. Plan a 20-minute conversation and compare their route with current entry requirements.

At most three interview questions

1. What did you need to demonstrate when you entered, and when was that?
2. What has a recent junior hire needed to demonstrate in your setting?
3. Which current public requirements apply to the level I am targeting?

E = reported firsthand experience O = opinion or recommendation F = external document statement

I = my inference Q = next question to check. Check document statements against the source. Split mixed statements.

Evidence record 1

Statement and source type: Practitioner B recommends relying on a portfolio rather than further study.
| O, a personal recommendation.

Scope: A senior worker's perspective; Workplace C; where I work; opinion expressed in October 2026.

Basis and check: A paraphrase of the advice. Their own entry route began in 2016; compare its requirements with current junior roles.

Supports and limits: A portfolio is one route to investigate. / Their preference cannot establish a current local hiring rule or whether I qualify.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Record 2 lists a junior requirement. Compare it with the senior recommendation before choosing a plan.

Evidence and the next check

Evidence record 2

Statement and source type: A junior role description lists SQL skills and one year of reporting experience. | F, external document statement.

Scope: Workplace D; junior analyst role; where I work; October 2026 role description.

Basis and check: Record the role description's URL, date and stated requirements before assessing entry conditions.

Supports and limits: Separate portfolio quality from the requirements a specific entry role states. / One posting does not establish the market's rules, my eligibility or a required credential.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Compare the employer, level and period behind each record. Next question: What do comparable current junior roles require?

Evidence record 3

Statement and source type: Do current junior roles accept a portfolio instead of experience? | Q, next question to check.

Scope: The specific roles and employers I am targeting.

Basis and check: Compare the advice and role requirements with a current employer explanation of accepted experience.

Supports and limits: Check the entry question before treating a portfolio as meeting a role's requirements. / Advice about a portfolio does not establish eligibility.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Use current requirements or a clear public employer explanation to check this question.

My next check

Action now: Pause the four-weekend commitment. Keep the portfolio idea as an option while checking junior entry conditions.

Fact and check: Read three current employer pages for comparable junior roles in my region. Separate stated requirements from preferred skills and note publication or checked dates. Where an actual credential rule applies, use the relevant official authority.

Owner and date: I will complete the first comparison by 9 October 2026.

Maximum investment: At most 60 minutes and 0 in my currency. No course purchase or application commitment is part of this check.

If supported: If current comparable roles accept a suitable portfolio, choose one small portfolio task and review it before committing four weekends.

If evidence differs or needs another check: If relevant requirements are missing from my background, identify one gap or a different entry role. If the source needs clarification, record a specific question to check and defer spending.

Review after checking: Add the comparison and revised action. Preserve both sources and their different levels and periods.

Example C Checking working hours

For a schedule decision, use a public source when the conversation does not provide the hours.

The action to review

Action before the conversation: Pay for a training place after checking that the working hours of the target role fit my schedule.

Original assumption: Working hours need to fit my schedule. Check them against a public source before deciding on payment.

My target and constraint: A target role where I work. I can use 30 minutes and spend no money on an initial schedule check.

Conversation context: Contact C at Workplace E; plan 15 minutes on working hours. No private personal history is needed.

At most three interview questions

1. What public information describes the usual hours for this role?
2. Which parts of the schedule vary by employer or contract?
3. Where can I check the requirements for the specific role I am considering?

E = reported firsthand experience O = opinion or recommendation F = external document statement

I = my inference Q = next question to check. Check document statements against the source. Split mixed statements.

Evidence record 1

Statement and source type: Contact C chooses not to discuss their team's schedule. | E, a reported interaction. Record the schedule question separately as Q.

Scope: The contact's response; it is not a statement of workplace hours.

Basis and check: Record the declined answer without adding a schedule.

Supports and limits: I need another type of source for the schedule question. / A declined answer does not establish long hours, flexibility, hiring prospects or my suitability.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Do not infer a schedule or a reason from a declined answer. Next question: What public source states the hours?

Evidence and the next check

Evidence record 2

Statement and source type: What working hours and schedule conditions match the target role? | Q, next question to check.

Scope: My target level, where I work and the employer whose role I am considering.

Basis and check: Record the specific schedule question without filling in a guessed answer.

Supports and limits: Confirm the schedule condition before payment. Keep a question field until a relevant source answers it. / A question is not evidence that the condition is met.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Check a current employer page or public role description for the hours and schedule conditions.

Evidence record 3

Statement and source type: Use a public employer document as the next source. | I, my choice of a verification method.

Scope: A planned research step, not evidence about any actual employer.

Basis and check: Use a public document without asking Contact C for private details.

Supports and limits: I can continue with a modest public check while respecting the declined answer. / A general occupation profile cannot guarantee the hours of a specific vacancy or contract.

Contrary or limiting evidence: Record the public document's link, date and hours wording after checking it.

My next check

Action now: Pause payment until the schedule condition is checked.

Fact and check: Look for a current employer role page or public vacancy in the target region that states hours. Record the link, checked date, role level and wording. If it omits hours, keep the gap visible and use a public employer contact route only if I choose to do so.

Owner and date: I will do the first public check by 10 October 2026.

Maximum investment: At most 30 minutes and 0 in my currency. Stop at the time limit and keep the next question to check.

If supported: If an actual relevant source states compatible hours, make one small further check about the particular role before reconsidering payment. Hours are one necessary condition; they do not establish that training is suitable or worth paying for.

If evidence differs or needs another check: If hours conflict or are omitted, keep or change the plan without assuming the condition is met. Stop this research session at the time limit.

Review after checking: Add the actual source, result and revised action. Keep a question record when the source omits the required hours.