

Score Any Recruiting Candidate in 10 Minutes

The 1–35 Ideal Agent Scorecard from the 2026 Recruiting Insight Personas framework — adapted for independent broker-owners doing their own recruiting.

Candidate name: _____

Date: _____

Persona type: _____

How to use: For each question, select the option that best describes this candidate. Note the score. Total all questions at the end and compare against the result guide on page 2. Score before the conversation where possible — use public MLS/production data for Dimensions 1 and 3.

DIMENSION 1

Production Fit

Q1 What is this candidate's current production level relative to what this brokerage needs?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|
| ☐ | Significantly below the brokerage's median productive agent — unlikely to contribute meaningfully in year one | Score: 1–2 |
| ☐ | At or near the brokerage median — productive but not yet driving meaningful company dollar | Score: 3–5 |
| ☐ | Above the brokerage median — will contribute real company dollar from month one | Score: 6–7 |

Q2 What is this candidate's production trajectory over the last 24 months?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------------|
| ☐ | Flat or declining — production has not grown materially in two years | Score: 1–2 |
| ☐ | Stable — consistent but without strong upward momentum | Score: 3–5 |
| ☐ | Growing — measurable production increase over the last 12–24 months | Score: 6–7 |

Q3 Does this candidate's production niche or market focus align with where this brokerage operates?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|
| ☐ | Misaligned — different price point, geographic focus, or property type than our core market | Score: 1–2 |
| ☐ | Partial alignment — some overlap but would require adjustment or new market development | Score: 3–5 |
| ☐ | Strong alignment — directly competitive in the same market segments where we operate | Score: 6–7 |

DIMENSION 2

Coachability

Q4 Does this candidate have evidence of responding positively to coaching or feedback?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|
| ☐ | No evidence — cannot cite a specific example of feedback they implemented | Score: 1–2 |
| ☐ | Some evidence — can describe feedback they received but response is vague | Score: 3–5 |
| ☐ | Strong evidence — provides a specific example of feedback that changed their approach | Score: 6–7 |

Q5	How does this candidate describe their ideal brokerage relationship and support model?	
☐	Highly independent — explicitly resistant to structure, accountability, or coaching involvement	Score: 1–2
☐	Selectively open — values some support but with defined boundaries around involvement	Score: 3–5
☐	Actively receptive — describes a coaching relationship as important to their development	Score: 6–7
Q6	Does this candidate show evidence of implementing new skills or systems in their business?	
☐	No — relies primarily on the same methods they have always used	Score: 1–2
☐	Partial — has adopted some new tools or approaches but inconsistently	Score: 3–5
☐	Yes — actively experiments with and integrates new approaches into their business	Score: 6–7

DIMENSION 3 Tech Alignment		
Q7	What is this candidate's comfort level with the technology tools this brokerage uses?	
[]	Low — has minimal experience with CRM, transaction management, or digital marketing tools	Score: 1–2
[]	Medium — comfortable with standard tools but limited experience with automation or advanced systems	Score: 3–5
[]	High — actively uses and advocates for the type of technology infrastructure this brokerage has built	Score: 6–7
Q8	How does this candidate describe their current technology workflow?	
[]	Manual — tracks leads in a spreadsheet or notebook; minimal digital infrastructure	Score: 1–2
[]	Standard — uses basic CRM and communication tools but without integrated workflow automation	Score: 3–5
[]	Advanced — has an integrated, automated workflow that mirrors or exceeds this brokerage's tech stack	Score: 6–7
DIMENSION 4 Cultural Pillars		
Q9	Does this candidate's description of their ideal brokerage culture match what this brokerage actually is?	
[]	Clear mismatch — what they describe is incompatible with how this brokerage operates day-to-day	Score: 1–2
[]	Partial fit — some alignment but meaningful differences in collaboration style or values emphasis	Score: 3–5
[]	Strong fit — their description closely matches the culture, team dynamic, and operating model here	Score: 6–7
Q10	How does this candidate describe their relationship with the agents they currently work around?	
[]	Isolated — describes little meaningful connection or collaboration with the current brokerage community	Score: 1–2
[]	Selective — maintains a few relationships but operates largely independently	Score: 3–5
[]	Embedded — speaks positively and specifically about the team environment and will bring relationship energy	Score: 6–7
DIMENSION 5 Friction Level		
Q11	How complex is this candidate's transition from their current brokerage?	
[]	High friction — active disputes, non-compete considerations, or difficult personal circumstances that delay start	Score: 1–2
[]	Moderate friction — a clean transition but with some timing or pipeline complications to manage	Score: 3–5
[]	Low friction — can transition cleanly with minimal disruption to their production or our operations	Score: 6–7

Q12	How portable is this candidate's current client pipeline and referral network?	
[]	Low portability — most business tied to the current brokerage's brand, lead system, or team	Score: 1–2
[]	Moderate portability — some personal relationships but also significant brand-dependent business	Score: 3–5
[]	High portability — personal brand and referral network that transitions independently of brokerage affiliation	Score: 6–7

SCORING GUIDE		
Dimension	Questions Used As Diagnostic	Dimension Score (1–7)
1 — Production Fit	Q1, Q2, Q3 — evidence of production level and trajectory	___ / 7
2 — Coachability	Q4, Q5, Q6 — evidence of growth mindset and response to feedback	___ / 7
3 — Tech Alignment	Q7, Q8 — technology comfort and workflow sophistication	___ / 7
4 — Cultural Pillars	Q9, Q10 — cultural fit and community orientation	___ / 7
5 — Friction Level	Q11, Q12 — transition complexity and pipeline portability	___ / 7
TOTAL SCORE		___ / 35

SCORE	TIER	WHAT TO DO	DIAGNOSTIC QUESTION
30–35	Ideal Match	Pursue aggressively. Move quickly. This candidate's profile aligns strongly with what this brokerage needs. Prioritise speed — they are being recruited by others.	Which dimension scored lowest? Address it directly in your offer.
22–29	The Project	Pursue if the brokerage has genuine development capacity. Be honest about which dimensions scored low and whether you can address them. Do not recruit a Project without the infrastructure.	What specific dimension scored 3 or below? Do you have the system to fix it?
Below 22	Anti-Persona	Do not recruit, regardless of production numbers or enthusiasm. A candidate below 22 is statistically unlikely to produce consistently in this brokerage's model. Decline respectfully.	Which dimension drove the low score? Use this to refine your ideal avatar.

Build a recruiting system around this Scorecard: Book a call with the RightAlly team to map your recruiting pipeline, score your last 12 months of hires against the framework, and design a structured recruiting system for your brokerage.

rightally.io/book-a-call | rightally.io/roi-calculator