



FEEDBACK TO APPLICANTS WHO WERE NOT RECOMMENDED AFTER INTERVIEW

This note outlines the approach which the Selection Panel takes to providing feedback to applicants in the QC competition who were interviewed, but who were not recommended for appointment.

The Selection Panel only interviews applicants where, following consideration of the assessments received about them, there appears to be a prospect that the applicant may be recommended for appointment. It follows that almost all those interviewed, even if eventually unsuccessful, are highly competent advocates. However, because the Panel aims to give the applicant benefit of any doubt about whether they might be appointable at the pre-interview moderation stage, almost 40% of those interviewed were in the event not recommended for appointment. The Panel does **not** give applicants the benefit of the doubt when deciding whether or not to recommend for appointment: if the Panel is uncertain about an applicant, they will not be recommended.

The feedback to applicants is based on the conclusions of the Selection Panel as a whole at final moderation, rather than simply the view of the two Panel members who interviewed each applicant, or the two who graded them.

In order to be recommended for appointment, applicants must demonstrate “strong evidence of excellence” in both understanding and using the law (Competency A) and in written and oral advocacy (Competency B). Applicants must also demonstrate “strong evidence of excellence” in at least one of working with others (Competency C) or diversity (Competency D) and “evidence of excellence” in the other competency.

The feedback aims to make clear what conclusion the Selection Panel reached on the applicant in respect of each of the competencies except integrity. For each competency, the feedback will say whether or not the applicant reached the standard for recommendation for appointment. However, since “evidence of excellence” may or may not be sufficient in the case of Competencies C and D, depending on whether “strong evidence of excellence” is demonstrated in the other competency, the feedback will not normally say whether or not the standard for recommendation was met in either of those competencies when the applicant demonstrates merely “evidence of excellence”.

The feedback does not normally deal with the integrity competency. That competency is regarded as satisfied unless there is evidence to the contrary.

The main purpose of the feedback is to indicate to applicants the areas where more compelling evidence of excellence is needed for the applicant to succeed. Accordingly, although the feedback for each competency will normally start with positive evidence from assessors or from interview, any significant criticisms or reservations from assessors or the interview will normally also be recorded, so far as that can be done without breaching the confidentiality of an assessor. It should be noted, however, that it is far from unusual for there to be no significant criticisms of an applicant even though they have not been recommended for appointment. But the absence of criticism is not a sufficient basis to found a recommendation for appointment. The Panel needs to see strong and consistent evidence of **excellence**, not merely evidence of a high degree of competence, in order to recommend appointment.



Where an applicant has fallen well short of the required level in any competency, the feedback will make that clear. That applies to only a very small proportion of those who were interviewed.

Neither the Selection Panel nor the Secretariat can add to the feedback provided to individual applicants. However, if applicants have any questions about the general approach to feedback set out here, please email the Chief Executive at: russell.wallman@qcappointments.org