Post Selection Day Evaluation and Feedback Report

048 Fee-paid Valuer Chairs and Fee-paid Valuer Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Residential Property Tribunal

June 2021

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the selection days for **048 Fee-paid Valuer Chairs and Fee-paid Valuer Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Residential Property Tribunal** as well as capture general feedback on candidate performance. The report describes how selection days were undertaken by both panels and candidates; including what characterised stronger and weaker demonstrations of the competencies needed to fulfil the requirements of this role.

Framework

At selection day, the following selection tools were designed to assess the following competencies:

- Exercising Judgement
- Possessing and Building Knowledge
- Assimilating and Clarifying Information
- Working and Communicating with Others
- Managing Work Efficiently

The assessment criteria were developed so that candidates could demonstrate the proficiency and capability transferable to the role from other contexts. The specific behavioural indicators under each competency were designed to reflect the aptitude and faculty that an effective Fee-paid Valuer Member and Chair of the First-tier Tribunal, Residential Property Tribunal is expected to have. This enabled us to assess candidates in a fair and consistent way.

Performance of candidates

A total of 44 candidates applied for this exercise. Twenty-one candidates applied for the Valuer Member role, 8 candidates applied for the Valuer Chair role and 15 candidates applied for both roles.

All 44 candidates were invited to selection day. Nine candidates subsequently withdrew their application before the selection days. Fourteen candidates were recommended by the Judicial Appointments Commission to the Senior President of Tribunals for appointment. Six candidates were recommended for the Chair role and 8 candidates for the Member role. In making this decision the Commission took into account all relevant character checks and all evidence provided by the candidates at selection day as well as the candidates' independent assessments.

Twenty-one candidates were assessed as 'not presently selectable'.

Selection day

Selection days were held remotely via MS Teams, between Monday 7 June and Thursday 17 June 2021. All candidates were offered a one-to-one tutorial with a member of the JAC team to ensure they were comfortable with using MS Teams and knew what to expect.

Situational questions

Development

The situational questions were drafted by 2 Tribunal Judges from the Residential Property Tribunal. In common with all the selection tools developed for this exercise, the situational questions were designed to assess relevant transferable skills and to minimise the extent to which candidates might be advantaged or disadvantaged by their professional background.

The materials developed for this exercise were reviewed internally by Operations, Policy, and Diversity and Engagement teams to quality and equality assure the material to ensure it was an effective tool to assess candidates. The teams also ensured that the materials did not unfairly advantage or disadvantage any potential candidates undertaking the selection days on the basis of their diversity characteristic or professional background.

Following this internal quality assurance, the material was then reviewed by the JAC Advisory Group. The Advisory Group is composed of members of the judiciary and representatives of the legal professions and chaired by a lay JAC Commissioner. It offers its advice and guidance on the development of selection material and looks at material in terms of quality and whether it would have any negative impacts on diverse groups. The effectiveness of the situational questions was assessed by means of a dry run with a range of volunteers from relevant candidate groups. This provided an opportunity to trial the test material and make any necessary amendments.

Structure of the situational questions

There were 4 written scenarios with a series of questions on each scenario. Candidates applying to be a Valuer Member only were presented with scenarios one to 3. Candidates applying to be a Valuer Chair (or both Member and Chair) were presented with scenarios one to 4.

Candidates were asked to take on the role of a Valuer Member/Chair and consider issues that are typical of those likely to arise in this post.

During their preparation time candidates were required to review the scenarios and prepare their answers to the situational questions.

Evidence for Exercising Judgement, Possessing and Building Knowledge, Assimilating and Clarifying Information and Managing Work Efficiently were tested in the situational questions.

Advance preparation

The candidates invited to selection days were asked to familiarise themselves with a number of documents two weeks in advance of selection days.

Assessment of candidates' responses to the situational questions

The evidence for each competency is assessed as either outstanding, strong, sufficient or insufficient. The panels then make a final overall assessment of candidates as either outstanding, strong, selectable or not presently selectable.

Outstanding evidence included:

- Correctly identifying all the facts from the reports and issues to be addressed
- Considering any other relevant evidence outside of those presented

- Demonstrating knowledge of the Rules to consider
- Providing decisions taken and giving a clear explanation of how decisions have been reached
- Clarifying the critical issues
- Demonstrating thorough understanding of tribunal processes and procedures
- Demonstrating clear knowledge of the tests to be applied, their implications and the relevant case law

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating a thorough grasp of the facts in the materials and giving appropriate weight to the issues raised
- Providing a confident analysis, evaluating the evidence and providing reasoning
- Considering any other relevant evidence outside of those presented

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating the ability to grasp the necessary facts and most of the issues to be addressed
- Reaching correct conclusions but with limited explanation of reasoning
- Some hesitation and deliberation of the factors before reaching a conclusion
- Demonstrating a reasonable understanding of tribunal processes and procedures
- Providing correct responses but lacking sufficient detail for the information to be considered strong

Insufficient evidence included:

- Failing to demonstrate relevant understanding of tribunal processes and procedures
- Reaching a wrong or inappropriate decision with no rationale
- Showing lack of knowledge of Residential tribunal procedures
- Insufficient grasp of the relevant facts in the scenario, missing key information and issues
- Hesitancy to debate the issues and failure to make clear recommendations

Competency based interview

Each candidate then had a competency-based interview. Here the panel was seeking further evidence and examples from the candidate of the required competencies and in the context of the role of Valuer Chair/Member. The panel drew upon evidence provided in the candidate's self-assessment and career history to inform their questioning. When coming to their final assessment of the candidate, the panel considered evidence from their independent assessors. Three competencies were assessed in the interview; Possessing and Building Knowledge, Working and Communicating with Others and Managing Work Efficiently.

Possessing and Building Knowledge

Outstanding evidence included:

- No candidates gave outstanding evidence of this competency

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating the ability to acquire and apply knowledge appropriately with accuracy and precision.
- Demonstrating the ability to adopt a range of resources to assist in keeping abreast with learning and development

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating some ability of gaining new knowledge rapidly to deal with changing circumstances
- Demonstrating some evidence to assist in keeping abreast with learning and development

Insufficient evidence included:

- Failing to provide specific examples to demonstrate acquiring knowledge rapidly
- Failing to provide examples that lack complexity or challenge

Working and Communicating with Others

Outstanding evidence included:

- No candidates gave outstanding evidence of this competency

Strong evidence included:

- Providing structured, articulate and well-developed answers
- Demonstrating the ability to understand other's perspectives and persuade colleagues to achieve a consensus
- Dealing with resistance and showing sensitivity to others' views

Sufficient evidence included:

- Describing some sensitivity and patience when challenged
- Providing responses which were sufficient but reasonably straightforward in nature

Insufficient evidence included:

- Providing routine examples with which only described actions at a superficial level
- Failing to provide clear evidence of skills of persuasion or the ability to influence others
- Providing a poorly articulated answer which did not explain effective collaboration

Managing Work Efficiently

Outstanding evidence included:

- No candidates gave outstanding evidence of this competency

Strong evidence included:

- Using a range of tools to effectively manage priorities during a very busy period

- Clearly demonstrating planning and delegation to meet tight deadlines
- Demonstrating flexibility in a changing environment

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating a methodical approach in dealing with issues
- Remaining focussed on key tasks
- Delegating appropriately

Insufficient evidence included:

- Providing generic descriptions of how to organise work
- Failing to provide any evidence of effective prioritisation
- Failing to provide specific any examples

Feedback from Candidates

After the selection days, candidates were invited to complete an anonymous candidate survey. 19 candidates responded to the survey. Based on the results of the survey

The instructions provided beforehand enabled me to prepare for the selection day.
- 100% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed

I understood what was expected on the selection day.
- 90% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 10% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

The situational questions discussed in the situational questioning were realistic and relevant to the role.
- 95% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 5% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

The situational questioning gave me a chance to display how I would react to various tribunal situations.
- 84% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 16% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

I am confident in the situational questioning as a JAC selection tool.
- 100% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed

The interview questions gave me the opportunity to demonstrate my skills, abilities and competence for this role.
- 79% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 11% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

The panel behaved professionally and treated me with respect.
- 100% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed

I am confident in the interview as a JAC selection tool.
- 95% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 5% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed