



# **Post Selection Day Evaluation and Feedback Report**

## **027 Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England**

**February 2022**

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the selection days for **027 Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England** 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 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 Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England is expected to have. This enabled us to assess candidates in a fair and consistent way.

## **Performance of candidates**

Fifty-eight candidates applied for this exercise and all candidates were invited to selection days. Six candidates subsequently withdrew their application before the selection days.

Forty-one candidates were recommended by the Judicial Appointments Commission to the Lord Chancellor for appointment although one of these candidates has since withdrawn. Eleven candidates were assessed as 'not presently selectable'. 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.

## **Selection day**

Selection days were held remotely via MS Teams, between Monday 19 July and Tuesday 3 August. All candidates were offered a one-to-one technical tutorial with a member of the JAC team to ensure they were comfortable with using MS Teams and knew what to expect.

## **Development of situational questions**

The situational questions were drafted by the President of the Valuation Tribunal for England. 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**

The situational questions were based on three scenarios with a series of questions on each scenario. Candidates were asked to take on the role of a newly appointed Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England and consider issues that are typical of those likely to arise in this post.

Candidates were provided **45 minutes** preparation time on the selection day. During this time candidates were required to review the scenarios and prepare their answers to the situational questions which lasted up to **25 minutes**.

The first scenario involved candidates having to consider whether an appellants case had merit or not based on a council tax relief application, and whether to allow the appeal or not. They were presented with the applicants letter and a copy of the billing authority letter. The second scenario provided candidates with a list of five situations relating to managing the proceedings and asked them to describe what they would do if appointed a chairman of the Tribunal. The third scenario informed candidates that they were hearing an appeal on which council tax band a property had been placed in, whereby they were provided with background on council tax banding law and practice as well as the circumstances of the case. Candidates were asked what band they would place the appeal dwelling in and to give their reasoning.

The situational questions were designed to assess how candidates deal with decisions they would be asked to make and situations they may encounter if appointed as a newly appointed Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England. They probed for job-related or transferable skill. The panels were looking for candidates to be able to explain how they would manage the tribunal hearings fairly, efficiently and effectively. There was no need for any previous knowledge of rating law as all relevant information to answer the questions was provided.

The scenario and questions were designed to test the competencies of Exercising Judgement and Assimilating and Clarifying Information.

There was no preparation required 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 letters provided and issues to be addressed
- Considering any other relevant evidence outside of those presented
- Demonstrating knowledge of the rules to consider

- Clarifying the critical issues
- Providing thorough understanding of materials provided
- Providing decisions taken and give a clear explanation of how decisions have been reached
- Providing clear knowledge of the tests to be applied, their implication and the relevant rules
- Considering alternative methods to pursue from the information provided if required

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating a thorough grasp of the facts in the materials and give appropriate weight to the issues raised
- Providing analysis, evaluating the evidence and provide brief reasoning
- Considering any other relevant evidence outside of those presented
- Considering some alternative methods from the information provided if required

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
- Expressing hesitation and deliberation of the factors before reaching a conclusion
- Demonstrating a reasonable understanding of processes and procedures within materials provided
- Providing correct responses but lacking sufficient detail for the information to be considered strong

Insufficient evidence included:

- Failing to demonstrate relevant understanding of the materials presented
- Showing lack of understanding of processes and procedures within materials provided
- Insufficient grasp of the relevant facts in the scenario, missing key information and issues
- Failing to clarify facts prior to making a decision
- Providing limited reasons regarding decisions made 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 Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England.

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:

- Demonstrating an outstanding ability to acquire and apply knowledge appropriately with accuracy and precision.

- Demonstrating an outstanding ability to adopt a range of resources to assist in keeping abreast with learning and development

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 evidence 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: check against marking guide

- Failing to provide specific examples to demonstrate acquiring knowledge rapidly
- Failing to demonstrate the ability to acquire expertise in a complex new area of work

## **Working and Communicating with Others**

Outstanding evidence included:

- Demonstrating an outstanding awareness and understanding other's perspectives
- Demonstrating an outstanding understanding of diversity and sensitivity to others

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating an understanding of other's perspectives
- Demonstrating an understanding of diversity and showing sensitivity to others

Sufficient evidence included:

- Describing some sensitivity and patience when challenged
- Demonstrating some understanding of diversity and showing sensitivity to others

Insufficient evidence included:

- Failing to provide sensitivity and patience when challenged
- Failing to demonstrate an understanding of diversity and showing sensitivity to others
- Providing a poorly articulated answer which did not explain effective collaboration.

## **Managing Work Efficiently**

Outstanding evidence included:

- Demonstrating outstanding resilience by responding effectively to emerging pressures
- Demonstrating an outstanding ability to organise work and resolve problems when challenged

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating evidence of delivering resilience and flexibility in a changing environment.
- Demonstrating evidence of reprioritising work when challenged

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating some evidence of resilience and flexibility in a changing environment
- Demonstrating some evidence of prioritisation and planning work effectively

Insufficient evidence included:

- Failing to demonstrate the ability to prioritise work effectively
- Failing to provide evidence of effective resilience
- Failing to provide specific examples

## **Feedback from Candidates**

After the selection days, candidates were invited to complete an anonymous candidate survey. 27 candidates responded to the survey. The results of the survey are as follows:

### **The instructions provided beforehand enabled me to prepare for the selection day.**

- 85.2% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 14.8% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

### **I understood what was expected on the selection day.**

- 92.5% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 7.5% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

### **The situational questions discussed in the situational questioning were realistic and relevant to the role.**

- 88.9% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 11.1% of candidates neither agreed or disagreed

### **The situational questioning gave me a chance to display how I would react to various tribunal situations.**

- 81.4% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 14.8% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed
- 3.8% of candidates disagreed

### **I am confident in the situational questioning as a JAC selection tool.**

- 85.1% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 11.1% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed
- 3.8% of candidates strongly disagreed

### **The interview questions gave me the opportunity to demonstrate my skills, abilities and competence for this role.**

- 74% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 14.8% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed
- 11.2% of candidates 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.**

- 85.1% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 11.1% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed
- 3.8% of candidates strongly disagreed