

6 Did you find the guide “Preparing for the QC Interview”?

Response	Total	Successful	Unsuccessful	Men	Women	No gender specified	BAME	White	No Ethnicity specified
Helpful	70	62	8	40	28	2	10	58	2
Acceptable	39	26	13	22	14	3	5	32	2
Unhelpful or valueless	7	3	4	5	2	0	1	6	0
Did not answer	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	3
Not applicable: Filtered Out	56			38	10	8	12	35	9

7 Did you consider the interview tested competencies relevant to QC appointment?

Response	Total	Successful	Unsuccessful	Men	Women	No gender specified	BAME	White	No Ethnicity specified
To a considerable extent	54	49	5	31	21	2	9	44	1
To a reasonable extent	45	36	9	24	20	1	6	38	1
To a small extent at most	17	6	11	12	3	2	1	14	2
Did not answer	3	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	3
Not applicable: Filtered Out	56			38	10	8	12	35	9

8 Did you find the interview?

Response	Total	Successful	Unsuccessful	Men	Women	No gender specified	BAME	White	No Ethnicity specified
More testing than expected	17	10	7	8	9	0	1	16	0
As expected	81	67	14	50	26	5	11	66	4
More straightforward than expected	17	14	3	8	9	0	4	13	0
Did not answer	4	2	2	1	0	3	0	1	3
Not applicable: Filtered Out	56			38	10	8	12	35	9

9 How did you find the interview questions?

Response	Total	Successful	Unsuccessful	Men	Women	No gender specified	BAME	White	No Ethnicity specified
It was generally clear what information the interviewers wanted	85	77	8	47	35	3	14	69	2
I found some questions unclear or ambiguous	28	14	14	17	9	2	1	25	2
It was rarely clear what information the interviewers wanted	3	0	3	3	0	0	1	2	0
Did not answer	3	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	3
Not applicable: Filtered Out	56			38	10	8	12	35	9

10 Did you find your feedback letter?

Response	Total	Unsuccessful	Filtered Out	Men	Women	No gender specified	BAME	White	No Ethnicity specified
Reasonably helpful in the circumstances	31	11	20	24	8	1	5	26	0
Acceptable	28	9	19	14	4	2	6	20	2
Unhelpful of valueless	17	4	13	19	2	4	3	9	5
Did not answer	6	2	4	0	0	5	0	1	5
Not applicable: Successful	93			49	40	4	14	75	4

Commentary on the Survey Results

4. The main points the Selection Panel drew from the responses to the questions in the survey were:
- As usual successful applicants were much more positive about the process than the unsuccessful.
 - The guidance is generally reasonably well regarded. 58% considered it “very helpful”.
 - Completing the application form took almost all applicants two full working days or more, and it took 60% of applicants at least four days. In the circumstances it is encouraging that over 70% thought QCA sought the right amount of information.
 - The application form was considered unnecessarily difficult to complete by 22% of respondents.
 - The guide “Preparing for the QC Interview” was quite well regarded – 60% found it helpful, and only 5% considered it “unhelpful or valueless.”
 - Most respondents thought the interview tested the competencies “to a considerable degree” (47%) followed by “to a reasonable extent” (39%). However, 14% thought the competencies were tested “to a small extent at most.” Unsurprisingly, successful applicants were more positive than unsuccessful ones.
 - Over 70% of respondents found the interview questions “generally clear.”
 - 41% of applicants found the feedback “reasonably helpful in the circumstances” but 22% thought it “unhelpful or valueless”.

Applicants’ suggestions for Improvements

5. The questionnaire also invited respondents to let us have any comments they had on the interview, or any suggestions they might have for improvements to the process.

Comments about the interview

6. There was little new in comments from applicants about the interview. The main points were:
- Applicants find it frustrating that concerns raised by assessors are not put directly to them. (This is however an inevitable consequence of the assurance of confidentiality given to assessors.)
 - Some applicants express dissatisfaction that their feedback includes reservations which (in the applicant’s view) were not explored at interview.
 - Some interviewees express a preference for at least one of the interviewers being a specialist in the same area as the applicant; or to have good experience of advocacy.

Comments about the process

7. There were two significant issues to take from applicants’ comments about the process.
- There was even greater concern than usual at the absence of fixed dates on which applicants would be notified of the outcome of the competition (and of whether they would be invited to interview). So far as a fixed date for the announcement of the outcome of the competition is concerned, we are in the hands of the Ministry of Justice. The Ministry of Justice have not thus far been willing to establish a date. The MoJ have however made considerable efforts (which we have welcomed) to get the announcement out before Christmas. So far as the date on which the decisions about interview are notified, we already include that information in the Guidance for Applicants. We can however readily include it on the website, and we have now done so.
 - For the first time, a number of applicants express concern at the level of fees – despite the fact that they are now lower in cash terms than they were in 2013. Those who have expressed such concerns will no doubt be disappointed by the Directors’ decision to increase fees for the 2022 competition.
8. Amongst the other points raised were:
- Some applicants expressed frustration at the character limit for self-assessment. The Selection Panel has up to now preferred to have character limits in order to prevent undue prolixity.
 - A few applicants expressed the view that it is undesirable for the announcement of the outcome of the competition to be published shortly before Christmas. However, when we asked applicants specifically about that, there was a very clear majority both from the successful and

the unsuccessful in favour of making the announcement as early as possible, even if that was very shortly before Christmas.

- There is a suggestion that the application form is unfair to those with ADD or to other neurodiverse potential applicants. We will need to explore that.

QCA
July 2022