

FOI DOF/2026-0177

Request

RE: IRC320461 - Freedom of Information Request

1. Was a marking scheme or a scoring matrix used and if so, can a copy be provided?
2. Were all panel members who carried out any sifts provided with a standard definition of what constitutes "sufficient breadth and depth" before assessing applicants, can a copy of this definition be provided?
3. What was the maximum score available for 2b and what was the minimum score required to be invited to interview?
4. How many applicants were invited to interview?
5. How many panel members assessed criterion 2b and did each member score independently prior to moderation?
6. Was a moderation process carried out following individual scoring and if so, what was the outcome in respect to my application?
7. How many candidates have sought to appeal or for more clarity (or words to the same effect) on their feedback?

DoF response

I can confirm the department holds the information requested.

1. Please see attached at Annex C, the scoring matrix that was used for shortlisting.
2. Panel members were not provided with a specific definition of the term "sufficient breadth and depth".
3. The maximum score available for 2b at shortlisting was 10 and the minimum score required to be invited to interview was 5
4. A total of 177 applicants were invited to interview.
5. Six panel members assessed the eligibility criteria. The recruitment policy states that panel members must individually consider each application against each eligibility/shortlisting criteria before attending the sift meeting.
6. I refer to the response to question 5 (above). All candidates have received the outcome of the sift.
7. A total of 43 candidates have sought further clarification on their feedback.