

FOI DOF/2026-0198

Request

RE: IRC 322756 – Deputy Principal Fisheries Officer

1. What Scoring Matrix was the 'breadth and depth of information provided in response to eligibility criterion 2' measured against? Can you please provide me with a copy of this scoring matrix
2. How many applicants applied for the post, how many made it to the stage at which the panel shortlisted the applicants, how many failed at the short-listing stage, and how many proceeded to interview stage?
3. Of those who were shortlisted out of the application process, how many of them were shortlisted because 'the panel carried an objective evaluation of the breadth and depth of information provided in response to either eligibility criterion and it was decided that the information provided was below the standard required to be invited for interview' even though they met the eligibility criteria for the eligibility criterion?

DoF response

I can confirm the department holds the information requested.

1. The scoring matrix is below at Annex C
2. 41 applicants applied for this competition, 32 applicants made it to the shortlisting stage, 18 applicants failed the shortlisting stage, and 14 applicants proceeded to interview stage.
3. Of the 18 applicants who were shortlisted out of the application process, all 18 were shortlisted out because the panel carried out an objective evaluation of the criterion and decided the information provided was below the standard required to be invited to interview.

Annex C

Rating	Brief Descriptor	Relation to Job Performance
5	Outstanding	Evidence provided by the candidate consistently exceeded the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples demonstrated the selection criteria/competences to an exceptional degree.
4	Very Good	Evidence provided by the candidate frequently exceeded the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/Examples demonstrated the selection criteria/competences to a very high degree.
3	Good	Evidence provided by the candidate met, and in some cases exceeded, the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples demonstrated the selection criteria/competences to a high degree.
2	Just below standard	Evidence provided by the candidate only partially met the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples did not always demonstrate the selection criteria/competences to a satisfactory degree. Continued development is required.
1	Well below standard	Evidence provided by the candidate clearly did not meet the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples did not demonstrate the selection criteria/competences to a satisfactory degree. A great deal of further development is required.