



**College of
Policing**

Fast Track National Assessment Centre 2014

Results and Analysis Report

September 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, modified, amended, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the College of Policing. For additional copies, or to enquire about the content of the document, please contact the College of Policing Examinations and Assessment on (01423) 876941 or email SeniorSelection@college.pnn.police.uk.

For copyright specific enquiries, please telephone the College of Policing Library on (01256) 602650.

TABLES

Table 1 – Applicants and Results by Force	i
Table 2 – Applicants and Results by Current Status	ii
Table 3 – Applicants and Results by Sex	ii
Table 4 – Applicants and Results by Ethnicity	ii
Table 5 – Applicants and Results by Ethnic Categories	iii
Table 6 – Applicants and Results by Age	iv
Table 7 – Applicants and Results by First Language	iv
Table 8 – Applicants and Results by Academic Attainment.....	v
Table 9 – Applicants and Results by Disability.....	v
Table 10 –Results by those who received a Reasonable Adjustment at the Assessment Centre	v
Table 11 – Applicants and Results by Marital Status	vi
Table 12 – Applicants and Results by Caring Responsibilities	vi
Table 13 – Applicants and Results by Sexual Orientation.....	vii
Table 14 – Applicants and Results by Religion/Belief/Faith	vii
Table 15 – Applicants and Results by Employment Status	viii
Table 16 –Results by Economic Sector.....	viii
Table 17 –Results by Managerial Status.....	ix
Table 18 –Results by Current Salary.....	ix
Table 19 –Results by Job Sector	x
Table 20 –Results by Main Degree Discipline Area	xi
Table 21 – Candidate and Assessor Relevance and Fairness Ratings.....	xii

SUMMARY REPORT

1. The Fast Track Programme is aimed at opening up entry to the service to members of the special constabulary, police staff and graduates, who will bring new perspectives and diverse backgrounds to support the continuous development of policing.
2. The aim is to develop officers with the skills, experience and potential and motivation to reach the senior ranks of the service, at least superintendent level, to impact on and influence the management and culture of the service.
3. The Fast Track National Assessment Centre aimed to:
 - identify candidates who have the ability to become an inspector after three years;
 - identify candidates who have potential to reach at least the rank of superintendent or above within their career;
 - identify candidates who can bring new perspectives and ways of thinking to the service
 - ensure candidates met the standards required of someone joining the Police Service.
4. The Fast Track Programme was open to three groups of applicants. These were graduates who held a degree not below a 2:1. Graduates with a degree at a 2:2 level could be considered by their force if there was evidence that they could cope with the demands of the scheme and they had skills and abilities that align to the force's future success. The programme was also open to Police Staff and members of the Special Constabulary who had been sworn into a Home Office police force in England and Wales by 1st April of the year of application.

5. Overall, 1849 applications were received for Fast Track Programme in 2014, across the 28 forces participating in the programme.
6. The Fast Track programme is a three year programme which will include training as constable and sergeant. After the first year on the programme, successful candidates will be joined by serving constables who will complete a two year programme. The programme will be robust with testing throughout and candidates can be removed from the programme if they are found to be unsuitable at any point.
7. A national application form was provided by the College of Policing that all applicants were required to complete. A number of other documents were also provided by the College of Policing to support both candidates and forces with this stage including Force Sifting Guidance and Interview Questions for Forces, and a Realistic Job Preview, Self-Selection Questionnaire and a High Potential Development Tool for candidates.
8. Forces could set the duration of their own application window within a two month period. Sifting at the application stage was the responsibility of individual forces who could then support up to two and half times the number of applicants for the National Assessment Centre as they had places available. Basic eligibility checking was also conducted by forces at this stage. Following this, 120 applicants (6.5%) were supported by 23 forces to attend the Fast Track National Assessment Centre. Five forces choose not to support any applicants and Warwickshire and West Mercia chose to jointly support one candidate.
9. A total of 15 applicants (12.5%) withdrew from the process prior to the Assessment Centre, leaving a total of 105 candidates attending the Assessment Centre.

10. The Assessment Centre consisted of seven exercises, which candidates completed over a day and a half. These were a Written In-Tray exercise, an Oral Briefing, a Partnership Meeting, a Performance Management exercise, a Presentation, an Interview and Cognitive Ability Tests. The Cognitive Ability Tests were three tests from the SHL Verify™ Range: Verify™ Verbal Reasoning Test, Verify™ Numerical Reasoning Test and Verify™ Inductive Reasoning Test, which were scored against the Graduate level.
11. In all exercises except the Cognitive Ability Tests, candidates' potential and suitability was assessed against the behavioural competency areas at the Senior Manager level of the Policing Professional Framework (PPF) which are relevant to the target rank of Superintendent.
12. A total of 43 candidates (41.0%) were recommended for the Fast Track Programme at the Fast Track National Assessment Centre. Recommended candidates then had to be supported by their forces to gain a place on the Programme. All 43 candidates were supported by their chosen force. From the 23 forces who supported applicants, 15 had one or more candidates recommended for the programme.
13. In conducting analysis of the biographical data of applicants, it should be noted that where the number of applicants in some groups are low, care should be taken to avoid over-inferring or generalising from this data. All biographical data reported is self-reported data from the applicants.
14. Of the 1849 applications received, 1477 (79.9%) were from external graduates, 225 (12.2%) were Police Staff and 147 (8.0%) were members of the Special Constabulary¹. Following the in-force sift, 86.7% (104 applicants) of those supported were external graduates, 10% (12 applicants) were Police

¹ It should be noted that applications to the Metropolitan Police Service were taken from their successful candidates at the MPS Graduate Assessment Centre and were therefore all classified as Graduates for the purposes of this analysis. However, some candidates may also be members of Police Staff or the Special Constabulary. Applicants to all forces were asked to define themselves in one of the three categories and therefore it is possible that some applicants may fall across more than one of these categories.

Staff and 3.3% (4 applicants) were members of the Special Constabulary. 37 graduates (41.6%) were recommended following the assessment centre, along with 3 members of Police Staff (25.0%) and 3 members of the Special Constabulary (75.0%).

15. Applications were received from 792 females (42.8%) and 1057 males (57.2%). Of those supported by forces after the in-force sift, 54 applicants (45%) were female and 66 applicants (55%) were male. Males had a slightly higher success rate at the Assessment Centre with 24 (42.1%) being recommended compared to 19 females (39.6%). The difference between these groups was not significant.

16. Female representation on the Fast Track programme will be 44.2%, which is above that within the Police Service of England and Wales including British Transport Police (BTP) which is currently 27.9%². The number of females is also above current representation within constable, sergeant, inspector, chief inspector and superintendent ranks nationally, which are currently 30.1%, 20.4%, 19.3%, 20.9% and 16.6% respectively³.

17. 164 applicants (8.9%) described their ethnicity as being from a 'Black and Minority Ethnic' (BME) background and 1681 (90.9%) were from a 'White' background. There were 4 applicants who did not provide this information and as such have been recorded as 'prefer not to say'. Of those supported by their force after the in-force sift, 17 applicants (14.2%) were from a BME background and 102 applicants (85%) were from a white background. One supported applicant did not disclose their ethnic background. 6 candidates (40.0%) from a BME background were successful, compared to 37 (41.6%) of 'White' applicants. The difference between these groups was not significant.

^{2,3,4&5} Based upon Home Office Statistical Bulletin 07/14; Police Workforce, England and Wales. 31 March 2014.

18. The representation of 'BME' candidates (6, 14.0%) going forward to attend the Fast Track Programme is higher than the current figure of 5.2% of police officer numbers in England and Wales (including BTP)⁴. The number of candidates from a BME background is also above current representation within constable, sergeant, inspector, chief inspector and superintendent ranks nationally, which are currently 5.7%, 3.7%, 3.6%, 3.9% and 3.9% respectively⁵.

19. The age of applicants ranged from 18 to 53 years, with the average age being 25.2 years. The age range of those supported by forces was 20 to 42 years, with the mean age being 26.0 years. The average age of those who were recommended at the Assessment Centre was 25.1, with candidate ages ranging from 20 to 34 years. This compared to an average age of 26.2 years for candidates who were not recommended at the Assessment Centre. The age range for these candidates was 21 to 42 years. Younger candidates tended to have higher success rates than older candidates.

20. Further information on applicant numbers and success rates of biographical groups is available within the appendix, including further characteristics not previously discussed (e.g. marital status, religion/belief/faith and caring responsibilities, etc).

21. Information was also gathered from those attending the national Assessment Centre regarding their socio-economic status and educational background. This information is included within the appendix. Overall, the information gathered from candidates indicates that the majority of candidates were in full time employment but worked across different economic sectors and held a range of positions. The data also shows that candidates had a wide range of degree disciplines.

22. Analysis of the marks achieved by candidates' shows that all exercises had a mean score between 2.94 and 3.95, which are all broadly close to 3.5, the mid point of the mark scale. The mean score for the Cognitive Ability Tests was 2.94 which is slightly higher than the mid-point. The range of scores for the Cognitive Ability Tests was 1 to 5, showing that no candidates were awarded an overall mark of 6 in this exercise. The Cognitive Ability Tests were normed against other graduates, and candidates were awarded a grade of A to D for each test. Their performance was then reflected as an overall mark based on these grades. For candidates to receive an overall grade of 6, they would have had to achieve a D grade in all three Cognitive Ability Tests.
23. In addition, the distribution of the marks shows that the full grade scale was used in all other exercises and these were approximately normally distributed. Overall this gives an indication that the exercises differentiate well between candidates and that they are set at an appropriate level of difficulty for the applicant group.
24. Both candidates and assessors were asked to provide feedback on aspects of the Selection Process, including the exercises. On average 82.6% of candidates thought the exercises were fair and 81.2% of candidates thought the exercises were relevant. Candidates gave lower ratings on average for the Cognitive Ability Tests. Analysis of the feedback suggests that this is because they saw these as least relevant and directly transferable to the workplace. On average 96.7% of assessors thought the exercises were fair and 97.9% of assessors thought the exercises were relevant.

APPENDIX

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Avon and Somerset	144	7	4.9	6	4	66.7
Bedfordshire	26	1	3.8	1	1	100.0
British Transport	42	2	4.8	2	1	50.0
Cheshire	68	3	4.4	1	0	0.0
Dyfed-Powys	9	1	11.1	1	0	0.0
Essex	105	1	1.0	1	0	0.0
Greater Manchester	253	11	4.3	11	4	36.4
Gwent	34	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hertfordshire ⁶	57	4	7.0	4	2	50.0
Humberside	39	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kent	112	1	0.9	1	1	100.0
Metropolitan ⁷	151	47	31.1	39	20	51.3
Norfolk	18	1	5.6	1	1	100.0
North Wales	18	1	5.6	1	0	0.0
North Yorkshire	92	7	7.6	6	1	16.7
Northamptonshire	39	2	5.1	2	1	50.0
Northumbria	162	5	3.1	4	0	0.0
South Wales	97	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Yorkshire	20	3	15.0	3	0	0.0
Staffordshire	16	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Suffolk	12	1	8.3	1	1	100.0
Surrey	14	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sussex	74	6	8.1	6	1	16.7
Thames Valley	55	5	9.1	5	1	20.0
Warwickshire	19	1	1.4	1	0	0.0
West Mercia	55					
West Midlands	25	3	12.0	3	2	66.7
West Yorkshire	93	7	7.5	5	2	40.0
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 1 – Applicants and Results by Force

⁶ One candidate later changed their application from Hertfordshire Police to Thames Valley Police. Please note for the purposes of this report, this candidate is included within the data for Hertfordshire Police as that is the force to which they applied and was supported for the Assessment Centre.

⁷ Metropolitan Police Service supported applicant data is based on those successful at the Metropolitan Police Service Graduate Entry Scheme

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Graduate	1477	104	7.0	89	37	41.6
Police Staff	225	12	5.3	12	3	25.0
Special Constabulary	147	4	2.7	4	3	75.0
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 2 – Applicants and Results by Current Status⁸

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Female	792	54	6.8	48	19	39.6
Male	1057	66	6.2	57	24	42.1
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 3 – Applicants and Results by Sex

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
BME	164	17	10.4	15	6	40.0
White	1681	102	6.1	89	37	41.6
Prefer not to say	4	1	25.0	1	0	0.0
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 4 – Applicants and Results by Ethnicity

⁸ It should be noted that applications to the Metropolitan Police Service were taken from their successful candidates at the MPS Graduate Assessment Centre and were therefore all classified as Graduates for the purposes of this analysis. However, some candidates may also be members of Police Staff or the Special Constabulary. Applicants to all forces were asked to define themselves in one of the three categories and therefore it is possible that some applicants may fall across more than one of these categories.

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Asian/Asian British	76	5	6.6	5	1	20.0
Bangladeshi	6	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indian	28	3	10.7	3	0	0.0
Pakistani	30	1	3.3	1	1	100.0
Any Other Asian Background	12	1	8.3	1	0	0.0
Black/Black British	27	1	3.7	1	0	0.0
African	21	1	4.8	1	0	0.0
Caribbean	5	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Any Other Black Background	1	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chinese	2	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mixed	48	9	18.8	7	3	42.9
White and Black African	1	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
White and Black Caribbean	13	3	23.1	2	1	50.0
White and Asian	25	3	12.0	2	2	100.0
Any Other Mixed Background	9	3	33.3	3	0	0.0
White	1681	102	6.1	89	37	41.6
British	1394	91	6.5	78	36	46.2
English	151	5	3.3	5	0	0.0
Scottish	10	3	30.0	3	1	33.3
Irish	10	1	10.0	1	0	0.0
Welsh	66	2	3.0	2	0	0.0
Any Other White Background	50	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Any Other Ethnic Background	11	2	18.2	2	2	100.0
Missing	4	1	25.0	1	0	0.0
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 5 – Applicants and Results by Ethnic Categories

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
20 years and under	99	1	1.0	1	1	100.0
21 – 25 years	1167	64	5.5	58	26	44.8
26 – 30 years	343	41	12.0	34	14	41.2
31 – 35 years	127	10	7.9	9	2	22.2
36 – 40 years	59	2	3.4	2	0	0.0
41 years and over	54	2	3.7	1	0	0.0
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 6 – Applicants and Results by Age

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
English Not First Language	66	2	3.0	2	1	50.0
English as a First Language	1759	116	6.6	101	41	40.6
Missing	2	2	100.0	2	1	50.0
Not Stated	22	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 7 – Applicants and Results by First Language

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
No formal qualifications	5	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
O Level/GCSE/CSE	28	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
A Level/NVQ Level 3	135	5	3.7	5	3	60.0
Degree/NVQ Level 5	1394	78	5.6	63	24	38.1
Postgraduate MSc/PhD	287	37	12.9	37	16	43.2
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 8 – Applicants and Results by Academic Attainment

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Disability	85	28	32.9	26	11	42.3
No Disability	1749	92	5.3	79	32	40.5
Prefer not to say	15	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 9 – Applicants and Results by Disability

	Number of candidates (N) at AC	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Reasonable Adjustment	7	3	42.9
No Reasonable Adjustment	98	40	40.8
TOTAL	105	43	41.0

Table 10 – Results by those who received a Reasonable Adjustment at the Assessment Centre

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Civil Partnered	9	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cohabiting/Partnered	361	25	6.9	19	6	31.6
Divorced	18	1	5.6	1	0	0.0
Married	186	14	7.5	12	5	41.7
Re-Married	4	1	25.0	1	1	100.0
Separated	9	1	11.1	1	0	0.0
Single	1223	76	6.2	69	29	62.0
Widowed	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prefer Not to Say	39	2	5.1	2	2	100.0
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 11 – Applicants and Results by Marital Status

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Has a Caring Responsibility	83	2	2.4	2	1	50.0
No Caring Responsibility	1718	109	6.3	94	39	41.5
Prefer Not to Say	48	9	18.8	9	3	33.3
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 12 – Applicants and Results by Caring Responsibilities

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Bisexual	36	2	5.6	2	1	50.0
Gay/Lesbian	85	3	3.5	3	0	0.0
Heterosexual	1634	106	6.5	92	37	40.2
Prefer Not to Say	94	9	9.6	8	5	62.5
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 13 – Applicants and Results by Sexual Orientation

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Buddhist	10	1	10.0	1	1	100.0
Christian	692	51	7.4	43	14	32.6
Hindu	7	1	14.3	1	0	0.0
Jewish	7	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Muslim	47	2	4.3	2	1	50.0
Sikh	17	3	17.6	3	0	0.0
Other	1	1	0.0	0	N/A	N/A
No Religion	992	51	5.1	46	21	45.7
Prefer Not to Say	76	10	13.2	9	6	66.7
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 14 – Applicants and Results by Religion/Belief/Faith

	In-force selection			National Assessment Centre		
	Number of Applicants Overall (N)	Number of Supported Applicants (N)	Success Rate (%)	Number of candidates (N)	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Full Time	1017	89	8.8	78	33	42.3
Part Time	254	4	1.6	3	0	0.0
Student	457	25	5.5	22	10	45.5
Unemployed	99	2	2.0	2	0	0.0
Missing	22	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	1849	120	6.5	105	43	41.0

Table 15 – Applicants and Results by Employment Status

	Number of candidates (N) at AC	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Public	44	17	38.6
Private	29	11	37.9
Third	3	2	66.7
Unemployed	14	6	42.9
Other	6	4	66.7
Prefer not to say	1	1	100.0
Missing	8	2	25.0
TOTAL	105	43	41.0

Table 16 – Results by Economic Sector

	Number of candidates (N) at AC	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Top Level	1	1	100.0
Middle Management	14	4	28.6
First Level Management	12	4	33.3
Non Managerial	51	22	43.1
Unemployed	14	6	66.7
Other	5	3	60.0
Prefer not to say	1	1	100.0
Missing	7	2	28.6
TOTAL	105	43	41.0

Table 17 –Results by Managerial Status

	Number of candidates (N) at AC	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Unpaid/No Salary	21	10	47.6
Up to £10,000	3	2	66.7
£10,000 to £20,000	14	6	42.9
£20,000 to £30,000	37	13	35.1
£30,000 to £40,000	14	7	50.0
£40,000 to £50,000	5	1	20.0
Over £50,000	3	1	33.3
Prefer not to say	2	1	50.0
Missing	6	2	33.3
TOTAL	105	43	41.0

Table 18 –Results by Current Salary

	Number of candidates (N) at AC	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Administration/Business Support	2	1	50.0
Armed Forces	6	0	0.0
Banking	1	1	100.0
Civil Service	4	1	25.0
Consultancy, Strategy and Change	1	1	100.0
Education	6	1	16.7
Engineering and Manufacturing	1	0	0.0
Finance	1	1	100.0
Health	3	1	33.3
Health and Safety	1	1	100.0
Hospitality and Catering	3	1	33.3
Human Resources	1	1	100.0
IT	2	1	50.0
Legal	4	2	50.0
Leisure	1	0	0.0
Marketing/Advertising	4	1	25.0
Media and Creative	3	2	66.7
Police	21	10	47.6
Prison Service	1	0	0.0
Retail	7	3	42.9
Sales	1	0	0.0
Social Care/Services	1	0	0.0
Travel and Tourism	1	0	0.0
Student	8	4	50.0
Unemployed	7	5	71.4
Other	1	1	100.0
Prefer not to say	1	1	100.0
Missing	12	3	25.0
TOTAL	105	43	41.0

Table 19 – Results by Job Sector

© College of Policing (2014)

	Number of candidates (N) at AC	Recommended candidates within category	Success Rate within category
Arts and Humanities	25	13	52.0
Business and Management	12	3	25.0
Design	1	0	0.0
Education	1	0	0.0
Engineering	3	1	33.3
Environment and Development	2	2	100.0
Health and Social Care	1	1	100.0
Languages	3	0	0.0
Law	18	8	44.4
Psychology and Counselling	7	2	28.6
Science	9	6	66.7
Social Sciences	12	3	25.0
Other	3	1	33.3
Not Applicable	1	0	0.0
Missing	7	3	42.9
TOTAL	105	43	41.0

Table 20 –Results by Main Degree Discipline Area

	Candidate				Assessor			
	'Fair'		'Relevant'		'Fair'		'Relevant'	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Written In-Tray	36	87.8	36	87.8	12	100.0	12	100.0
Performance Management	37	90.2	36	87.8	14	93.3	15	100.0
Oral Briefing	38	92.7	36	87.8	15	93.8	15	93.8
Interview	38	92.7	39	95.1	15	100.0	15	100.0
Presentation	37	90.2	38	92.7	11	100.0	11	100.0
Partnership Meeting	29	70.7	29	70.7	14	93.3	14	93.3
Cognitive Ability Tests	22	53.7	19	46.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 21 – Candidate and Assessor Relevance and Fairness Ratings