

Legal  
Compliance  
Students and  
Education Support  
Directorate

Room G37  
James Clerk Maxwell Building  
57 Waterloo Road  
London SE1 8WA  
Tel: 020 7848 4260  
Email: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx



Ms Sharma

By Email: [request-182753-fc1ef2d4@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:request-182753-fc1ef2d4@whatdotheyknow.com)

Tuesday, 11 March 2014

Dear Ms Sharma,

**Freedom of Information Act 2000 appeal request and new request – Criteria**  
interviewers use to determine a candidate's suitability.

You wrote to College on 8 December 2013 requesting a review of the information that had been sent to you. This letter addresses that appeal request. The College conducts its appeal procedures in line with our FoIA policy which can be viewed here:

[http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/assets/files/governance\\_and\\_legal/Freedom\\_of\\_Information\\_Policy\\_updated\\_Oct\\_%202011.pdf](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/assets/files/governance_and_legal/Freedom_of_Information_Policy_updated_Oct_%202011.pdf)

On behalf of the College I apologise for the delay in our response.

On reading your request it would appear that you have requested a review of the College's position on not releasing some of the information in your original request, dated 30 October 2013, but that you also asked for new information which had not formed part of your original request.

Therefore I have split this response into two parts, one part dealing with the new request for information and the other part being the review of the College's decision to refuse your request for information under section 12 of the Act as the cost had exceeded the 'appropriate limit' prescribed in the Fees Regulations (SI 2004/3244).

The response to both is set out below.

#### **New Request for information**

On 8 December you asked:

- 1. Secondly, I would like to further ask how the College ensures that every interview is of the same standard. I.E. there are many clinicians and academic who interview; therefore how does the College ensure that the same standard of interview is provided to each interviewee? Are all the interviewers trained in interviewing candidates and if not what steps are taken to ensure that the candidate interviewed by such interviewers are treated equally along with*

*interviewers who are interviewed by interviewers who are trained in interviewing? Is the fact that there are 2 people interviewing the only safe guard for this query?*

At the start of each admission cycle the College conducts compulsory interviewer training. This is compulsory for both new interviewers and those who have previously been an interviewer at College. During this training, interviewers are given clear guidance on what the College is seeking in an applicant, what to ask and how to assess this.

In addition:

- We always aim to place new interviewers with experienced ones (once the interview cycle has begun) in order for them to be given guidance on the required standards we expect.
- There is a rubric setting out different levels of answers and how each of these are to be assessed as an aid to standardisation and consistency across interviews for the same subject. This rubric is part of the training but is made available during each interview to interviewers
- Interviewers (new and old) are observed on an ad hoc basis to see that they are following set guidelines. All report forms are also double checked.

*3. If so I would like to further requests the success rate of interviewee who have been interviewed by: 1. people trained in interviewing and  
2. not trained in interviewing.*

Given the answer above this question is not applicable to the College.

This concludes the answers to the new FoIA requests you raised in your letter dated 8 December 2013.

## Review

You asked the following:

*“In the response to my query point 5. ‘If you can I also get the answers for question 3 and 4 specifically for graduates (from any field; who holds a degree ) applied to the 5 year programme who were successful in obtaining an offer to read medicine.*

*Your response states that:*

*Your response states that ‘The College does not keep an electronic format of which medical applicants already hold a degree. Therefore to answer this question would require us to manually check each medical paper application received for the years*

*requested. Even give a very conservative estimate of 15 minutes per file this request would easily breach the 'appropriate limit'.*

- 2. I would like to further clarify this because as per my understanding goes, the university has to submit the highest qualification on entry to the relevant government department and or the appropriate council. This information is usually sent via electronic transmission so I fail to understand the reasoning that the university doesn't hold this information and needs to check each application who were successful in their interviews and started studying medicine at the prestigious university. I might be wrong if so could you kindly clarify what data of the applicant is submitted to the government.*

In responding to your appeal, I will consider whether the exemption in s.12 of the FOIA was correctly engaged by the Legal Compliance team and if so, whether the College's response to your request was correct in its decision of the estimation of those costs.

I note that the wording for question five of your original request, dated 30 September requested interview score details *"Specifically for graduates (from any field; who holds a degree) applied to the 5 year programme who were successful in obtaining an offer to read medicine.*

The College defines "Successful in obtaining an offer" to include all those who received an offer to study A100 at King's, but did not necessary enrol in the College.

To clarify our original response, the College does not hold paper filing systems, and does have an electronic application filing system. If using the College's interpretation of 'successful' as 'successful in obtaining an offer' then there are no requirements to give interview scoring or qualification information on our applicants or offer holders. There is a requirement to record and verify the highest qualification on entry to the course. This is then sent to HESA.

In your second email, dated 8 December 2013, where you have queried our response you have referred to **"Applicants who were successful and who did start their medicine course at the university"**. This is a different query, and now refers to the enrolled students.

However, during the course of this review the Legal Compliance Team contacted the Admissions Team and found that they had manually extracted and collated the information that you had requested as a part of a management report.

Therefore to answer your query for the 2013 admissions cycle

- The average score of applicants for A100 (all interviewees) who received an offer was approximately 22.46

- The average score at interview for A100 (applicants with/due to complete a minimum undergraduate degree qualification) who received an offer was 22.15

On review, the College did not correctly apply section 12 of the Act as the information was available and could be provided to you below the cost prescribed in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004. This information has now been provided to you.

This completes your request for information and the review of your request.

You have the right to complain.

Further information is also available from the Information Commissioner at:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire  
SK9 5AF  
Tel: 01625 545 700  
[www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

Yours sincerely



Anne Cameron  
Legal Compliance Manager