



Post Selection Day Evaluation and Feedback Report

00299 Fee-paid Professional Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Property Chamber (Residential Property)

June 2026

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the selection days for Fee-paid Professional Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Property Chamber (Residential Property), as well as to capture general feedback on candidate performance. The report describes how selection days were undertaken by both panels and candidates, including what characterised stronger and weaker demonstrations of the judicial skills and abilities needed to fulfil the requirements of this role.

Judicial Skills and Abilities Framework

At selection day, the situational questioning was designed to assess the following judicial skills and abilities:

- Professional/Personal Skills
- Dealing with Information
- Personal Qualities

And the interview was designed to assess the following judicial skills and abilities:

- Communication Skills
- Effective Working

The Judicial Skills and Abilities Framework highlights the key skills that all judicial office holders or prospective judicial office holders should demonstrate across their application or career. This enables us to assess candidates in a fair and consistent way.

Additional selection criteria

For this exercise, candidates were expected to have substantial experience relating to housing or housing conditions and/or matters relating to landlord and tenant relationships, in line with paragraphs 2(4)(q) and (r) of the [Qualifications for Appointment of Members of the First-tier Tribunal and Upper Tribunal Order 2008](#).

Candidates were expected to evidence at least five years' experience in their area of expertise, and it was expected that candidates' experience should fall within the last three years.

Such experience may, for example, have been obtained through professional practice in surveying, architecture, environmental health, building engineering, construction, housing management, property management, or other roles involving the assessment of housing conditions, housing standards, property disputes, leasehold matters, tenancy issues, or landlord and tenant relationships.

In addition, candidates were required to have been a member, or in the case of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, an AssocRICS member, of one of the following professional bodies for at least five years during their career:

- Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
- Royal Institute of British Architects

- Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
- Chartered Association of Building Engineers
- Chartered Institute of Building

Performance of candidates

62 candidates applied for this exercise. Following an eligibility sift, 36 candidates were invited to selection day. The 20 most meritorious candidates were then recommended by the Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) to the Senior President of Tribunals for appointment. In making this decision, the Commission took into account all relevant character checks, and all evidence provided by the candidates at selection day, as well as the candidates' independent assessments and statement of suitability.

Selection day

Selection days were held remotely via Microsoft Teams between 8 and 11 June 2026. Candidates who took part in remote interviews were provided with [technical support to get ready for their selection day](#) as detailed on our website.

Development of the situational questions

The situational questions were drafted by a Regional Surveyor from the Residential Property Tribunal. In common with all the selection tools developed for this exercise, the situational questions were designed to assess relevant transferable skills.

The JAC Advisory Group, which is composed of members of the judiciary and representatives of the legal professions and chaired by a lay JAC Commissioner, offered advice and guidance during their development.

The effectiveness of the situational questions was assessed by means of a mock assessment with a range of volunteers from relevant candidate groups. This provided an opportunity to trial the test material and make any necessary amendments.

Structure of the situational questions

The situational questions comprised one scenario with eight questions.

Candidates were asked to consider a scenario likely to arise in the role of a Fee-paid Professional Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Property Chamber, Residential Property Tribunal and to assume that they had recently been appointed to the role.

The scenario concerned a residential property dispute involving the payability of service charges and related landlord and tenant issues. Candidates were informed that the matter was being heard by a panel comprising a Tribunal Chair, a Valuer Member and a Professional Member.

Candidates were asked a series of questions requiring them to identify the issues to be determined by the Tribunal, explain the relevant steps the Tribunal should take when considering the evidence and arguments presented by the parties, and demonstrate how they would contribute as a Professional Member to ensuring that the case was dealt with fairly and efficiently. The scenario also included questions relating to the conduct and behaviour expected of a Fee-paid Professional Member when carrying out their responsibilities as a member of the Tribunal.

Advance preparation

One week ahead of selection days, candidates received pre-reading material with which they were asked to familiarise themselves. Candidates were sent the following:

- Equal Treatment Bench Book: July 2024 (February 2026 update) Appendix E
- Equal Treatment Bench Book: July 2024 (February 2026 update) Introduction and chapter 1
- Landlord and Tenant Act 1985: Sections 18 to 20 and 27
- Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013
- Courts and Tribunals Judiciary | Guide to Judicial Conduct

At selection day, candidates were allocated 30 minutes preparation time to read the additional materials below and to prepare their answers to the situational questions:

- The scenario
- A related Service Charge Statement
- A related Service Charge Account
- The situational questions

Assessment of candidates' responses to the situational questions

The evidence for each skill and ability is assessed as either outstanding, strong, sufficient or insufficient. The panels then make a final overall assessment of candidates as either outstanding, strong, selectable or not presently selectable.

Outstanding evidence included:

- Demonstrating excellent professional and personal judgement throughout the exercise, applying relevant knowledge and experience effectively to the scenario
- Addressing all, or nearly all, of the key issues raised and supporting conclusions with clear, logical and well-developed reasoning
- Showing a strong understanding of the Tribunal's role and responsibilities, including the need to act fairly, impartially and within the limits of the Tribunal's jurisdiction
- Demonstrating a comprehensive grasp of the information provided in the brief and pre-reading materials, accurately identifying and analysing the key issues and drawing well-reasoned conclusions

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating good application of professional and personal judgement to the scenario, addressing most of the key issues raised
- Reasoning being generally sound and conclusions being appropriate, although some explanations lacked depth or did not fully explore all relevant considerations
- Showing a good understanding of the Tribunal's role and generally demonstrating appropriate awareness of fairness, impartiality and professional conduct
- Absorbing most of the key information contained in the brief and pre-reading material, identifying the principal issues and reaching reasoned conclusions, although some smaller or more nuanced points were missed

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating an adequate application of professional and personal judgement, covering some of the key issues raised by the scenario but not all of them
- Responses which were brief or underdeveloped at times, with reasoning not always clear or fully supported
- Showing some understanding of the Tribunal's role and responsibilities but not consistently demonstrating awareness of all relevant considerations relating to fairness, conduct or impartiality
- Identifying some of the important information contained within the brief and pre-reading materials, but missing, misunderstanding or confusing other significant issues

Insufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating limited application of professional and personal judgement and failing to address a number of the key issues raised by the scenario.
- Providing responses that lacked logical reasoning, contained significant errors, or reached conclusions that were not supported by the information provided
- Not demonstrating an adequate understanding of the Tribunal's role, the importance of impartiality, or the standards of conduct expected of a Professional Member
- Failing to identify or properly understand major issues arising from the brief and pre-reading materials and being unable to reach clear, reasoned decisions based on the evidence available

Skills and Abilities-based interview

Each candidate then had a skills and abilities-based interview. Here, the panel was seeking further evidence and examples from the candidate of the required skills and abilities and in the context of the role of Fee-paid Professional Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Property Chamber (Residential Property).

Communication Skills

Outstanding evidence included:

- Demonstrating highly effective listening skills and adapting communication style confidently to meet the needs of a wide range of individuals and circumstances
- Using questioning, empathy and other communication techniques to build understanding, manage complex or sensitive situations and ensure others fully understood key issues
- Providing clear, focused and well-developed examples that demonstrated courtesy, patience, sensitivity and the ability to inspire confidence and trust

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating effective active listening and an ability to adapt communication style to suit different audiences
- Communicating clearly and appropriately in challenging situations, showing sensitivity, patience and awareness of the needs of others
- Providing relevant examples that showed how communication contributed to positive outcomes, although some examples lacked the complexity or depth required for an outstanding assessment

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating some evidence of active listening and adapting communication style appropriately
- Showing an understanding of the importance of clear communication and audience awareness, but providing examples that were straightforward, lacked complexity, or focused too heavily on background context rather than the candidate's own actions
- Responses which demonstrated Communication Skills but often lacked detail, analysis or reflection on the effectiveness of the approach taken

Insufficient evidence included:

- Providing examples that did not adequately address the questions asked or failed to demonstrate the required communication skills
- Giving limited detail about actions taken, relying on description of events rather than explaining how communication was used to achieve an outcome
- Failing to demonstrate effective listening, adaptation of communication style, or clear evidence of engaging successfully with others

Effective Working

Outstanding evidence included:

- Demonstrating exceptional planning, organisation and prioritisation skills across complex and competing demands
- Providing detailed examples of managing multiple stakeholders, deadlines and competing priorities while maintaining quality and achieving successful outcomes

- Demonstrating a highly effective and proactive approach to inclusivity, teamwork and supporting the participation of others

Strong evidence included:

- Demonstrating effective management of multiple tasks, competing priorities and challenging workloads
- Showing a structured and organised approach to planning, monitoring progress and achieving objectives, often making effective use of digital tools, collaboration and stakeholder engagement
- Demonstrating a positive and inclusive approach to supporting others, although some examples lacked the complexity, breadth or depth required for an outstanding assessment

Sufficient evidence included:

- Demonstrating an organised and methodical approach to managing work and prioritising tasks
- Providing examples of planning activities, meeting deadlines and working with others to achieve objectives
- Showing some awareness of inclusivity and the needs of others, but examples were often routine, underdeveloped or lacking sufficient detail to demonstrate the full extent of the candidate's contribution and decision-making

Insufficient evidence included:

- Providing limited or unclear evidence of planning, prioritisation or managing competing demands
- Failing to demonstrate how tasks were organised, prioritised or delivered effectively
- Examples which lacked specificity, were not clearly related to Effective Working, or did not demonstrate an inclusive approach, collaborative working or effective management of workloads and deadlines

Advice from panel members

Panel members were asked what single piece of advice they would give to candidates applying for this vacancy in a future exercise.

Common themes included:

- Candidates should prepare thoroughly in advance of the assessment, making full use of the pre-reading materials provided beforehand and the supporting materials provided on the day
- Candidates should ensure that their responses are fully developed, addressing the question asked and explaining the reasoning behind their conclusions
- Candidates should adopt a clear, logical and structured approach to answering questions, identifying the key issues and setting out their thought process

- Candidates should use specific examples when responding to interview questions, focusing on their own actions, the challenges faced and how they achieved the outcome
- Candidates should avoid overly general or superficial responses and instead provide sufficient detail to demonstrate their skills, judgement and decision-making

Feedback from Candidates

After the selection days, candidates were invited to complete an anonymous candidate survey, 15 candidates (42%) responded to the survey. The results of the candidate survey are below (please note that due to rounding, percentages may not total 100%):

The instructions provided beforehand enabled me to prepare for the remote selection day.

- 100% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed

I understood what was expected on the selection day.

- 100% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed

The situations discussed in the situational questioning were realistic and relevant to the role.

- 93% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 7% of candidates disagreed or strongly disagreed

The situational questioning gave me a chance to display how I would react to various tribunal situations.

- 93% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 7% of candidates disagreed or strongly disagreed

I am confident in the situational questioning as a JAC selection tool.

- 86% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 7% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed
- 7% of candidates disagreed or strongly disagreed

The interview questions gave me the opportunity to demonstrate my judicial skills and abilities for this role.

- 86% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 7% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed
- 7% of candidates disagreed or strongly disagreed

I am confident in the interview as a JAC selection tool.

- 86% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed
- 14% of candidates neither agreed nor disagreed

The panel behaved professionally and treated me with respect.

- 100% of candidates either agreed or strongly agreed

How would you rate the quality of customer service you received from JAC staff on selection day?

- 93% of candidates rated it excellent or good
- 7% of candidates rated it fair