



National Recruitment into Anaesthesia

Survey of Applicants at CT2 and ST3 – April 2010

Executive Summary	2
Tables and Analysis	3
<i>Principles of National Recruitment</i>	4
Is national recruitment a good idea?	4
Candidates without Primary FRCA.....	5
Timing of the process	5
Information about the process	6
<i>The online application form</i>	6
Understanding the questions	6
Technical issues	7
<i>The interview process.....</i>	8
Arranging interviews.....	8
Conduct of the interview.....	9
<i>Plans for future recruitment.....</i>	10
National recruitment into CT1.....	10
ACCS.....	10
Common interview format.....	11
<i>Final Comments</i>	11
Appendix - comments to questions.....	12
The principle of national recruitment.....	12
<i>Candidates without the full Primary.....</i>	14
Negative comments	14

Positive Comments	15
Timing of the process	16
About right	17
Too late	17
Information about the process	18
Enough information	18
Not enough Information.....	19
The application form.....	20
Technical/computer problems	24
National Recruitment at CT1.....	27
No	28
Don't know	28
Yes	28
Common format for interviews.....	29
Good idea	29
Bad idea	30
Arranging interviews.....	32
Conduct of the interviews.....	35
Interview was conducted badly	35
Interview was conducted well.....	39
Other/Final comments.....	43

Executive Summary

As part of the National Recruitment process in anaesthesia a survey of the applicants has been carried out to determine their views. All applicants to CT2 and ST3 were emailed and invited to take part in an online survey hosted at SurveyMonkey. 246 responses were obtained.

The findings were generally supportive.

- Over 75% of the respondents supported the principle of national recruitment.
- 59% agreed with the May Primary being included in the process, but 37% opposed it as unfair to more ambitious trainees and viewed the College as being inconsistent in their approach.
- 78% broadly agreed with the recruitment timeline.
- 86% considered the interview process to be fair

Specific difficulties that were identified were:-

- 35% of respondents thought that the information on guidance could have been clearer, particularly on interview timings and offers.
- 49% thought that the application form was difficult to interpret.
- 30% had some technical difficulties, especially with saving data and the word count.

Applicants were also canvassed for their opinions on recruitment for future years. 52% were in favour of a national CT1 recruitment, and 51% supported introduction of a common interview format.

Tables and Analysis

246 respondents filled in the survey; of these 216 answered all questions and 30 left some questions unanswered.

The survey was carried out between April 22nd and April 28th. This time period was chosen as the period between the end of the interviews and the issuing of the offers. It was felt that once candidates had received an offer (or a rejection) this could colour their views of the process.

Respondents were asked how many UoAs had invited them to attend interviews. Candidates were limited to two interviews at each level; however some candidates had applied at both CT2 and CT3 and could have three or four interviews.

The results to this question were:-

Number of interviews	No. of respondents	Percentage
0	23	9%
1	63	26%
2	126	51%
3	15	6%
No reply	19	8%
Grand Total	246	100%

Since the number of interviews a candidate attended is likely to have some influence on their perception of the scheme then it has been used as the basis of some of the crosstabs in subsequent questions.

Principles of National Recruitment

Is national recruitment a good idea?

Do you agree with the principle of a nationally coordinated recruitment process into anaesthesia?

The majority of respondents (76.5%) thought that in principle it was a good idea.

The data has been broken down based on the number of interviews. As one would predict, national recruitment was more popular amongst those who had interviews - only 43% of those with no interviews thought that it was a good idea

Do you agree with the principle of National recruitment?	Number of interviews					Grand Total	
	0	1	2	3	No reply		
In principle this is a bad idea	9	8	20	1		38	15%
In principle this is a good idea	10	51	94	12	19	186	76%
No preference	3	4	10	2		19	8%
(blank)	1		2			3	1%
Grand Total	23	63	126	15	19	246	100%

- *I agree as it removes the 'stick or twist' scenario of previous years, giving candidates a better chance of acquiring their job of choice.*
- *Idea in principle is good. Makes it difficult when Scotland have a separate recruitment process though.*
- *However, the only disadvantage is that the candidate lost the advantages that candidates in the past used to have of being able to apply to all deaneries which means more chances.*
- *Advantages include all offers coming out simultaneously, disadvantages include the initial restriction to 2 UoAs*

Candidates without Primary FRCA

Candidates who have not yet completed the Primary FRCA but who are midway through the exam process were permitted to apply for ST3 this year. Their application will be included or excluded, once the exam is complete. Do you think this is a good idea in principle?

59% of respondents thought that this was a good idea in principle and 37% thought it was a bad idea; a small number were indecisive.

- *I have no issue with them applying, but the instructions from the college to not discriminate against them is preposterous. People with the primary exam should have a clear advantage over candidates without.*
- *This is unfair to candidates who have passed the primary FRCA*
- *I think if there is only one entry a year, they should be allowed to enter. If the process runs 2-3 times a year, with multiple start points, they should be ineligible.*
- *There is lots of pressure on us to sit the exam earlier and earlier. I think some people learn better from experience and need longer to prepare.*

Timing of the process

The recruitment process for posts commencing in August 2010 began in January. Invitations for interview were sent out towards the end of March, interviews were held in April and the first Offers at the end of April.

78% of the respondents thought that the timing was about right. Only 15% thought that the process was happening too late. One candidate thought that process was happening too early.

There was great concern amongst Deaneries and Consultants last year that the process was happening too late. In contrast the majority of applicants thought the timing was alright.

- *The downside for this year is that the interview invites and reference process took place over a bank holiday period (Easter) and it was difficult to get references submitted.*
- *The exam timetable needs to be adjusted to take into account recruitment. More opportunities to sit exam and possibly so soon after MCQ.*
- *Only gives 3 months notice to sort out house, schools, alternative work etc if having to move.*

Information about the process

Have you had enough information about the process?

35% of respondents felt that there were parts of the process that had not been explained properly.

- *Difficult to get the details from a single site, Process of application is not well explained*
- *Information was spread over a wide area, needed to spend quite a bit of time familiarising myself with the rules (from many different sources)*
- *RCOA website had all information we needed.*
- *Co-ordination between Scotland and England - no one has been able to give me a clear answer on where we stand accepting offers from the two.*
- *Unfortunately as it is the first year of nationally coordinated recruitment, many people in the deaneries are not even sure about the process and are unable to give correct information about the process and made it very confusing.*

The online application form

Understanding the questions

Did you have any difficulties understanding the questions or knowing what information you were required to give?

49% of candidates complained that there were some questions that they did not know how to answer properly. Specific comments included:-

- *Clinical experience question was confusing, were they asking about speciality or previous experience such as foundation?*
- *Confusing questions about the numbers of months of experience in various areas.*
- *Duration of experience questions were ambiguous.*
- *It was very difficult to tell what information the shortlisters are looking for. A sample answer would be helpful.*
- *Particularly with number of years experience questions. Made no sense at all and no-one at West Midlands could*

help either

- *What time have you spent outside core anaesthetics- very badly worded, had absolutely no idea if the number I put down represented what it was intended to.*
- *Question about foundation competencies- no option for those of us who graduated before foundation programme but who trained in approved posts.*

The candidates who experienced difficulties in completing the application form tended to have been invited to fewer interviews.

	Number of interviews					Grand Total
	0	1	2	3	No reply	
No difficulties - the questions were clear and easy to understand	9	29	65	11	4	118
There were some questions where I did not know how to answer properly (blank)	14	34	59	4	15	111
Grand Total	23	63	126	15	19	246
Percentage of candidates having 'No difficulties'	39%	46%	52%	73%	21%	48%

Technical issues

Did you have any Technical / Computer problems that made it difficult to complete the application form?

30% of respondents said that they had problems of a technical nature that had hindered them.

- *Despite continuing to type on a page it would time out, thereby losing data. Data was also lost even without a 'time out' happening. Some of the text boxes would not scroll down whilst you were typing them, so you were typing blind.*
- *Not enough spaces on courses attended therefore could not enter them all*
- *The website is ungainly - it is slow to access pages, prints out poorly and is poorly displayed. The lack of ability to change font size or add bold text to create headings or emphasise points is ludicrous.*
- *The word count on the application form differed from word*

counts performed in word and the counts changed when an answer was saved.

The interview process

There were 42 respondents who had no interviews (or who left this section blank). 63 respondents had one interview, 126 had two and 15 had three. Feedback was therefore obtained on 352 Interview Experiences.

Arranging interviews

Did you have any problems or difficulties with arranging the interview, or with booking the time and date?

UoA	There were no difficulties with arranging the interview	There were minor difficulties arranging the interview, which were resolved fairly easily	There were significant problems with arranging the interview and/or I was unable to attend	Grand Total	Significant	Minor + Significant
East Midlands North	5	7	1	13	8%	62%
East Midlands South	11	1	1	13	8%	15%
East of England	6	2	0	8	0%	25%
Kent, Sussex and Surrey (KSS)	13	4	1	18	6%	28%
London	34	12	6	52	12%	35%
Mersey	12	1	0	13	0%	8%
North West	37	3	2	42	5%	12%
Northern	17	0	0	17	0%	0%
Oxford	18	1	1	20	5%	10%
Severn	16	0	0	16	0%	0%
South West Peninsula	12	1	0	13	0%	8%
Wales	22	3	0	25	0%	12%
Wessex	16	1	1	18	6%	11%
West Midlands	33	3	0	36	0%	8%
Yorkshire and Humber	44	4	0	48	0%	8%
(blank)	0	0	0	0		
Grand Total	296	43	13	352	4%	16%

16% of respondents experienced some difficulty in arranging the their interviews, but the majority of these difficulties were resolved fairly easily.

The commonest complaints were that some Deaneries had fixed timings for interviews.

Conduct of the interview

Did you feel that the interview itself was fair, reasonable and gave you an adequate opportunity to demonstrate your skills and abilities?

UoA	The interview process was unfair/unreasonable	The interview was conducted well	Grand Total	
East Midlands North	1	12	13	92%
East Midlands South	1	12	13	92%
East of England	0	8	8	100%
Kent, Sussex and Surrey (KSS)	1	17	18	94%
London	14	38	52	73%
Mersey	1	12	13	92%
North West	4	38	42	90%
Northern	1	16	17	94%
Oxford	3	17	20	85%
Severn	2	14	16	88%
South West Peninsula	1	12	13	92%
Wales	4	21	25	84%
Wessex	1	17	18	94%
West Midlands	8	28	36	78%
Yorkshire and Humber	8	40	48	83%
Grand Total	50	302	352	86%

86% of respondents thought that the interview had been conducted well.

Plans for future recruitment

National recruitment into CT1

It has been proposed that a national process for recruitment into Anaesthesia should be introduced at CT1 level. Would you support this idea?

52% of respondents said that they would favour such a process. Those that supported the idea of National Recruitment at ST3 were more likely to favour it at CT1. 12% of respondents did not express a preference. Comments tended to support or criticise the concept of national recruitment per se, rather than at CT1 specifically. One respondent highlighted the stick-twist dilemma between specialties that could exist at CT1.

- *Very important- avoids the problem of having to make decisions on offers when still waiting for decisions from other deaneries*
- *Scotland needs to be included, rather than having a separate application with different deadline dates.*
- *The entire system of national recruitment is bordering on the tyrannical.*

ACCS

If a National Recruitment process were to be introduced at CT1 level then what would be your thoughts about ACCS?

Almost half the respondents expressed no view or failed to answer this question, and one confessed that he didn't know what ACCS stood for.. Amongst those that did respond there were twice as many who thought ACCS should recruit separately to anaesthesia.

The comments that were received were more related to ACCS per se than to recruitment.

Common interview format

At present then each Deanery/UoA arranges the style and format of interviews independently. It has been suggested that all Deaneries/UoAs should share a common format for interviews. What are your thoughts on this?

51% of respondents thought that a common format for interviews would be a good thing. 33% thought it would be a bad thing and 15% expressed no preference.

Those that thought a common format would be a good thing mentioned transferable scores as a plus. The commonest given for opposing a national format was that UoAs should be able to decide for themselves; others commented on the risk of candidates interviewed later being able to 'crib' answers.

Final Comments

A free-text box for comments was given to raise other points. The full list of comments is given at the end – some of the more interesting comments were:-

- *Very smoothly run application process. I was very impressed.*
- *Are points from short-listing counted when appointments are made? I fear not and this essentially discounts the CV of the applicant and any achievements/experience not mentioned in the interview. This is unfair.*
- *The London Deanery seem to be very well organised. Apart from the interviews allocated at very short notice.*
- *There should be more clarity about the fate of applicants who require tier 2 visa.*
- *This is a morally bankrupt recruitment process which is disgusting to undergo.*
- *Having been through MTAS this whole process has been a pleasure compared to that! Well done!*

Appendix – comments to questions

Below is a full list of the free-text comments unedited and in alphabetical order. In some cases the responses have been grouped into positive and negative.

The principle of national recruitment.

- *A standardised application form is a good idea*
- *Advantages include all offers coming out simultaneously, disadvantages include the initial restriction to 2 UoAs*
- *As we already know what a disaster MTAS was I wonder why are we still trying to change a system that was not flawed in the first place!!!*
- *Avoids need to decide on low preference uoa before higher preferences have finished recruitment process. very important*
- *Avoids responding to similar questions multiple times. The qualities needed are nationwide, therefore seems unnecessary to have separate applications.*
- *But limits the number of applications. I havent got the job, so my comments might be biased.*
- *Having been through both systems, this system is long winded, inefficient and complicated*
- *However, the only disadvantage is that the candidate lost the advantages that candidates in the past used to have of being able to apply to all deaneries which means more chances.*
- *HOWever, those cordinating the process must be readily contactable and at short notice to answer queries. I'm not sure if one deanery can cope with queries from a whole country*
- *I agree as it removes the 'stick or twist' scenario of previous years, giving candidates a better chance of acquiring their job of choice.*
- *I have found this process to have been poorly communicated to deaneries and college tutors. Regarding applications, everything has been far too impersonal, without anyone to contact for advice. I would prefer the individual schools of anaesthesia to directly recruit trainees. Where anyone wished there to be transparency, there has only been confusion. It has clearly been implemented by individuals with no clinical background and who serve to perpetuate a process that lacks in substance and exudes beaurocracy*

- *I was not given a chance to apply for CT2 in London as I had forgotten to apply for it initially and not I have not been short-listed for ST3 and am going to be unemployed in August..*
- *I would prefer to be able to apply to all units of application as this will increase my chances of being shortlisted*
- *Idea in principle is good. Makes it difficult when Scotland have a separate recruitment process though.*
- *It seems like a sensible way of co-ordinating and job planning and also transparent and fair. However I have reservations about only filling in one form because if you make a mistake then you may not be eligible for any jobs in the UK.*
- *It should be done by rcoa not by west midlands It is nice to have RCOA recruitment section to co-ordinate both UK and overseas recruitment and to have one ICAMS (RCOA-ICAMS)*
- *Limited number of applications means markedly reduced chance*
- *Much more sensible than previous recruitments*
- *Never liked a one size fits all approach*
- *Pro - to complete only one application form. - timeline of process is useful. against - limited choice of UoA i.e. only 2 interviews, minimise chance of securing a job if did not do well in interviews. - tight schedule of interviews.*
- *Really need to get Scotland on board to make this a truly national process.*
- *There are advantages to this process in that the specialty is well set up and has been for many years so all the deaneries should be looking for roughly the same qualities and it should be easy to standardise an assessment process. It is also a complete nonsense, however. One of the application questions why candidates wish to work in a certain deanery or area and this is inevitably highly personalised and/or dependent on what the deanery has to offer. Reasons for applying to one deanery may be very different to reasons for applying to another and yet the same answer must suffice for both - this is ridiculous!*
- *There should be choice of more Deaneries, not just two, although the interviews can be centralised as well. Lot of good candidates did not get shortlisted at all.*
- *This limits the choice of the applicants*
- *Though it limits the no. of interviews we can get, it is easy and simple with one application form only.*
- *Too vague as to potential for job placement. Appears that at least one deanery is running their application process in 'parallel' to the national process with confusion resulting in*

interview offers/ possibility of job offers. Just let me apply to the deaneries that I want to work in. The ranking system is less than ideal.

- trainee lost the opportunity to apply to more than two deaneries.*
- Using the jobs.NHS website might reduce the work of applying for some who already have a template as it were on that website.*
- What would be an improvement is if the RCOA and the deaneries could agree upon a standardised application each year and then the individual deaneries to be able to recruit individually as and when - using these agreed application forms.*
- When I went to one of the interviews I was told by my colleagues that of the few posts already two were decided for internal candidates. when I spoke with one of my consultants he said they are the preferred candidates but they can be won if I performed well. This nationally co ordinated system is basically an eye wash in some of these important aspects.*

Candidates without the full Primary

Negative comments

- I was not allowed to apply when I had passed my theory aspect of Primary FRCA*
- Cant be certain re the number of seats at CT2 or ST3 level.*
- Every qualification should be complete by the time of application or at least interview. It stops other eligible candidates with qualification to secure a place. This is unfair advantage to unqualified candidates.*
- I have no issue with them applying, but the instructions from the college to not discriminate against them is preposterous. People with the primary exam should have a clear advantage over candidates without.*
- I have the final FRCA and was not even shortlisted..*
- I think that the examination may delineate certain candidates and potential free up some more space thus placing an emphasis on acquiring the primary exam in good time prior to the application process*
- I think this rewards people who are motivated and work hard to pass the exam in good time. Otherwise I feel it*

- should certainly count for more in the selection process*
- *There are enough candidates with primary and final FRCA.*
 - *There is no consistency on this matter with the ROCA and deaneries.*
 - *This is unfair to candidates who have passed the primary FRCA*
 - *Those will compete with others and then vacate places where others will not have access to (if they have not been shortlisted initially!)*
 - *Why is this done, is it to get those who are already in training jobs.*
 - *With such high competition ratios, it would be fair to include only those who have Primary FRCA*
 - *With the competitive nature of the jobs I feel that exam status should be gained by the time of interview, otherwise it confuses matters*
 - *You cannot incorporate them into Round one AFTER it has been completed once they have sat the exam - it does not correlate.*

Positive Comments

- *But this does make it awkward for those of us with the full exam, as we may have to wait until after the summer OSCE/SOE for jobs.*
- *I feel candidates that have successfully passed the exam by the May of the CT2 year should be given preference. I don't think Anaesthetists should be appointed to ST3 without the full Primary FRCA.*
- *I think if there is only one entry a year, they should be allowed to enter. If the process runs 2-3 times a year, with multiple start points, they should be ineligible.*
- *Interviews should take place after the May sitting of the Viva/OSCE in order to do away with conditional offers. Either that or create an earlier exam sitting than May.*
- *It is unfair that candidates could be excluded purely because the timing of the application / interview does not match the timing of the exam.*
- *It now seems that some posts are being held back for candidates who have not yet passed their primary FRCA. This seems incredibly unfair on candidates who have*

shown the aptitude and commitment to the specialty to get through the Primary FRCA

- The current CT1/CT2 system may not give enough time to get the Primary - although I think the CT3 year will address this in the future...*
- The exam should only be an issue on formally accepting an offer of a post, unless recruitment is moved until after the May exam and if this was the case then full primary should be required to apply*
- There is lots of pressure on us to sit the exam earlier and earlier. I think some people learn better from experience and need longer to prepare.*
- There needs to be a well-thought out process about 'holding offers' until after the exam. I think including the May sitting of the OSCE/SOE leaves everything too late.*
- They should however be placed lower down the list for a job and should not take the place of a candidate with full primary*
- This of course the team should understand puts a lot of pressure on the candidate who goes for the interview and sits for the exam after 1 month. The college should consider extending the dead line for the candidates to two sittings after selection rather than one or at least one part clearance than two parts.*
- To not allow for this would make a mockery of the RCOA and the Primary FRCA examination. However, those who have completed the exam already should gain more marks in short-listing.*
- Two years is not necessarily enough for everyone to complete the Primary. However, if you do complete the exam by then you are leaving yourself with another year of CT2+ without progressing onto to ST3 as the whole system is veered to completing the training process as quick as possible.*
- Well if a once yearly recruitment process is to be embarked upon - how can one fairly exclude these candidates.....if you exclude them then they will have to wait for next years recruitment.*

Timing of the process

About right

- *Assuming that timetable is adhered to. However, the shortlisting was delayed and we have yet to see if the offers will be made on time.*
- *I felt I had adequate preparation time between stages.*
- *late enough to maximise time to pass exam. too early for december and april starters though*
- *Other than for London Deanery, who sent out interview requests late and (it would appear from information given out on the day, that stated offers in 2-4 weeks) may make offers late or delay the national first wave of offers.*
- *See previous comment re exam timing*
- *The downside for this year is that the interview invites and reference process took place over a bank holiday period (easter) and it was difficult to get references submitted.*
- *The exam timetable needs to be adjusted to take into account recruitment. More opportunities to sit exam and possibly so soon after mcq*
- *You need to give as much time as possible for candidates to pass the primary FRCA and this time scale doesn't interfere with revision for the May sitting.*

Too late

- *if moving house and area it doesnt give much time to sort these things out.*
- *If unsuccessful, it will leave applicants very little time to sort out a job before August.*
- *Interviews were during Easter break and the candidates in the third category will not get the offers until June*
- *It would be better a little bit earlier as it has meant that interviews were less than a month before exams*
- *Only gives 3 months notice to sort out house, schools, alternative work etc if having to move.*
- *Shortlisting happened late, was only made aware I was on the reserve list after perhaps an hour and a half of phone calls emails and this was 5 days before interviews. There should be a single point of contact via telephone none of*

this we'll email in 24-48 hours, we have jobs to do and being unaware of the state of play less than a week before the interviews is unacceptable.

- The interview are to close to the exam and Hinder those applying who do not have the exam because they are distracting from the last few weeks revision needed to pass, therefore both the revision/ exam performance and interview performance both suffer*
- Timing of interviews is too close to the Primary FRCA viva/OSCE for comfort.*
- Unfortunately it keeps the candidates hanging for a long time of not knowing what their next post is going to be. It is very disruptive for family life as you don't know if you will have to be uprooting. However more of a concern is the 2nd round process is definitely happening a little too late.*
- Was this done so as to maximise the opportunity to those who were taking primary*

Information about the process

Enough information

- I find this a little difficult to answer as I have been through all the rounds since MTAS so I have been kept up to date. However candidates whom this was their first exposure, this question would be more viable.*
- Information was spread over a wide area, needed to spend quite a bit of time familiarising myself with the rules (from many different sources)*
- plenty of information but MMC, west midlands, RCOA etc websites all needed to be read. maybe just one website with all the information.*
- Plenty of information, but too many sources. Information was posted by RCoA, my deanery of choice, West Midlands Deanery, iCAM and by email. This creates the possibility of missing something vital by not looking in all the right places.*
- RCOA website had all information we needed.*

Not enough Information

- *As a trainee who came through the SHO scheme (though probably one of only a few), I was/am somewhat confused by the whole foundation level competencies. Also the timing of obtaining or providing references was not entirely clear.*
- *Co-ordination between Scotland and England - no one has been able to give me a clear answer on where we stand accepting offers from the two.*
- *Criteria for short listing was not clear I have been short listed in one deanery but not the other. My colleagues in the same trust similar experience same qualifications have been short listed for either both or just one UOA but different to mine*
- *Dates regarding the interview period were unclear per region and also wrong in some cases. Also at first access to the west midlands website was not clear and took time to figure out. Recruitment information was not relayed to consultants therefore help was not easily attainable.*
- *Delay in London Deanery Confusion around original F2 competencies equivalent, i.e. Certificate A and B*
- *Difficult to get the details from a single site, Process of application is not well explained*
- *for those trainees without evidence of foundation competencies the advice was confusing*
- *how offers will be communicated*
- *I found the I-cam portal difficult to find on the west midlands website*
- *I found the website poor. Unclear on first use where to navigate to.*
- *I would like to have more information about the interview structure.*
- *Information was difficult to find although most things were there. It should be made easier.*
- *interview not standardised*
- *Need more information on scoring process - is it a combination of application form and interview or once shortlisted is it only interview performance which counts?*
- *Not clear on documentation required for interview*
- *referencing procedure not well explained*
- *referencing procedure was a bit vague*
- *Score your own portfolio? and every thing 5 years old will be zero, so e.g you score zero for your medical graduation if you`d been practicing for 5 years??*
- *Second round information? No news if you havent been offered a post... would be helpful to have an email saying*

that you had not been matched, rather than waiting all day with nothing.

- shortlisting score sheet why there are choices for only two deaneries allowed*
- shortlisting scores, how many jobs? no. of interviewees? etc*
- Specifically, what was happening with timing of offers. And info from Wst Midlands conflicted with that from RCOA*
- the communication is bad I don't know if a process is started for e.g I received an interview 3-4 days after the proposed day. I thought I was not included. Now I do not know if the process of job offering has started, or my e-mail is not printed or typed properly. (An e-mail must be sent to update the candidate regarding the process)*
- The format of interview was not explained by all deaneries*
- The information about the process is spread in several websites, often holding an excluding meaning (eg. timing dates of interviews). There should be one website with correct information.*
- The use of the ICAMS portal was not well explained The portal was difficult to access ie through several other sites.*
- There were conflicting reports as to what information was required to corroborate foundation competences. It was not clear who to send forms A/B to, and then there was a late change to say that completion of SHO training certificate was acceptable. Also the process of references - when where and how these should be delivered is still not abundantly clear*
- Unfortunately as it is the first year of nationally coordinated recruitment, many people in the deaneries are not even sure about the process and are unable to give correct information about the process and made it very confusing.*
- Very very confusing process.*
- We do not know how we will receive our offer or when.*
- what happens to those without offers? Is there a second round?*
- Who is sending out invitations to interview, offers etc was not always clear and varied between deaneries.*

The application form

- 1. Overall UK Medical Experience. I presumed length of UK training experience at SHO, CT1 or ST1 level included CT2*

level (as this is technically a SHO level) although it did not specify this grade in the question. 2. Full employment history, drop down option for foundation competencies achieved in this post? I was not sure whether to say yes for Foundation Year 1 and Year 2 (as competency is assessed over both years) or just Foundation Year 2 (as this is when the final certificate is issued). 3. Supporting Information. I felt there was a degree of overlap between "speciality experience" and "details of clinical experience" as we were asked to include relevant clinical experience in the speciality experience section.

- About the Foundation competencies and form A-those who did not do the training in UK
- As alternative to FACD, SHO training certificate was asked which does not exist. confusion about how many references required.
- Clinical experience question was confusing, were they asking about speciality or previous experience such as foundation?
- Confusing questions about the numbers of months of experience in various areas.
- Details of how many years experience on application form was not very clear
- difficulty knowing whether form A was required and where it should be sent
- Duration of experience questions were ambiguous.
- Especially the question about how long we have been doing anaesthetics.
- Especially the questions identifying past experience were not clear. The question on courses attended required more spaces so that maximal marks could be gained.
- Experience at SHO/CT1 level - did not specify different specialties
- Experience to date - not clear if this was to include what you had completed of the CT2 year.
- For example, the category of level used in the section for previous employment is not explained. The way the question is phrased is confusing - where it required duration of training in/out of specialty.
- I felt some questions on the application form overlapped, and in many cases I struggled to match them to either the National Person Specs or my chosen deaneries marking scheme.
- I thought there was some overlap
- I'm from the Republic of Ireland and I couldn't answer some questions like "what national audits are taking place in UK at the moment"

- *It was the personal details process prior to the actual application that I encountered problems with. On the reference part there was too many parts to the job description for example - post, title, position - was this really necessary?*
- *It was very difficult to tell what information the shortlisters are looking for. A sample answer would be helpful.*
- *It wasn't clear what was required to answer questions 1 and 2. Could do with being more specific as there was obvious overlap*
- *Limited guidance as to the marking scheme and too many websites or choices to try to find information to make any sense of where that information might be.*
- *Months of training unclear. First 2 questions overlapped and unclear what exactly was wanted.*
- *Not having had to have a portfolio before, more instruction on what was required would have been helpful eg. non-medical certificates.*
- *Particularly with number of years experience questions. Made no sense at all and no-one at West Midlands could help either*
- *Question on the length of anaesthetic training.*
- *question regarding roles was repeated, unclear of what to put in each box.*
- *Reply from the deanery concerned was not always clear.*
- *Some confusion of the clinical and speciality experience questions. Were they asking for experience of anaesthesia, subspeciality experience or experience in other (non-anaesthetic) specialities*
- *some of the questions covertly encompassed three or four sub questions which were slightly difficult to tease out the relevant.*
- *Some of the short answer questions seemed to be ambiguous in the information required. Also a question about the number of months at SHO level and the number of months in posts other than anaesthesia was ambiguous.*
- *Some questions appeared to repeat themselves*
- *some questions appeared to repeat themselves and only the word limit was an indication on how much information was expected.*
- *Specifically the "level" with a drop-down menu on the employment history. What is more frustrating is not being able to ask anybody when such questions do arise*
- *the first 2 questions were not clear and I used the scoring guidance as more of a clue to what was wanted. It wasn't clear which wanted info on previous jobs and which wanted just anaesthetic career info*

- *The first 2 questions were very similar 'specialty experience' and 'clinical experience'. There is potentially a lot of overlap in answering these questions and the way you answer them would depend on whether the form is marked horizontally or vertically to get the most marks (which is not known by the candidate). I think they need to be more specific or put as one question to avoid repetition or putting information in potentially the wrong answer and losing out on marks.*
- *The first two questions with the headings were quite confusing.*
- *There were also overlap of answers that could be provided in the first question and one of the last few questions.*
- *the question about length of time in prev posts was not very clear*
- *The question in regards to subspecialties was unclear as to whether it meant experience prior to anaesthesia or subspecialties within anaesthesia - which most CT1 and 2 trainees have minimal exposure to.*
- *The question regarding previous experience was misleading and could not be satisfactorily clarified even after several emails to the WMD helpdesk.*
- *the question wanting logbook information was a bit vague*
- *the questions about timing of jobs were not clear and could be interpreted more than one way. Also I think that it should be more evident which questions should be non compulsory*
- *The questions were frequently obtuse and it was not clear what was expected. Themes were repeated within different sections of the form.*
- *The wording of some of the questions was very confusing and the information the question required was not clear*
- *There appeared to be a lot of overlap between questions and a lot of "generic" questions*
- *There are inconsistencies in the requirements on the form, leading to great worry that it may result in exclusion from the process.*
- *There is no explanation regarding providing evidence for completion for those who had completed old sho system*
- *There seemed to be a lot of repetition between questions.*
- *There were a couple of questions which were difficult to understand and answer*
- *These were eventually answered by the helpdesk, but they deleted their answers after a week meaning you had to resubmit the same question & await a response again.*
- *What time have you spent outside core anaesthetics- very badly worded, had absolutely no idea if the number I put*

down represented what it was intended to. Question about foundation competencies- no option for those of us who graduated before foundation programme but who trained in approved posts.

- why applying for this UoA? how can i answer in a common application for two different UoAs*
- With the essay type questions, I think there is no harm if some guidance is also given as what is expected.*

Technical/computer problems

- Altering the details of referees during "registration" did not get transferred to the application forms.*
- At times the system was very slow and I could not access some pages of the form on a number of occasions*
- boxes for text were too small, and led to sections being cut up/ rearranged. I used ms word and copied and pasted all of my responses from that as it made things easier to edit on the screen*
- countdown timer?*
- Dates for courses and prizes were not saved by iCAMS*
- Dates for relevant courses attended kept disappearing every time I saved the form.*
- Despite continuing to type on a page it would time out, thereby losing data. Data was also lost even without a 'time out' happening. Some of the text boxes would not scroll down whilst you were typing them, so you were typing blind.*
- difficulty contacting help desk on multiple occasions*
- I couldn't print the appl. form(web site problem), helpdesk link didn't work.*
- I found problems with it not saving or crashing when saving, particularly with dates. It was also very difficult to check the application through. It was much easier with the read only file which you had access to after submission so perhaps you should be able to read that prior to final submission*
- I had an email saying a page hadn't saved properly. Lost faith in system.*
- I received communication fro the wessex deanery through ICAMS but not from the London deanery Inconsistencies*

like this cause unnecessary anxiety especially without prior notification

- I submitted my application form and received confirmation, then rechecked only to find it was still open and not submitted. I had to email WMD to confirm.*
- I used Word document to write out my answers and subsequently pasted it onto the answer box. I found it difficult to have to scroll down the box to double check my answers. I also think autosaving the page would be a better idea compared to having to save within 30 mins each time.*
- I wrote my answers originally in microsoft word as it was easier to edit and see as a whole but when I put answers into the on-line form the word counts were completely different!*
- I wrote my application form in microsoft word originally as it was easier to view as a whole and edit etc... However when you type the answers into the application form on-line the word counts were completely different! Not a problem in the end but a bit strange.*
- Internet in entire Luton/Harpenden region broke for 3days prior to submission of application forms*
- Issues regarding word count on website being different to microsoft word*
- It is not good idea to have individual deanery ICAMS-which is confusing*
- it was not initially clear that the application form would only be found under the west midlands deanery*
- It was not very user friendly- typing in small spaces was difficult.*
- It was very easy to select cancel accidentally after spending all the time filling out the application form! To reapply, you have to get a new email address!*
- not enough spaces on courses attended therefore could not enter them all*
- Once I confirmed the interview on the icams it completely disappeared. I had reconfirm with the deanery about the timing.*
- One deanery required a copy of the application form to be brought along to the interview and the printing function was poor.*
- Poor website, difficult to navigate*
- Saving data every 30mins or losing it all seemed unnecessary and difficult. Also there was an occasion where I clicked save and the whole website just shut down losing everything I'd typed since the last save.*
- saving period must be more than 30 min.*

- sections had to be completed in limited time.
- some of the questions needed more time to fill and autosaving method will be very helpful in this process instead of manually saving it on the webpage
- The 30 minute lockout was frustrating sometimes as I occasionally lost material
- The answer to a particular question is not visible as a whole and there is no slider which could be used to move the answer down/up.
- The data was lost if I lost internet connection or spent more than 30 minutes on any section, and I learnt this hard way.
- The fact that the form would let you continue entering data when it had already timed-out, then when you try to save it, it had deleted everything! It should have an autosave/ or a signal to say that it will log out soon so that you have time to save before it deletes everything.
- The half hour time out caused a lot of problems - losing work after 30 minutes can not be seen as helpful. More helpful would be an autosave or a reminder to save your work every 30 minutes (hence your work could be saved instead of losing it)
- The online form did not allow you to print it out which made checking for mistakes difficult. The word counter was different to Microsoft word - so having written answers which were exactly the right number of words - copying them onto the form came up with another word count which was over the limit.
- The personal details and to filled out before the main application. I felt this was a bit of an agony as we actually just wanted to get onto the application to view and start preparing for the questions. I made the mistake of speeding the personal details process so when I went back to fill out details that I did not have at the time of completing the form it did not update on the application form and I had to fill it out AGAIN!
- The preference page wouldnt load for 48 hours before the deadline and kept crashing the form and logging you out- I had to send my form without checking it- luckily I had entered my preferences the week before. I emailed the help desk about this- still no reply weeks later, so not very helpful there!! A help line number would be better.
- The time out function seemed pointless, I can understand timing out if the application form had been left unattended for a period of time but to time out while typing resulting in the loss of work was very frustrating. Also, the clock was not visible when you scrolled down.

- *The website is ungainly - it is slow to access pages, prints out poorly and is poorly displayed. The lack of ability to change font size or add bold text to create headings or emphasise points is ludicrous.*
- *The word count on the application form differed from word counts performed in word and the counts changed when an answer was saved.*
- *The word count on the application form freetext boxes did not refresh as the entry was altered. This was very confusing.*
- *The word counter online differed markedly to that in common Word applications.*
- *There was concern about my weather my application actually did reach the shortlisting deanery. This was firstly because the application was not printing completely off the Internet after the application was submitted. This has been brought up with College Tutor.*
- *there was problem accessing the application and had difficulty opening the application and the deanery address to send the competencies was really complicated to find.*
- *time out of each page*
- *time out was an issue, the boxes should expand to allow reading of all text*
- *unable to print out the application form on a number of occasions*
- *When entering the free text questions, the text box size was way too small - this made it almost impossible to edit the text on the form and furthermore difficult to check if a copy&paste from other applications into the box was correct*
- *Word count did not match that on Microsoft Word. Boxes were tiny which made reading my entire answer difficult.*
- *Word count differed on the online application form and in MS Word. Online application kept logging off after 30 mins -very annoying, I lost my application changes twice.*
- *Word count incorrect, & didn't save information*
-

National Recruitment at CT1

No

- *I am against National led recruitment in principle.....*
- *National process is blind process and tends to miss out good candidates that are otherwise appropriately prioritised locally.*
- *The entire system of national recruitment is bordering on the tyrannical.*
- *The process seems to be struggling a little under the burden of maybe 1000 applicants. MMC and MTAS was a disaster and I cannot see one centre coping with such a massive number.*
- *You have little or no control over whereabouts in the country you end up!!*
- *you will need to employ much people to manage these candidates relocations soon.*

Don't know

- *Candidates should have a reasonable chance to work, where they WANT and not move all the time all around the UK.*
- *Co-ordinated application, interview and offers avoid many complications seen in the last two years. This can work at CT2 and ST3 level. However, at CT1 level, candidates may be applying for other specialities, and I'm not sure how well it would work. Candidates may still have to 'stick or twist' between offers despite national anaesthetic recruitment.*
- *makes no difference to me*
- *Sure in one sense it is easier than filling out up to ten forms but on another you have to make up your mind before being given a chance to decide between the choice you have made.*

Yes

- *A centralised online process for CT1 would make it much easier. When I applied it was mostly paper applications, which required much duplication onto similar forms and the*

need to get to the post office on time. It also required many duplicate references on different forms by our consultants.

- I found it very frustrating to have to do numerous different application forms when I applied at CT1*
- I stop the difficulty in having many interviews, the associated time off, expense of photocopying etc. Also resolves the pressure associated with rejecting offers if you are waiting for your 'first choice'.*
- Scotland needs to be included, rather than having a separate application with different deadline dates.*
- Separate application forms for each Deanery leads to unreasonably high paperwork load.*
- the national process seems fair and also is great in that you only need one application.*
- There should be bench markers and aptitude tests to choose suitable candidates in to Anaesthesia*
- this would prevent people from going to areas of the country that they didn't want to go to because they were waiting to hear from their first choice!*
- very important- avoids the problem of having to make decisions on offers when still waiting for decisions from other deaneries*

Common format for interviews

Good idea

- all my interviews had a similar 3 station format anyway. it would be good to have known what to have expected beforehand but i was unable to find out specific information on the internet.*
- At least a common requirement for paper work. As one deanery said it was against the rules to interview without 4 passport photos whereas the other had never mentioned photographs at all*
- But they should still be held separately so we can learn from each interview*
- Common format and one interview for each level of entry.*
- Hopefully this would allow transfer of scores if not offered in first 2 interviews.*

- *I feel you should put this question to the Consultants from each deanery and you should prepare a format for the interview and seek their opinions whether they like it or not*
- *If uniformity is what is required, then you have already agreed on an application form. Why not agree on an interview format too?*
- *It would allow a national comparison of candidates, but I suspect deaneries would prefer to have some say in the candidates that they take on.*
- *There should be a common format for each deanery.*
- *There should be a standard format so the candidates know what to expect and can apply to external deaneries easily.*

Bad idea

- *- each deanery has different strengths: i.e. some have strong research programs and it would be only right that such deaneries focus upon this in their interviews such that they recruit appropriate candidates to continue that particular tradition. - commitment/specific reasons to train in a particular deanery are best assessed by that deanery*
- *Answers for the scenarios asked at ST3(London NWT) were available online 6 weeks ago, I know because I found them and discussed with colleagues-a national system would confound the issue. I'm not convinced there is any satisfactory way to grade candidates apart from working with them-at least with a local system you know what you're getting.*
- *BAd idea- I think its fairer for each deanery to decide the format.*
- *deaneries should be able to assess candidates however they like.*
- *Deaneries should be able to decide how they select trainees.*
- *Deaneries should have the opportunity to decide the discriminating questions for the interview, as they will actually be employing the candidates for the next 5 years, rather than a third party.*
- *Different deaneries may want different things from their candidates and I think they should decide locally how they want to do this.*
- *Different deaneries have a different ethos and 'flavour'. This diversity should be preserved and not destroyed by the introduction of a 'one size fits all' approach to*

interviews.

- *Each deanery is different and desires different attributes of their candidates.*
- *Each Deanery should have some autonomy*
- *each of the two deaneries seemed to cover general themes but each had significant differences. I think that a common format would make choice between candidates more difficult.*
- *Having a common format prevents adapting the interview process to the individual. Because someone looks good on paper and ticks boxes, does not mean they are necessarily the best candidate for the job*
- *I believe the process of interview should be individual to each deanery.*
- *I feel each deanery can design their own in order to ascertain the qualities in applicants they deem appointable for that region*
- *I think that the deaneries should design their own format because different deaneries will have different views on what is necessary.*
- *I think the interview process gives the local deanery the opportunity to sell its self to the candidate - however if this is the case I think the candidate should be free to change the order of their preferences following the interviews.*
- *If a common format is to be introduced, we may as well dispense with multiple interviews and have only one. My experience of the two interviews I attended is that they are already very similar*
- *It is up to the employers to decide what strengths and weaknesses they wish to identify.*
- *It should be up to the deanerys how they interview, providing it is standardised for all applications to that UoA.*
- *It would stifle the ability of Deaneries to distinguish between candidates if it were possible for candidates to predict what questions/stations are likely to be presented to them.*
- *RCoA/GMC/PMETB are just creating robots - anaesthetists. We are all the same, the same courses, skills, competencies. Where is variability and natural selection?*
- *That would simply render the interviews even more formulaic and predictable*
- *There has to be room made for individuality!*
- *This national recruitment system, as stated before is tyrannical. Requirements differ from region to region and so should the interviews.*
- *This would make questions too predictable.*
- *Variety is the spice of life and all that.... Seriously though,*

it is important to have different processes for interviews so that new things can be tried.

•

Arranging interviews

- *because i couldn't arrange anything.It's all fixed time and date for the interview*
- *Booking initially failed on iCams, this was resolved the next day I think.*
- *Both were scheduled for the same time, it was difficult to speak to anyone about this all communication is supposed to be by email. However the automated reply from the deanery states someone will try to get back to you within 48hrs, this is not much use when you have to accept/reject an interview within 48hrs.*
- *Comments_Arranging*
- *Difficulty in arranging a visit*
- *Fixed time/date slots in London*
- *Fixed time/date slots in London*
- *Given a slot and told this was non negotiable*
- *However, I was given an interview date and was lucky to be able to go. There was no opportunity to choose a time or a date and time on i:cams.*
- *I booked one slot for both CT2 and ST3 as directed. Despite this, I received a phonecall from the Deanery one day prior to the interview booking deadline stating I had not booked my slot for CT2, when in fact I had.*
- *I couldn't get a late slot and had to get up fairly early to prepare. I had been in Sheffield the previous day, so was exhausted which affected my performance.*
- *I had a date clash and this was kindly rearranged.*
- *I had an interview previously arranged in Dundee, for the Scottish process that was on the same day. I was essentially given a choice and there was no flexibility whatsoever. Also, the timing of the East Midlands (South) invite (approx 2pm on a Thursday before a long bank holiday weekend) was utterly atrocious. The bluntness of the EM(S) staff regarding this was horrendous. No sympathy at all.*
- *I had problems due to the flights all being canceled but the Deanery was very helpful and accommodating*
- *I had to travel down to london from liverpool and my interview was at 9.15. I was not allowed to change the*

time.

- *I thought I had booked myself an interview slot, however on turning up they had no record of this*
- *I was allocated an interview slot*
- *I was already off that day.*
- *I was fortunate that my 2 interviews were not clashing. London interview dates were fixed.*
- *I was given a fixed interview slot, with information that "interviews cannot be changed". I therefore had to rearrange my other interview, that was already booked for the same day.*
- *I was not able to arrange an interview - it was pre-determined by the deanery, with no alternative offered. The deanery was also over 1 week late with the offer for interview, leaving only 1 week to organise rota swaps & travel and accommodation.*
- *I WAS NOT EMAILED BY THE LONDON DEANERY WHEREAS ALL MY COLLEAGUES WERE. I RANG THE DEANERY TO ASK FOR CLARIFICATION BUT WAS STONEWALLED AND TOLD TO SEND AN EMAIL. I RECEIVED A RESPONSE SAYING IF I HADN'T HEARD I WAS THEREFORE UNSUCCESSFUL. ONE DAY LATER I GET A CALL FROM THE DEANERY ASKING WHY I HAVN'T RESPONDED TO THEIR OFFER OF INTERVIEW - WHAT A SHAMBLES! THIS CAUSED UNECESSARY STRESS. I WAS OUTRAGED AT THE LACK OF HUMAN COURTESY AFFORDED TO ME BY THE LONDON DEANERY WHEN I RANG UP TO ASK FOR HELP / CLARIFICATION. YES, IT IS A LARGE DEANERY BUT THAT IS NO EXCUSE!!!!!!!!!!!!!! THIS NEEDS ADDRESSING AS GETTING AN INTERVIEW OR NOT HAS MASSIVE IMPLICATIONS FOR SOME PEOPLE.*
- *I was not given an opportunity to book my own interview this was arranged for me by the deanery and I was advised of this in a letter*
- *I was on my honeymoon - arranged well in advance of the interview timings being posted - and returned to find that I had had a ridiculously short window of opportunity to apply. The timings need to be boldly displayed and not just given a vague idea.*
- *I was pre-nights*
- *I wasn't given the opportunity to book a slot, it was allocated.*
- *Interview booked, then cancelled and had to be rebooked*
- *Interviews booked online, not enough slots initially released*
- *Issues with the reference forms, initially they asked for their own, then changed their minds and asked for the*

westmidlands deanery form, which caused problems getting referees to re do them.

- *It was not clear that I had accepted the slot for interview on their email.*
- *London Deanery came out with the results in last minute and there was a note saying, interview times are fixed. This created considerable problems with my Scotland interview.*
- *London deanery itself gave us time and date, we could not book it ourselves.*
- *London interviews were fixed you couldnt change the date or the timing.*
- *no choice of date or time*
- *No choice of the interview date or time.*
- *online booking system.*
- *Process in London was quite disorganised and interview date was informed on a very short notice.*
- *The Deanery appeared surprised by my presence and had not prepared all the necessary paperwork they had ready for other candidates.*
- *The interview time was appointed to me. I did not have a chance to choose the time slot.*
- *The online booking system was not set up correctly (not enough slots listed)*
- *The system wasn't updated at the time of the invite of the interview but was eventually updated and I could book a slot.*
- *The venue location was not easy to find. Not enough directions given. e.g. closest tube station etc*
- *the wrong date was initially sent out by the welsh deanery.*
- *there was a problem booking the interview, easily fixed with a phone call to KSS, who were very helpful.*
- *There was no chance to book a slot in wales deanery result of which I was interviewed quite late when the interviewers did not show much interest in one station which put me off.*
- *There were problems with the letter sent out not stating what info was needed on the day of interview ie passport photos and photocopies of proof of attendance at any courses mentioned on application but this was readily resolved*
- *There were two dates on offer, but the first date had only six places available and those disappeared within the 2 hours between e-mail being sent and my receipt of e-mail. Also, the offered dates were on consecutive days, which is not much choice.*
- *They gave available time slots which were actually not*

available - my time slot was for 8.30, but i was told I would not be interviewed until 10am even if I turned up. My time was changed to the next day but no additional arrangements were made.

- This deanery did not use the iCAMS system to notify its candidates that they had been selected for interview which was frustrating for people who were on holiday or coming from overseas, especially given the dreadful travel conditions around the UK at the time of the interviews. I think this was grossly unfair on some candidates.*
- This deanery only sent out letters and did not use icams website. The letter did not ask us to confirm attendance but subsequent strongly worded emails wanted a confirmation.*
- time for london interview is fixed. no changes allowed*
- Very flexible arrangements for interview, allowing the candidate to book their own slot, and even to change the booked slot.*
- Was given date and time by the deanery-cannot change*
- Shortlisting was late as well*
- Was informed re the interview a week after the official last date for informing acc to initial information. No choice of day or time.*
- Was told time and date, no choice.*
- We were TOLD to come at a particular date and time.*
- When I was first informed I had an interview it was on the friday evening. However when it came to booking the interview I could not book it. It cause much cistress over the weekend as I was not able to get any advice on it. On monday, the problem resolved itself.*
- Why were we not emailed invitations to interview, given that the ICAMS site was not exactly user friendly?*
- Yes, interview booked and then had to be cancelled and rebooked.*

Conduct of the interviews

Interview was conducted badly

- 4 minutues to present what you had acheived in your*

- training and what things you want to cacheive,etc,....*
- *A written interview for a post where everyone is expected to have passed the Primary FRCA seems like a complete waste of time.*
 - *acetates were not on my preparation station desk and i therefore did not prepare a presentation on acetate i feel this disadvantaged me as acetate were subsequently made available for everyone else*
 - *agressive in approach*
 - *Communication and "scenario" stations didn't seem very well scripted/thought out .. Also, questions didn't seem very discriminating.....*
 - *Despite arriving early for the interview I was imediately rushed to the the interview. I had anticipated time to register and calm down prior to starting. My interview was held 30 min before my booked time. Questions were ambiguous and wordy in the structured interview.*
 - *Each deanery conducted the interviews in a different way. there was no consistency*
 - *Each deanery have different way of assessing trainee. I think there should be universalisation of questions or topic in all deanery.*
 - *I did not attend interview*
 - *I didn't find the interview for KSS a pleasant experience. The panel wasn't very supportive nor nice. I found myself very distressed and haven't received any significant help with that problem. The questions were asked sharply and shortly with no further indications, even when I stuck with one of them. I was quite unhappy afterwards, blamed myself, but after a second interview i realised that maybe it wasn't only my thought.*
 - *I do not think the interview process was unfair, but I question its relevance. It was a test of one's ability to memorise certain definitions of clinical governance and audit, and asked little personal information. There was no reference to the application form and it wasn't clear if we should be building on the information therein, or treating the interview as completely separate and assuming the interviewer had no access to our forms.*
 - *I dont feel it gave peopkle an opportunity to shine. It felt like an artificial, tick box exercise. Surely there is a better way of differentiating candidates in a fair reproducible manner*
 - *I feel that the welsh deanery interview asked a large number of clinical questions, down to the doses of certain drugs. The structured interview station did not resemble the "difficult colleagues/hot topics etc." format that most*

structured interviews provide, instead it was like a clinical viva but with such a paucity of clinical information about the case that assumptions had to be made. I felt this was not a good test of my ability as a registrar. Equally the portfolio station was very disappointing. The interviewers did not touch, let alone open, my portfolio which I have spent a serious amount of time collating and worrying about. Points were given for achievements outside medicine such as in music(!) but there was not recognition of teaching experience which other deaneries asked about and which formed a part of the application form. I appreciate not that much of the score for the interview comes from that station but I walked away feeling I might as well have just come in from the street rather than doing all the preparation. The Welsh interviewers were all very nice though. I'm not sure about doing it in a hotel, either - I'm sure a couple of the stations were in a bedroom and the lack of space made it difficult when trying to do a presentation as I was practically on top of the examiners!!

- I felt that as I knew the panel I was uncomfortable.*
- I felt that the portfolio review and personal attribute questions were superficial and didn't allow adequate time. The presentation station was rushed and I could not see how it could assess presentation skills with such short time to prepare. There seemed to be an over emphasis on clinical scenarios which were 'easy' exam questions- is there any point in this if you need the exam to accept the job? many of the interviewers seemed disinterested and looked like they had been hearing the same answers to the questions all day*
- I find the questions are more management orientated and less clinically relevant.*
- I think this was related more to the personality of some of the interviewers than anything else. Found one of them quite aggressive -but maybe he was just trying to put me under pressure!*
- I thought it was very slanted towards research and education rather than a broader approach to anaesthetics.*
- I was interviewed at only one deanery and the questions and scenarios were more compared to other deaneries. I think the scenarios and interviews should be of same pattern in every deanery.*
- In London I found the CT2 interview more difficult than ST3...*
- In the communication skills station the question wasn't clear. On repeatedly requesting for the question to be repeated it wasn't done.*

- *interview was fair, but didn't provide the opportunity to demonstrate skills/abilities.*
- *My belief was that it was more of Final VIVA than just an interview. But well scheduled.*
- *no credit given for the candidate's CV as far as I can see- why was the portfolio station not scored? panels were very short, not very searching. but fair questions*
- *Questions and the way of asking was quite irrelevant to the post. Interview panel was overall very unfriendly and patronising.*
- *Questions appeared to assess minimum standards and were based on clinical scenarios not allowing the applicant to sell themselves. The questions varied depending on who delivered them and i would have approach my second station differentially had I known the rest would be heavily based on clinical scenarios.*
- *questions were asked fast and felt like they were just rushing through the questions*
- *Somewhere just wanted to know, if candidates can do the job. Too service based.*
- *station was to tell about your training ,portfolio evidence of that,... as soon as i get in, the senior there fired her questions in a way i didnt like much : why you think you are coming to this post,at this grade, in this region and now? Do you have a training system backhome?...*
- *The administration of interview appeared chaotic, interviews running late. Some interviewers were unfriendly and appeared bored, questions were mainly concerned with having 'memorised' definitions rather than an opportunity to show one's personal experience. One of the clinical scenarios was misleading.*
- *The interview did not involve any review of my portfolio.*
- *the interview itself was well organised but it does not test your skills and abilities properly*
- *The interview questions were very common and standard, and didn't appear to be having enough discriminatory power to distinguish very good candidates from average ones.*
- *The process was so didactic and points based that there was no opportunity to score points at the Portfolio station for things that were not on their list eg MRCP part 1, letters to journals, management activities. The structured interview was too short. the telephone station was not true to real life because the "doctor" on the end of the did not give complete answers eg What drugs are they on, "Frusemide". You then had to say anything else? to find out they were on multiple meds. Life is generally not like*

that. I like the fact that there were several different stations and I think it gave people with different skills the opportunity to flourish in different areas.

- the station on teaching included 5 mins for preparation and 5 mins to present. I don't understand as what was the thought process behind such an idea and the clinical scenario was too hypothetical with inadequate time to go through the notes and make a plan which is very much unlike the actual day to day practice.*
- the structure of the interview was inadequate highly. It basically had 6 examiners for selecting a person for 5 years. I think it should have been more competitive and objective than simple cartoonish format.*
- There was no opportunity to demonstrate my skill and abilities*

Interview was conducted well

- -Though the interview was fair, the structured nature meant it was difficult to "shine" -I was surprised that the deanery presented me with a copy of my application form to sign that included equality information (i.e. sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity) and other deaneries applied for/ranking of deaneries*
- 3 questions which required opinions rather than an accepted 'right way'. quite a different approach to usual.*
- Again, not sure how they differentiate between candidates based on clinical scenarios.*
- Although a timed station (preparing a presentation) should have a CLOCK on the wall or a person giving timed warnings (e.g. five minutes to go). I would have better paced myself with these queues. Otherwise it was fair.*
- Although there were no questions about anaesthesia, or your dedication and enthusiasm for the subject. With 10mins for each of three panels, I don't think you got chance to fully answer and show your abilities, and I hope my application chances haven't been hindered by this.*
- an ok interview - difficult to shine, and there is no way of showing the type of person you are, other things that you have done in your life beyond anaesthetics etc*
- But I think they should have conducted interview for CT2 & ST3 separately not clubbed together.*
- But the questions were very superficial and not very specific to ST3*

- *communication station a little confusing, not sure what was wanted as told not to get caught up in clinical detail.*
- *could have been better*
- *demanding interview none the less*
- *Did not give me adequate opportunities to demonstrate my skills and abilities.*
- *However, I found it odd that some people were interviewed purely by members of their first choice school and others were not.*
- *I did not attend due to illness*
- *I did not attend the interview because of some personal problem.*
- *I did not attend the interview because of some family problem.*
- *I don't think it gave the opportunity to properly show my skills and abilities.*
- *I don't think it gave the opportunity to properly show my skills and abilities. They should have had the same interviewers asking the same questions to all the candidates to ensure that everything was done as fairly as possible.*
- *I don't think that I had much opportunity to `sell` myself, but I don't think that I was asked anything unreasonable.*
- *I felt the interview was mainly assessing my skill as an anaesthetist and a lot of the questions were similar to the viva exam questions.*
- *I felt the three stations (ability / behaviour / portfolio) were as expected, with no unusual questions. I personally felt I didn't come across as well as I could have, but I do not believe the nature of the interview hindered this.*
- *I felt this interview was than Yorkshire as it allowed me to sell myself more- I liked the fact that 30 mins was dedicated to the portfolio review*
- *I found it a bit peculiar, not sure how candidates are being differentiated based on what was asked.*
- *I understand there are large numbers of applicants to interview on the day, but 10 min interview slots felt extremely rushed.*
- *I was not sure about the timekeeping process ie there was no hint of how long the interview would continue for during the interview. The portfolio group were taking quite a long time with the previous candidate.*
- *I was very impressed by the organisation and nature of the peninsula school's interview. I felt it was a good, genuine test of abilities and gave me an opportunity to perform. The interviewers were probing enough that all of the hard work in terms of collating and tweaking my portfolio and*

- interview preparation felt worthwhile, and appreciated.*
- *In the presentation station I think, there is too much of information to take on board in given time and to present it. There was not enough time to get to the questions what the interviewers were expecting , which was happened to me.*
 - *interview was not on time, but the topics / questions and everything was fair.*
 - *Interviews are funny things and I feel that I was unable to fully demonstrate exactly what I am about*
 - *It was much as I expected. However one station was a little confusing and I think it seem to throw some of the candidates.*
 - *It was very impersonal, focussing on management & research skills but generically. No questions at all regarding my portfolio, my personal skills or even why I wanted to apply for Anaesthesia.*
 - *Just not enough time for a portfolio.*
 -
 - *Liite chaotic-who goes where?*
 - *logbook and portfolio station was without the candidate, thus one was unable to explain his portfolio, publication ect*
 - *More opportunity to demonstrate personal and clinical attributes would have been fairer.*
 - *Not clear what was expected from the portfolio (i.e. what portions of the logbook, WBAs etc would be needed)*
 - *not sure about some of the stations (SIM, presentation station), very artificial scenarios and poss. not entirely representative of true skills*
 - *not uniform for all deaneries, some of them had written parts as well, I felt like doing my FRCA exam*
 - *One interviewer was rather dismissive and pressurised me into giving answers quickly, I felt she did not really listen to my answers unless it was exactly what she was expecting to hear.*
 - *one of the questions was not clear, it was not the right way to check the knowledge and application of one of the skills in practice. Although I knew the skills and apply but I mentioned it briefly and not in details because I didn't know that the question is to check for these skills.*
 - *overall a better interview, but once again really very difficult to show the type of person you are, or your extra medical interests. everything is very medicine centred - what about the rounded person beyond medicine*
 - *Personal questions as well as ones which probed my clinical and management skills.*
 - *Questions asked were fairly non discriminating and i*

thought it would be difficult to separate candidate performances

- some not quite clear questions*
- Some parts fo the interview was very obviuos that it was meant for the selected few and their capabilities. It looked as if it was meant for them.*
- The application form I was given on the day, to sign and confirm was mine, still had my deanery preferences attached, and therefore this could have prejudiced the interviewers.*
- The clinical part of the interview was good and I was able to demonstrate my competence. i did not feel enough time was spent looking at my portfolio, and I did not have a chance to talk through my portfolio with the panel. They looked at it for 5 minutes. In my other interview 30 minutes was didicated to a portfolio review with the panel and this really allowed me to sell myself and show them all my achievments.*
- The clinical scenarios were quite relevant, but there was no discussion about the portfolio and very limited time to answer general questions.*
- The format of the comm skills station was a little unrealistic and it wasn't clear what was wanted*
- The interview had a very large clinical component, very similar to a clinical viva*
- The interview was conducted well and very clinical*
- The interview was excellent. A freindly, relaxed atmosphere. Lots of open questions and ability to demonstrate strengths.*
- The interview was thorough but like most interviews these days it was more like an exam than an interview.*
- The interview was very speciality specific. It was conducted very well and the panel members were kind and considerate.*
- The most efficient interview I have attended - well organised, fair questions and running to time.*
- The panel at my Wessex interview was fair, supportive and run the interview in a very pleasant atmosphere. Withing first few minutes, the members of the panel managed to make me feel relaxed and really concentrate on the questions. They were very helpful if any problems with a question occured. I specially would like to mention the 'Clinical scenario' panel-with whom I a very essential clinical discussion in wonderful atmosphere. Also all members of a panel at 'Portfolio and CV' station were very kind. After finishing questions I even heard some compliments which made me feel happy. I think these*

people were very helpful and professional and I would like to express my acknowledgements to them. Irrespectively of the results of the recruitment, the interview with a Wessex panel was a very good life experience. Thank you!

- The questions were fair. I was surprised the portfolio station was not marked. Also there was no space to add any personal/ circumstantial information.*
- there was a significant delay on the interview day of over an hour*
- There was less emphasis on the portfolio and CV!*
- There was no clear instructions in clinical and communication station.*
- Time given for CT2 interview was shorter than ST3 and interviewers felt significantly more under time pressure and at times had to cut what candidate was saying which may include demonstration of skills/abilities.*
- too many questions in 10 minutes*
- Ver clinical interview, minimal personal info asked for.*
- very well conducted*
- well organised interview considering number of people.*

Other/Final comments

- All in all it was a very frustrating process. Certain administration sections of the form were badly worded & lead to confusion that took days to sort out. Once the status changed from "Shortlisting" to "interview" it took a further couple of days to find out when & where you had been listed for an interview and even then, some deaneries did not use the online process for notification. There should be national agreement on using the online system or not.*
- Although I'm sure audit and research do demonstrate some level of commitment, they give no information about clinical aptitude. Nowhere in the application form -and even less so in the interview- was there any opportunity to convey if you were popular with patients or colleagues, if you were reliable and punctual, if you had sound clinical judgement etc. I appreciate that these things are more difficult to quantify on paper, but if you do not even seek these attributes, how can you possibly hope to appoint the best doctors? For many people the lack of human contact (ie reliance on an email address that rarely yields an answer) has been very frustrating. The standard of feedback and of answering questions relating to the*

application form, the interview process and the provision of references, has been appalling. The only response I have had has been a single line, referring me to the website (which obviously I had already looked at and which I didn't feel answered my query). There needs to be a properly staffed helpline so that applicants can discuss the process with people who are sufficiently trained to help. The anonymous electronic form leaves us feeling undervalued and having no-one to clarify the many ambiguities that such a system throws up makes this a lot worse.

- Are points from short-listing counted when appointments are made? I fear not and this essentially discounts the CV of the applicant and any achievements/experience not mentioned in the interview. This is unfair.*
- Candidates had no idea what skills were tested at each station. Using emergency clinical scenarios to test candidates response is faulty because answering the question verbally sitting across the table is very different from what the person would actually do and look for.*
- COMMUNICATION COMMUNICATION COMMUNICATION
The Help line is not easily fined???????*
- During my interview, one of the interviewees had 8 months experience in Anaesthesia in the UK and an MCQ pass in Primary FRCA, I fail to understand on what grounds he qualified.*
- Exam time and interview time is quite stressful and are both close together.*
- Greater communication between deaneries, INCLUDING Wales and Scotland and NI to avoid interview clashes. This is the third year of whatever hash of MMC remains and from what I can see, having a single window of entry is crazy. Deaneries cannot fill their posts with this method of recruitment. Ms Hewitt has a lot to answer for as do our seniors who agreed to this process. It has ruined relationships, careers and will continue to allow good doctors to leave the process altogether.*
- Having been through MTAS this whole process has been a pleasure compared to that! Well done!*
- I applied for CT2 as I did not have primary MCQ. I imagine under the current system those with MCQ pass and thus eligible for ST3 applications got shortlisted for CT2 also. Maybe ring fencing some ST2 places is needed?*
- I believe the process as a whole ran well this year and a national application form removed the annoyance of having to fill in a separate form for each deanery but that after the application form the process should shift from a national to*

deanery level

- *I did not get any message from london deanery whether I was shortlisted or not.*
- *I feel that multiple start points may be positive. In addition, I have hear that some areas held CT2 (and pos ST3) posts back to use locally- this shouldn't happen, or should be the case everywhere. There is a difference in job numbers between the West mids and London deanery websites. Finally, I am still confused as to whether I should send references to west mids, or you will be contacting my referees directly.*
- *I have specifically asked the RCoA for the written confirmation that I sit Primary FRCA in May. I did ask for it in March, before all the interviews. I did not recieve anything and guess what. They wanted the confirmation during the documents check in London Deanery that we intend to sit the exam in May. They had to accept the acknowledgment card, which does not itself guarantee the exam slot. Confusing...*
- *I meet all the essential criteria for shortlisting. Even then i was shortlisted for only one deanery. I did not get interview in the other. This makes it more worse a system than MTAS, at which time candidates were allowed atleast 4 interviews. During this recruitment, eventhough i am fully eligible, i was not even shortlisted for one deanery. How fair it is the shortlisting process? If the application form is via national recruitment, then why is the shortlisting at deanery level? Both application form and shortlisting should be done as national level (or) the application forms should be for individual deanery scrapping the national application form. Overall, this recruitment process is even worse than MTAS I got only one interview (with no luck at job) after all the hard work i have put in and the amount of time i have invested in improving my CV.*
- *I think that the need to submit all these documents before the interview is not justified, the only real need is to confirm Identity and could submit the rest after the Interview results is announced.*
- *I think there should be an idea for the candidate to understand the criteria for selection.*
- *I thought that it was a bad idea that the form had a section asking for reasons for applying for a particular deanery. As this is a generic form (for multiple deaneries) this will effectively exclude anyone from being on equal terms when applying to their second choice as a preference will have been described in the form. Perhaps there is a way of*

filling in alternative replies for different deaneries. Also the ranking of deaneries was not confidential which further meant that applicants would not be viewed on equal terms. I think these ranking details should be confidential.

- I was asked to sign my application at my north west interview to confirm it was mine. Firstly there was no need as the final submission is an electronic signature. Secondly the last page in the print out was my deanery preferences which should not have been available to individual deaneries and should have been kept with icams or west midlands deanery.*
- if it was possible to coordinate all the paperwork, not just the references it would save a lot on photocopying as I had to provide copies of everything for every place.*
- If someone doesn't get a shortlisting in a deanery in the initial process then this will rule them out for the clearing process despite other place will become available!*
- it is difficult to access the recruitment process from a non-UK position.*
- It was unfair for me that I could not apply for ST3 even though I had full primary as I do not finish 24months until december but my top 2 UoA (Severn and Wessex) have Feb start dates that I could have been recruited to through this process*
- it would be better if the feed back on the interviews and application is given completely.*
- It would be interesting to see how our view about the process changes incase we do not get an offer in the first round and how the subsequent rounds are conducted*
- London Deanery had dropped the number of posts at ST3 Level down to 50 from 110. If I knew this, I could have applied elsewhere. I think this is illegal.*
- London did not release their invitation to interview within the allocated time frame and did not use ICAMS to announce interviews. I do not know if they will announce offers inline with the national process. If I receive an offer from my second choice am I to assume that my first was unsuccessful, or might it be that London is late, going against the whole point of the national system? Candidates may once again have to gamble on whether or not they should hold out.*
- London was a bit late in getting back to us on the shortlisting front and now says we have to wait up to 6 weeks to know the outcome - surely they know the interview scores within a few moments -> a delay will prevent another job being obtained prior to August. Not very good at all!*

- *Make the rankings and give the jobs in one go as per rankings-National application and rankings*
- *more info regarding results*
- *My preference to different deanery were same But I thought I had to put some ordered of preference Therefore I was not invited to first preference and later none of the other deanery responded I was shortlisted or not.*
- *national recruitment means it should be national lead recruitment.All jobs collected together and interview should be in one place for all the jobs*
- *No feedback was given for not shortlisting.*
- *no information given abt the time period of selection of job*
- *nope*
- *Not all information was available via ICAMs. Mersey interview was invited by post. Scotland & Northern Ireland have seperate applications.*
- *Number of st3 jobs are too less. Too many accumulated training aspirant doctors.So jobs needs to be increased in number for 3-4 years.*
- *Once yearly recruitment cannot be right - either for trianees or for trusts/ deaneries in service provision....*
- *One of the desirable criteria for CT3 application was "Less than 48 months experience in Anaesthesia". Seems to be some of short listed candidates have more than 48 months experience. I have also checked couple of consultants (who are part of short listing board) & their understanding is no such criteria exists.*
- *One of the major problems for myself was that I wished only to be in the same deanery as my fiance (who is applying for jobs in a medical specialty at st3 level). However, there is no opportunity to link applications and the tight job acceptance deadline of 48 hours and the different job dates has made this very difficult (and perhaps impossible). The system does not take into account the applicant's personal situation or needs- could this be changed?*
- *One should be able to change the interview slot if possible, but i could not do it. I feel 3 UoA will be good idea rather than 2 options.*
- *overall went smoothly and acceptable amount of waiting time.*
- *Reference process should perhaps be started prior to interview invites and only require one standard copy to be forwarded to each UoA. Standardised document requirements at the interviews would also be more helpful as different UoAs required different things and it can be*

excessive and wasteful.

- *Request for Certificate A for a person who is applying for CT2 and is already on CT2 post. Is it reasonable ?*
- *speciality doctor should be considered for this training opportunity*
- *The collection of a vast amount of personal data i.e. photocopies of passports, birth certificates, drivers licences, I think breaks confidentiality and I can't find any information on the subsequent disposal of material in deaneries where jobs have not been taken. Identity fraud is prevalent and I don't think this process is secure enough.*
- *The foundation competencies issue needs to be resolved. The college says you do not need to prove this if you trained in UK posts before the advent of the foundation programme, but many deaneries ignored this guidance.*
- *The helpdesk response should be within a day not after few days. Information on eligibility and structure of Interview should be outlined giving an idea of what to expect. Credit should be given more on merits of what you have achieved than what and how well you have answered a question. ex: exams, experience. Allowing candidates to apply when they don't qualify or going to take exams is completely unfair to other candidates who have been waiting and achieved them all.*
- *the icams website did not keep up to date with the process. after invite to interview my status remained as longlisted*
- *The ICAMS website was crap. The jobs were difficult to find and the site was difficult to navigate.*
- *The London Deanery seem to be very well organised. Apart from the interviews allotted at very short notice. This obviously has service implications.*
- *The NHS Education South Central website published the shortlisting criteria for this year's recruitment process. I couldn't find it on any other Deanery websites and I assume they were not meant to do so.
http://www.nesc.nhs.uk/recruitment__careers/wessex_recruitment_2010/anaesthetics_st3.aspx It appeared genuine since it was authored by Clare Kennedy. I don't know whether it was an advantage to me since the shortlisting criteria bore very little resemblance to the application form anyway.*
- *the number of posts were not clear even now especially in london deanery*
- *The process has been a bit of a farce but not as bad as MTAS/MMC. Essentially, there are too many cooks. If I*

apply to one deanery, I have to go through their pages, link to West Midlands, link and register to I-CAMS, find the appropriate application and apply. While this may be coordinated through West Midlands, there was no obvious point of contact to explain exactly what was needed. What do i do about references - one deanery tells me I have to chase them myself, another tells me that it's someone else's problem, another tells me I need to get them to the central deanery, another tells me they want them locally. NO ONE seems to know what the process is. If it's going to be nationally coordinated, have deanery specific information readily accessible through each deanery but anything related to the application process should be available on the single portal or central deanery and candidates should not have to go searching elsewhere for answers.

- The process was so called national. Ideally all deaneries should have completed shortlisting process simultaneously and interview offers should have gone on one day from all the deaneries. London deanery was too slow in giving interview offers and this kept me very anxious. We got an email from London deanery that London would announce short listings next week but we were not told which date in next week? And even next week London deanery gave me interview offer on Friday at 6pm. This was really not good.*
- The structure of the website was absolutely dreadful. Very difficult to find the ICAMS page to start with and then very difficult to locate the actual application form. Finding the structured reference form, the address to send it to and when to send it by was also unclear (and considerably time consuming). For such an important event such as this, which has an absolutely huge impact on trainees, the website should have been better designed, more streamlined and clearer to use. Once logged-in to the website it is also difficult to see where 'messages' are etc. An absolutely dreadful website to use and navigate around. Would have liked clearer, more accessible, information about competition ratios, interview formats, dates specific only to anaesthetics.*
- There should be more clarity about the fate of applicants who require tier 2 visa.*
- There were difficulties with knowing whether form A should be submitted at the time of application or at interview, it was then requested for both. It was extremely difficult to submit this form or get any information about whether it was required. The references were another problem, it said on some of the interview information that they should*

be brought to interview and on others to send to west midlands deanery, it was not clear who in the deanery they should be sent to.

- There were questions about IELTS, Foundation competencies and some questions in the Anaesthetic section which were not very clear. I had sent an e-mail to west midlands deanery which said I would get a reply in 24 hours which did not happen by e-mail or phone*
- This is a morally bankrupt recruitment process which is disgusting to undergo. It is humiliating, impersonal and disempowering to be a candidate. The entire atmosphere is that I am a liar until I can prove otherwise, and that paper matters more than clinical ability. Arbitrary points systems take no notice of the individual. It is "sausage factory" recruitment heading towards "sausage factory" training. There is no chance to visit deaneries, to speak to people about the job that defines your career. The timing means it is impossible to book a holiday between April and August, since any holiday could overlap rounds 1 or 2 or the inevitable scramble for the scraps that some unlucky people will be left with. Adopting this approach in other circumstances encourages me to leave medicine for a career that actually recognises human ability. This recruitment system is one symptom and part of a system that leads me to actively discourage anyone from entering medicine as a career.*
- Very smoothly run application process. I was very impressed.*
- what happens if some one is unsuccessful with both the UoAs ? when will they know whether they have a job next or not?*
- What happens if you have no ST3 appointment in August? Any plans of incorporating extensions for trainees stuck in limbo having passed the primary with no job offers?*
- Why is audit giving so much weight? It is a mindless activity that can produce useful results but generally requires about as much intellectual activity & ability as peeling potatoes*
- Will the Primary (Irish) be counted for CT3 level?*
- you have proven your academic criteria / anaesthetic eligibility in the written application process - so why is everything in the interview so clinical and nothing about your interests / what your real life involves besides medicine. yes these are difficult to mark on a straight forward score sheet, but then working with people is not just about a score in an exam paper*
- YtH einterview was structured in such a way that it did*

not give an opportunity to show my skills and abilities.