**Hospital MTI Interview Outcome Report**

For marking schemes and example scoring, please refer to Page 2 and 3.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Hospital** |  | | |
| **Location/address** |  | | |
| **Name of candidate** |  | | |
| **Interview date/time** |  | **Duration** |  |
| **Format** (delete as appropriate) | Face to face / video meeting | **Type of video meeting** (delete as appropriate) | Zoom / Teams / Other (please specify) |
| **Interviewers** (name, position, minimum 2) |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain number** | **Domains** | | **Mark (1-5); Weighting** | **Mark** |
| **A** | **Achievements/ Experience** | | 1-5; (x2) |  |
| **B** | **Suitability & Commitment** | | 1-5; (x2) |  |
| **C** | **Professionalism/ Governance** | | 1-5; (x2) |  |
| **D** | **Clinical Scenarios** (please give details of scenarios used in the notes below) | | 1-5; (x3) |  |
| **E** | **Communication** | | 1-5; (x3) |  |
|  | **Final score** | | 60 **(pass 36\*)** |  |
| **Notes** (Scenarios used; specific questions): | | | | |
| **Post assessment discussion** (areas of concern\*\*/ potential considerations): | | | | |
| **Decision** | Accepted / Declined | **Feedback given** | | Yes / No |
| **Reason:** | | | | |
| **Additional comments:** | | | | |

**Appendix/Resources**

Marking scheme based on JRCPTB interview scoring for **ST3+**:  
<http://www.st3recruitment.org.uk/recruitment-process/interview/interview-scoring>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mark | Rating | Assessment |
| 1 | poor | not considered appointable |
| 2 | area for concern | performed below the level expected from a core level trainee applying to the specialty; possibly unappointable, subject to discussion and performance in other areas |
| 3 | satisfactory | performed at the level expected of a core level trainee applying to the specialty; the candidate is suitable for a higher specialty training post |
| 4 | good | above average ability; the candidate is suitable for a higher specialty training post |
| 5 | excellent | highly performing trainee; the candidate is suitable for a higher specialty training post |

Marking scheme based on JRCPTB interview scoring for **IMT**:  
<https://www.imtrecruitment.org.uk/recruitment-process/interview/interview-scoring>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mark | Rating | Assessment |
| 1 | poor | not considered appointable |
| 2 | area for concern | performed below the level expected during F2; possibly unappointable, subject to discussion and performance in other areas |
| 3 | satisfactory | performed at the level expected during F2; the candidate is suitable for appointment |
| 4 | good | performed at the level expected on completion of F2; the candidate is suitable for appointment |
| 5 | excellent | performed at the level expected at IMT or above; the candidate is suitable for appointment |

\*Pass of 36 = satisfactory (3) in 5 domains.

Domains D (clinical scenario), E (communication) are weighted higher for MTI interview

6 + 6 + 6 + 9 + 9 = 36

\*\*2 areas of concern results in a failed score

Candidate with one area of concern can be appointed with appropriate consideration to job role if agreed by panel; note candidate would need to score at least satisfactory (3) in other domains and good or excellent (4 or 5) in at least one domain to achieve score of 36 or more

Any score of 1: candidate is not deemed appointable regardless of other domain scores and total score

**Example scoring for 4 candidates**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Candidate Number** (example) | | | |
|  |  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
|  | Mark (1-5); Weighting |  |  |  |  |
| Domains |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Achievements/ Experience*** | 1-5; (x2) | 3 (6) | 2 (4) | 4 (8) | 5 (10) |
| ***Suitability & Commitment*** | 1-5; (x2) | 3 (6) | 4 (8) | 3 (6) | 5 (10) |
| ***Professionalism/ Governance*** | 1-5; (x2) | 3 (6) | 3 (6) | 2 (4) | 5 (10) |
| ***Clinical Scenarios*** *(number, e.g. 2)* | 1-5; (x3) | 2 (6) | 3 (9) | 4 (12) | 5 (15) |
| ***Communication*** | 1-5; (x3) | 2 (6) | 3 (9) | 2 (6) | 4 (12) |
| Domains with area of concern\*\* |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| **Final score** | 60 **(pass 36\*)** | 30 | 36 | 36 | 57 |

**Post assessment discussion** (areas of concern/ potential considerations):

* Candidate 1: 2 areas of concern
* Candidate 2: 1 areas of concern: may need \_X\_ work consideration
* Candidate 3: 2 areas of concern: risk despite score passing
* Candidate 4: 0 areas of concern: high score

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate | Decision | Reason |
| 1 | Declined | 2 areas of concern and score fails |
| 2 | Accepted | 1 area of concern, score passes- accepted with consideration to role |
| 3 | Declined | 2 areas of concern- not deemed suitable for MTI role |
| 4 | Accepted | No areas of concern and high pass rate |

**Feedback given:**

Candidate 1: Areas of concern discussed

Candidate 2: Decision explained

Candidate 3: Areas of concern discussed

Candidate 4: Decision explained

**Notes:**

(scenarios used; specific questions, any other considerations/circumstances)