

The Application as an Auditable Claim

A two-page briefing on Report 01: the thesis, the three findings that survive scrutiny, the method in brief, and what the research does not claim

AI did not create live assessment. It is making the purpose of live assessment clearer: institutions still need to verify who owns the thinking.

57

CODED SIGNALS

48

CITED OFFICIAL SOURCES

23

INSTITUTIONS OR SYSTEMS

Everything in this briefing is cleared for publication. The full report and the underlying register are available on request.

Hassan Akram

Founder and Principal Advisor, Elite Careers Strategy. Research lead: accountable for coding decisions, publication rulings, source grading and corrections.

JOURNALIST BRIEFING . REPORT 01 . REVISED 31 AUGUST 2026

Global Elite Selection Monitor: 57 signals drawn from 48 official sources, held in a 50-entry source register, across 23 institutions or systems. Sources checked 30 August 2026.

SECTION 01

The thesis, in one paragraph.

The application is best understood as an auditable claim. It opens the inquiry; later stages test whether its facts, reasoning and voice survive scrutiny. Fifty of 57 recorded observations were coded as existing processes at the review date. This review does not establish when these processes began or whether AI caused changes to them.

SECTION 02

Three findings that survive scrutiny.

- 1. Selection includes assessment the candidate does not write at leisure.** A&O Shearman gives candidates a case study and questions 40 minutes before the partner interviewer joins. Slaughter and May discusses a current-affairs article at interview. No proportion is claimed: the inclusion rule is not complete [SRC-017, SRC-020].

- 2. 50 of 57 observations were coded as existing processes.** That records what each page said at the review date. This review does not establish when these processes began or whether AI caused changes to them.

- 3. Six observations were coded newly explicit about AI, from three institutions.** DLA Piper, UBS and Cambridge all permit forms of preparation while protecting independent assessment and truthful representation [SRC-025, SRC-033, SRC-045].

SECTION 03

Method, in brief.

One row records one verifiable selection signal: a requirement, stage, assessment, institutional statement or material change, taken from an official employer or university page. Each carries a source ID, an observation date, a grade, a publication ruling and an analyst note. Multiple signals may come from the same source, which is why 57 signals cite 48 sources held in a 50-entry register.

SECTION 04

What this research does not claim.

SUMMARY

The research describes what institutions publish about their own processes. It does not rank them, estimate selectivity, or claim AI caused any of it.

RESEARCH INDEPENDENCE

The Who Gets In? reports use public institutional material only. No private client evidence appears in any report, and nothing in the programme implies affiliation with or endorsement by any institution referenced.

THE LIMIT

The sample is authority-led and cross-sectional. It is weighted toward UK and global process pages, law and banking. The percentages describe the coded sample only; they are not estimates for the entire market.

ON CAUSATION

The evidence does not establish that AI caused institutions to introduce live assessment. It establishes that live assessment was already present and that its purpose is now harder to ignore.

CITATION AND CONTACT

Akram, H. (2026). The Application as an Auditable Claim. Who Gets In?, Report 01. London: Elite Careers Strategy.

The full report, the source register and signal-level data are available on request. Interview within three working days; data checks and source verification same working day. Contact hassan@accessecs.com.