

# **Judicial Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics, October 2013 to March 2014**

**Judicial Appointments Commission  
Statistics Bulletin**

**Published 5 June 2014**



## **Background**

Executive summary	4
Introduction	7
Results for completed exercises by type of judicial office:	9
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health)	
Fee-paid Legal Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal for Wales	
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support) - Scotland	
Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support)	
High Court (Queen's Bench and Family Divisions) 2013	
District Judge (Civil) 2013	
Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Administrative Appeals Chamber	
Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health)	
Circuit Judge 2012	
Fee-paid Judge of the Restricted Patients Panel of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health)	
Grouped, small selection exercises (legal and non-legal)	
Sexual orientation and religious belief	
Explanatory Notes and Glossary of Terms	30
Annex A: Analysis of the trends in the diversity of applications and recommendations made by the JAC	31
Contacts	40

## Executive Summary

The 10<sup>th</sup> set of official statistics published by the JAC covers 18 selection exercises completed between October 2013 and March 2014. Sixteen exercises required legal qualifications and a total of 263 recommendations were made – 220 were for legal posts and 43 for non-legal posts.

### *Women candidates*

The results from the last six months continue the trend of an increase in the proportion of recommended candidates that are women. There are six large exercises where previous exercises have been carried out in the same post. Of these, the proportion of recommendations that were women was the highest to date in five out of the six, and was at the higher end of previous results in the sixth.

In addition, in seven of the nine large legal exercises, the proportion of recommended candidates met or exceeded the proportion of women in the eligible pool.

The analysis summarised in Annex A examines trends in the diversity of recommendations between the creation of the JAC and September 2013. This shows there has been an increase in the proportion of recommended candidates that are women across most legal posts in that time-period

### *Candidates from a Black Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background*

The analysis summarised in Annex A shows there has been an increase in the proportion of recommended candidates from a BAME background across most court posts between the creation of the JAC and September 2013 and a decrease in the proportion across most legal tribunal posts over the same time-period.

This trend is not clearly apparent in the most recent results. There are two posts where the proportion of recommended candidates from a BAME background is higher than in previous exercises of the same type (one court post, one legal tribunal post), three where the results are in line with past results (two court posts and a medical post), and one where the results are lower (a legal tribunal post). In addition, in five of the nine large legal exercises the proportion of recommended candidates met or exceeded the proportion of persons from a BAME background in the eligible pool.

In the 18 selection exercises considered in this report, candidates from a BAME background experienced a lower than average rate of success through the selection process, particularly in getting to shortlisting for interview: 17% of applicants were from a BAME background as were 12% of shortlisted candidates and 11% of recommended candidates.

This continues a more general pattern. In all of the 41 large legal exercises reported in this series of bulletins, the proportion of shortlisted candidates from a BAME background has been lower than the proportion of applicants from a BAME background. By contrast, the proportion of recommended

candidates from a BAME background has been the same or higher than the proportion of shortlisted candidates from a BAME background in almost half (20) of the 41 exercises.

#### *Candidates with a professional background of solicitor*

Analysis shows there has been a decrease in the proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors across most legal posts between the creation of the JAC and September 2013.

This trend is not clearly continued in the most recent results. Of the five legal posts where exercises have been run previously, the proportion of recommended candidates that were solicitors was higher than in the earlier exercise for one post, in line with past results for three posts, and lower than past posts for one exercise. In general, the proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors closely tracked the proportion of applicants who were solicitors.

#### *Disability*

3% of recommended candidates had a disability. In previous bulletins, the proportion of recommended candidates with a disability varied between 2% and 16%. The proportion of recommendations increases when there is a recruitment exercise for a Disability member<sup>1</sup>. The current results, which did not include an exercise for a Disability member, are in line with results from past bulletins which have also not included that kind of exercise

#### *Age*

Results for age were published for the first time twelve months ago so results cannot be compared with those from earlier exercises. Relative success by age showed a relatively clear pattern by kind of exercise. For the salaried posts of Circuit Judge and High Court Judge, applicants aged 46-65 were most likely to be successful. For all the other large legal posts, applicants aged 35 or less or 36-45 were the most likely to be successful.

#### *Recommendations for an immediate post (Section 87) and recommendations to identify persons for the future (Section 94)<sup>2</sup>*

For the first time, results are presented for recommendation to an immediate post and for recommendations following a request by the Lord Chancellor to identify persons for future vacancies. Results are shown for exercises that had 10 or more recommendations of both types, so that the confidentiality of recommended candidates is protected. Two exercises met those criteria in the period covered in this bulletin.

The diversity profile of Section 87 and Section 94 recommended candidates was similar for both posts. The clearest difference is that in the Circuit Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> A person selected for appointment to a tribunal on the basis of their experience of working with people with disabilities.

<sup>2</sup> Regulation 36 of the Judicial Appointment Regulations 2013 (SI 2013/2192) which replaced old section 94 of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005

exercise, recommended candidates who were current salaried judicial office holders were more likely to be Section 87 recommendations than Section 94.

*Sexual Orientation and religious belief*

For the first time, results are presented on the sexual orientation and religious belief of candidates aggregated across all 18 exercises.

3% of applicants were gay, lesbian, or bisexual compared to 1.5% of UK adults. The proportion of recommended candidates that were gay, lesbian, or bisexual was in line with the proportion of applicants, at 2%.

Compared to the results of the 2011 census, applicants were

- less likely to report their religion as Christian,
- as likely to report their religion as Muslim and nearly as likely to report they had no religion, and
- more likely to report their religion as Jewish and Hindu.

The profile of recommended candidates by religious belief was in line with the profile of applicants for all religious groups except for Muslims, who showed a lower level of success than other groups.

## Introduction

This bulletin presents statistics on applications and recommendations for the appointment of judges for selection exercises that were completed between October 2013 and March 2014. The statistics are used to monitor and evaluate the diversity of JAC selections for judicial office.

There are three stages in each selection exercise when the diversity of applicants is officially recorded: application, shortlisting and recommendation for appointment. The **Results** section includes an overview of each selection exercise by diversity group<sup>3</sup> at each of the three stages. This includes eligible pool<sup>4</sup> figures and the number of applicants, shortlisted candidates, and candidates recommended for appointment. It also includes the corresponding proportions for each of the three stages of selection exercises.

In addition, for the first time, where exercises had 10 or more recommendations to an immediate post (Section 87 recommendations) and to a list from which a vacancy can be filled which may arise in the foreseeable future (Section 94 recommendations) and results are provided for each type of recommendation.

Tables are presented that supplement the commentary. They contain absolute numbers and proportions of applications, shortlisted candidates and recommended candidates segmented by group. The tables also show each group as a proportion of the total number at each stage of the selection exercise, and as a proportion at previous stages, showing how each group has progressed through the exercise.

For the first time, we are presenting results for sexual orientation and religious belief aggregated across all exercises.

All the diversity statistics in this report are based on self-declared information applicants have provided on the JAC Application Monitoring Form. Completion of this is voluntary and is not considered in the selection process. Some applicants have not declared their diversity group or have filled in the form incorrectly; these applicants are included in an "Incomplete" group in the tables.

**Annex A** summarises analysis that has been carried out into trends regarding applications and recommendations made by the JAC since its formation regarding court and tribunal judiciary up to September 2013.

Any feedback, questions or requests for further information about this statistical bulletin can be directed to the appropriate **Contact** given at the end of this report.

---

<sup>3</sup> Each diversity group refers to: gender, ethnic background, professional background, the disability status and age of applicants.

<sup>4</sup> Eligible pool refers to: the approximation of the number of people who are able to meet the formal job-specific entry requirements (including the Additional Selection Criteria) laid down for that particular judicial post.

Information about data sources, statistical revisions, any forthcoming changes and stages in the selection process are given in the **Definitions and Measurement bulletin** that accompanies this document.



## Results

Results of the selection exercises with 10 or more recommendations are presented individually below and posts with fewer than 10 recommendations are presented with their results grouped together.

### **Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health) (Table 1)**

#### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 112,000 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the eligibility requirement that a candidate should have at least five years' experience in the legal profession. Of this pool, 56% were male and 44% female. Around 10% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 85% of the eligible pool were solicitors, 11% were barristers and 5% are fellows of CILEX. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 408 applicants in this selection exercise, 32 (8%) were shortlisted and 13 (41%) of these were recommended for appointment.

#### **Gender**

213 (52%) of the 408 applicants were women and 172 (42%) were men. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, 12 (38%) were women and 18 (56%) were men. Of the 13 applicants recommended for appointment, four (31%) were women, eight (62%) were men and one did not declare their gender.

This is the first recruitment exercise carried out by the JAC for a fee-paid legal post for the first-tier tribunal for the Health, Education and Social Care Chamber so there are no past posts to compare these results to.

#### **Ethnicity**

306 (75%) of the 408 applicants were white and 75 (18%) were from a BAME background. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, 26 (81%) were white and four (13%) were from a BAME background. Of the 13 applicants recommended for appointment, 11 (85%) were white, one applicant (8%) was from a BAME background and one candidate did not declare their ethnicity.

#### **Professional background**

222 (54%) of the 408 applicants were solicitors and 121 (30%) were barristers. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, 21 (66%) were solicitors and eight (25%) were barristers. Of the 13 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (54%) were solicitors, five (38%) were barristers and one candidate did not declare their professional background.

#### **Disability status**

27 of the 408 applicants had a disability (7%). Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, four (13%) had a disability. Of the 13 applicants recommended for appointment, two (15%) had a disability.

**Age**

217 (53%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 169 (41%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, 25 (78%) were aged 45 or less and six (19%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 13 applicants recommended for appointment, 10 (77%) were aged 45 or less, two applicants (15%) were aged between 46 and 65 and one candidate did not declare their age.

## **Fee-paid Legal Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal for Wales (Tables 2 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 106,000 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the eligibility requirement that a candidate should have at least five years' experience in the legal profession as a solicitor or barrister, but not as a fellow of CILEX. Of this pool, 58% were male and 42% female. Around 10% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 89% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 11% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 186 applicants in this selection exercise, 27 (15%) were shortlisted and 10 (37%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

96 (52%) of the 186 applicants were women and 81 (44%) were men. Of the 27 shortlisted applicants, 11 (41%) were women and 14 (52%) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, four (40%) were women, five (50%) were men and one candidate did not declare their gender.

### **Ethnicity**

151 (81%) of the 186 applicants were white and 26 (14%) were from a BAME background. Of the 27 shortlisted applicants, 22 (81%) were white and three (11%) were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, eight (80%) were white, one was from a BAME background and one candidate did not declare their ethnicity.

### **Professional background**

95 (51%) of the 186 applicants were solicitors and 63 (34%) were barristers. Of the 27 shortlisted applicants, 13 (48%) were solicitors and nine (33%) were barristers. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, five (50%) were solicitors, three (30%) were barristers, one candidate was a salaried judicial office holder and one candidate did not declare their professional background.

### **Disability status**

11 of the 186 applicants had a disability (6%). Of the 27 shortlisted applicants, two (7%) had a disability. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, two (20%) had a disability.

### **Age**

106 (57%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 73 (39%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 27 shortlisted applicants, 18 (67%) were aged 45 or less and eight (30%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (70%) were aged 45 or less, two applicants (20%) were aged between 46 and 65, and one candidate did not declare their age.

## **Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support) - Scotland (Tables 3)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 112,000 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the eligibility requirement that a candidate should have at least five years' experience in the legal profession. Of this pool, 56% were male and 44% female. Around 10% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 85% of the eligible pool were solicitors, 11% were barristers and 5% are fellows of CILEX. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 143 applicants in this selection exercise, 45 (31%) were shortlisted and 20 (44%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

65 (45%) of the 143 applicants were women and 71 (50%) were men. Of the 45 shortlisted applicants, 23 (51%) were women and 20 (44%) were men. Of the 20 applicants recommended for appointment, 11 (55%) were women, eight (40%) were men and one candidate did not declare their gender.

This is the first recruitment exercise carried out by the JAC for this post where the vacancies are entirely in Scotland so there are no past posts to compare these results to.

### **Ethnicity**

121 (85%) of the 143 applicants were white and 13 (9%) were from a BAME background. Of the 45 shortlisted applicants, 41 (91%) were white and two (4%) were from a BAME background. Of the 20 applicants recommended for appointment, 18 (90%) were white, one was from a BAME background and one candidate did not declare their ethnicity.

### **Professional background**

83 (58%) of the 143 applicants were solicitors and six (4%) were barristers. Of the 45 shortlisted applicants, 26 (58%) were solicitors and one (2%) were barristers. Of the 20 applicants recommended for appointment, 10 (50%) were solicitors, seven had another background and three did not declare their professional background.

### **Disability status**

Five of the 143 applicants had a disability (3%). Of the 45 shortlisted applicants, one (2%) had a disability. Of the 20 applicants recommended for appointment, none had a disability.

### **Age**

55 (38%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 80 (56%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 45 shortlisted applicants, 25 (56%) were aged 45 or less and 18 (40%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 20 applicants recommended for appointment, 14 (70%) were aged 45 or less, five

applicants (25%) were aged between 46 and 65, and one candidate did not declare their age.

## **Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, Social Security and Child Support (Tables 4 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 5,600 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the criterion that a candidate should have previous judicial experience. Of this pool, 70% were male and 30% female. Around 6% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 48% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 52% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 179 applicants in this selection exercise, 55 (31%) were shortlisted and 23 (42%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

84 (47%) of the 179 applicants were women and 85 (47%) were men. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, 33 (60%) were women and 19 (35%) were men. Of the 23 applicants recommended for appointment, 14 (61%) were women, seven (30%) were men and two did not declare their gender.

Summary statistics for the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post in 2008, 2009 and 2011, are presented in Table 13. (The results from the exercise in 2008 have not been shown to protect candidate confidentiality) Compared to the two later exercises, the proportion of applicants who were women was slightly higher in the most recent exercise (47% compared to 45%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was also higher in the most recent exercise (61% compared to 54% and 59%).

### **Ethnicity**

135 (75%) of the 179 applicants were white and 34 (19%) were from a BAME background. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, 50 (91%) were white and two (4%) were from a BAME background. Of the 23 applicants recommended for appointment, 21 (91%) were white, none were from a BAME background and two did not declare their ethnicity.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background was higher in the most recent exercise (19% compared to 15% and 16%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background was lower in the most recent exercise (none compared to 3% and 12%).

### **Professional background**

99 (55%) of the 179 applicants were solicitors and 43 (24%) were barristers. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, 29 (53%) were solicitors and 16 (29%) were barristers. Of the 23 applicants recommended for appointment, 13 (57%) were solicitors, five (22%) were barristers, two had another background, and three did not declare their professional background.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were solicitors was in the middle in the most recent exercise (55% compared to 39% and 69%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors was also in the middle in the most recent exercise (57% compared to 30% and 94%).

### **Disability status**

12 of the 179 applicants had a disability (7%). Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, two (4%) had a disability. Of the 23 applicants recommended for appointment, one (4%) had a disability.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants with a disability was similar (7% compared to 7% and 9%). The proportion of recommended candidates with a disability was also in line with the most recent exercise (4% compared to 0% and 5%).

### **Age**

70 (39%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 100 (56%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, 22 (40%) were aged 45 or less and 31 (56%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 23 applicants recommended for appointment, nine (39%) were aged 45 or less, 12 applicants (52%) were aged between 46 and 65, and two candidates did not declare their age.

Age was not recorded in the Official Statistics when the comparator exercise was carried out, so current age results cannot be compared to those of past exercises.

## **High Court (Queen's Bench and Family Divisions) 2013 (Tables 5 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 5,600 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the criterion that a candidate should have previous judicial experience. Of this pool, 70% were male and 30% female. Around 6% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 48% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 52% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 73 applicants in this selection exercise, 29 (40%) were shortlisted and 10 (34%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

22 (30%) of the 73 applicants were women and 48 (66%) were men. Of the 29 shortlisted applicants, nine (31%) were women and 20 (69%) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, three (30%) were women and seven (70%) were men.

Summary statistics for the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, in 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011 and 2013, are presented in Table 13. (The results from the exercise in 2011 have not been shown to protect candidate confidentiality). Compared to the four larger exercises where the results are presented, the proportion of applicants in the most recent exercises who were women was the highest to date (30% compared to between 9% and 17%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was second highest (30% compared to between 14% and 36%).

### **Ethnicity**

70 (96%) of the 73 applicants were white and one (1%) were from a BAME background. Of the 29 shortlisted applicants, 28 (97%) were white and none were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, nine (90%) were white, and one did not declare their ethnicity.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background was the lowest in the most recent exercise (1% compared to between 2% and 7%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background was none, which was the case in three of the four previous exercises with 10 or more recommendations.

### **Professional background**

Five (7%) of the 73 applicants were solicitors and 37 (51%) were barristers. Of the 29 shortlisted applicants, one (3%) were solicitors and 17 (59%) were barristers. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, none were solicitors, seven (70%) were barristers, one was a salaried judicial office holder and two did not declare their professional background.



It should be noted that the measurement of professional background is derived from how the diversity monitoring form is answered by the applicant. Where more than one category applies (e.g. barrister and salaried judicial office holder or solicitor and judicial office holder) then the applicant might reasonably complete the form in more than one way and results are impacted by the applicants' interpretation of the question.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were solicitors was in line with previous exercises (7% compared to between 1% and 9%). There were no recommended candidates who were solicitors, also in line with previous results.

### **Disability status**

Three of the 73 applicants had a disability (4%). Of the 29 shortlisted applicants, one (3%) had a disability. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, none had a disability.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants with a disability was in line with previous results (4% compared to between 1% and 6%). There were no recommended candidates with a disability, also in line with three out of the four previous results with 10 or more recommendations.

### **Age**

Three (4%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 68 (93%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 29 shortlisted applicants, none were aged 45 or less and 28 (97%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, nine (90%) were aged between 46 and 65, and one candidate did not declare their age.

Age was collected for the exercise carried out in 2013. In the 2013 exercise, all the applicants and recommended candidates were between 46 and 65, compared to 93% of applicants and 90% of recommended candidates in the 2014 exercise.

## **District Judge Civil 2013 (Tables 6 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 5,600 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the criterion that a candidate should have previous judicial experience. Of this pool, 70% were male and 30% female. Around 6% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 48% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 52% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 322 applicants in this selection exercise, 118 (37%) were shortlisted and 54 (46%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

141 (44%) of the 322 applicants were women and 172 (53%) were men. Of the 118 shortlisted applicants, 47 (40%) were women and 67 (57%) were men. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, 29 (54%) were women, 24 (44%) were men and one candidate did not declare their gender.

Summary statistics for the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, in 2007, 2009 and 2011 are presented in Table 13. The proportion of applicants in the most recent exercises who were women was in line with the last two exercises and substantially higher than for the first exercise (44% compared to between 29% and 45%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was the highest to date (54% compared to between 34% and 43%).

### **Ethnicity**

262 (81%) of the 322 applicants were white and 49 (15%) were from a BAME background. Of the 118 shortlisted applicants, 103 (87%) were white and nine (8%) were from a BAME background. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, 47 (87%) were white, four (7%) were from a BAME background and three did not declare their ethnicity.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background was the highest in the most recent exercise (15% compared to between 6% and 14%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background was perfectly in line with previous results at 7%.

### **Professional background**

187 (58%) of the 322 applicants were solicitors and 83 (26%) were barristers. Of the 118 shortlisted applicants, 70 (59%) were solicitors and 36 (31%) were barristers. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment 33 (61%) were solicitors, 19 (35%) were barristers, one had a professional background of 'other' and one did not declare their professional background.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were solicitors was the lowest to date

(58% compared to between 71% and 77%) as was the proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors (61% compared to between 68% and 74%).

### **Disability status**

13 of the 322 applicants had a disability (4%). Of the 118 shortlisted applicants, two (2%) had a disability. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, none had a disability.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants with a disability was in line with previous results (4% compared to between 4% and 5%). There were no recommended candidates with a disability compared with the previous exercises where the proportion was between 4% and 7%..

### **Age**

120 (37%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 191 (59%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 118 shortlisted applicants, 33 (28%) were aged 45 or less and 79 (67%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, 20 (37%) were aged 45 or less and 31 (57%) were aged between 46 and 65, and three candidates did not declare their age.

Age was not recorded in the Official Statistics when the comparator exercise was carried out, so current age results cannot be compared to those of past exercises.

### **Immediate recommendations and recommendations to a list for future appointments**

Recommendations can take two forms. In most cases, recommendations are for an appointment to an immediate post, so the appointment can take place following the recommendation (Section 87 recommendations). In some cases, recommendations are also made to a list under section 94<sup>2</sup> where the Lord Chancellor gives the Commission notice of a request he expects to make under section 87. For this exercise, more than 10 recommendations were made for immediate and future posts and results are presented broken down by type of recommendation.

Of the 54 total recommendations, 34 (63%) were to direct appointment and 20 (37%) were to a reserve list. The diversity profile of the two types of recommendation was very similar.

## **Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Administrative Appeals Chamber (Tables 7 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 94,000 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the criterion that a candidate should have seven years' experience as a solicitor or barrister. Of this pool, 60% were male and 40% female. Around 9% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 89% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 11% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 186 applicants in this selection exercise, 48 (26%) were shortlisted and 10 (21%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

77 (41%) of the 186 applicants were women and 104 (56%) were men. Of the 48 shortlisted applicants, 18 (38%) were women and 27 (56%) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, six (60%) were women and four (40%) were men.

Summary statistics for the previous recruitment exercise the JAC carried out in 2012 have not been presented in Table 13 to protect the confidentiality of recommendations in a small exercise.

### **Ethnicity**

136 (73%) of the 186 applicants were white and 40 (22%) were from a BAME background. Of the 48 shortlisted applicants, 38 (79%) were white and six (13%) were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, nine (90%) were white and one (10%) were from a BAME background.

### **Professional background**

79 (42%) of the 186 applicants were solicitors and 59 (32%) were barristers. Of the 48 shortlisted applicants, 10 (21%) were solicitors and 23 (48%) were barristers. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment none were solicitors, six (60%) were barristers, two were salaried judicial office holders and two had a professional background of 'other'.

### **Disability status**

18 of the 186 applicants had a disability (10%). Of the 48 shortlisted applicants, six (13%) had a disability. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, one (10%) had a disability.

### **Age**

71 (38%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 111 (60%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 48 shortlisted applicants, 13 (27%) were aged 45 or less and 33 (69%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, four (40%) were aged 45 or less and six (60%) were aged between 46 and 65.

## **Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health) (Tables 8 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

As this was a non-legal selection exercise there was no eligible pool.

Of the 85 applicants in this selection exercise, 80 (94%) were shortlisted. Of these, 42 (53%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

27 (32%) of the 85 applicants were women and 55 (65%) were men. Of the 80 shortlisted candidates, 25 (31%) were women and 52 (65%) were men. Of the 42 applicants recommended for appointment, 17 (40%) were women and 25 (60%) were men.

Summary statistics for the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post in 2011 and 2012 are presented in Table 13. The proportion of applicants in the most recent exercises who were women higher than the two previous exercises (32% compared to between 28% and 30%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was also higher than previous exercises (40% compared to between 27% and 31%).

### **Ethnicity**

44 (52%) of the 85 applicants were white and 38 (45%) were from a BAME background. Of the 80 shortlisted candidates, 43 (54%) were white and 34 (43%) were from a BAME background. Of the 42 applicants recommended for appointment, 28 (67%) were white and 14 (33%) were from a BAME background.

The proportion of applicants in the most recent exercises who were from a BAME background was higher than in the two previous exercises (45% compared to 37% and 39%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was in line with previous exercises (33% compared to 33% and 37%).

### **Professional background**

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession.

### **Disability status**

None of the candidates had a disability.

In previous recruitment exercises the JAC carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants with a disability was 2% and 3%. The proportion of recommended candidates with a disability in previous exercises was 0% and 4%.

### **Age**

23 (27%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 56 (66%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 80 shortlisted candidates 22 (28%) were aged 45

or less and 54 (68%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 42 applicants recommended for appointment 14 (33%) were aged 45 or less and 28 (67%) were aged between 46 and 65.

Age was recorded in the Official Statistics for the most recent of the previous exercises. Compared to that exercise, applicants were slightly younger in the recent exercises (27% aged 45 or less compared to 23%). Recommended candidates were also younger in the most recent exercises (33% aged 45 or less compared with 27%).

## **Circuit Judge 2012 (Tables 9 and 13)**

The original exercise was carried out in 2012 and additional recommendations were made in 2013. The inclusion of this exercise in this series of bulletins was delayed so that the diversity information for all the recommendations from this exercise could be presented in one set of results.

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 5,600 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the criterion that a candidate should have judicial experience. Of this pool, 70% were male and 30% female. Around 6% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 48% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 52% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 293 applicants in this selection exercise, 114 (39%) were shortlisted and 54 (47%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

91 (31%) of the 293 applicants were women and 196 (67%) were men. Of the 114 shortlisted applicants, 50 (44%) were women and 62 (54%) were men. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, 26 (48%) were women, 27 (50%) were men and one candidate did not declare their gender.

Summary statistics for the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, in 2007, 2008, 2011 and 2012 are presented in Table 13. The proportion of applicants in the most recent exercises who were women was in line with previous exercises (31% compared to between 11% and 34%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were women was the highest to date (48% compared to between 8% and 37%).

### **Ethnicity**

253 (86%) of the 293 applicants were white and 30 (10%) were from a BAME background. Of the 114 shortlisted applicants, 104 (91%) were white and eight (7%) were from a BAME background. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, 48 (89%) were white, five (9%) were from a BAME background and one did not declare their ethnicity.

Compared to the previous recruitment exercises the JAC has carried out for this post, the proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background was in line with previous results (10% compared to between 7% and 13%). The proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background was the highest to date, by a narrow margin, at 9% compared to between none and 8%.

### **Professional background**

192 (66%) of the 293 applicants were barristers and 51 (17%) were existing salaried judicial office holders. Of the 114 shortlisted applicants, 80 (70%) were barristers and 18 (16%) were salaried judicial office holders. Of the 54

applicants recommended for appointment 36 (67%) were barristers, 12 (22%) were salaried judicial office holders, three were solicitors and three did not declare their professional background.

The proportion of applicants who were solicitors was at the higher end of previous results (12% compared to between 5% and 12%) as was the proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors (6% compared to between 0% and 6%).

It should be noted that the measurement of professional background is derived from how the diversity monitoring form is answered by the applicant. Where more than one category applies (e.g. barrister and salaried judicial office holder or solicitor and judicial office holder) then the applicant might reasonably complete the form in more than one way and results are impacted by the applicants' interpretation of the question.

### **Disability status**

10 of the 293 applicants had a disability (3%). Of the 114 shortlisted applicants, four (4%) had a disability. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, two (4%) had a disability.

The proportion of applicants with a disability was in line with previous results (3% compared to between 2% and 5%) as was the proportion of recommended candidates (4% compared to between 0% and 6%).

### **Age**

47 (16%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 238 (81%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 114 shortlisted applicants, 14 (12%) were aged 45 or less and 98 (86%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 54 applicants recommended for appointment, six (11%) were aged 45 or less and 47 (87%) were aged between 46 and 65, and one candidates did not declare their age.

Age was not recorded in the Official Statistics when the comparator exercise was carried out, so current age results cannot be compared to those of past exercises.

### **Immediate recommendations and recommendations to a list for future appointments**

Recommendations can take two forms. In most cases, recommendations are for an appointment to an immediate post, so the appointment can take place following the recommendation (Section 87 recommendations). In some cases, recommendations are also made to a list under section 94<sup>2</sup> where the Lord Chancellor gives the Commission notice of a request he expects to make under section 87. For this exercise, more than 10 recommendations were made for immediate and future posts and results are presented broken down by type of recommendation.

Of the 54 total recommendations, 35 (65%) were to direct appointment and 19 (35%) were to a reserve list. The diversity profile of the two types of recommendation was very similar. The clearest difference was that among the



12 salaried judicial office holders who were recommended, 11 (92%) were recommended to direct appointment and only one (8%) was recommended to a reserve list.

## **Fee-paid Judge of the Restricted Patients Panel of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health) (Tables 10 and 13)**

### **Eligible pool**

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 1,200 people; this represents an estimate of the number of people who meet the criterion that a candidate should be a Recorder other than in exceptional cases. Of this pool, 83% were male and 17% female. Around 6% of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 6% of the eligible pool were solicitors and 94% were barristers. The disability status and age profile of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 43 applicants in this selection exercise, 24 (56%) were shortlisted and 10 (42%) of these were recommended for appointment.

### **Gender**

Seven (16%) of the 43 applicants were women and 36 (84%) were men. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, four (17%) were women and 20 (83%) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment three (30%) were women and seven (70%) were men.

The JAC has carried out one previous exercise of this type. Compared to that exercises the proportion of applicants and recommended candidates was higher in the most recent exercise (16% compared to 15%, and 30% compared to 20% respectively).

### **Ethnicity**

38 (88%) of the 43 applicants were white and five (12%) were from a BAME background. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, 22 (92%) were white and two (8%) were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, nine (90%) were white and one (10%) were from a BAME background.

The proportion of applicants and recommended candidates who were from a BAME background was higher than in the earlier exercise (12% compared to 6%, and 10% compared to none).

### **Professional background**

Four (9%) of the 43 applicants were solicitors and 37 (86%) were barristers. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, two (8%) were solicitors and 21 (88%) were barristers. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, one (10%) were solicitors and nine (90%) were barristers.

The proportion of applicants and recommended candidates who were solicitors was higher than in the earlier exercise (9% compared to 6%, and 10% compared to 7%).

**Disability status**

None of the applicants had a disability and this was the case with the earlier exercise also.

**Age**

10 (23%) of applicants were aged 45 or less and 33 (77%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, six (25%) were aged 45 or less and 18 (75%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, three (30%) were aged 45 or less and seven (70%) were aged between 46 and 65.

Age was not recorded in the Official Statistics when the comparator exercise was carried out, so current age results cannot be compared to those of past exercises.

## **Grouped, small selection exercises (legal and non-legal) (Table 11)**

This subsection relates to the nine small selection exercises which were completed during this period. Eight of the nine were for legal posts and had less than 10 recommendations for appointment. For the purpose of this report the figures have been grouped together in order to protect applicant confidentiality and to provide more meaningful counts and results. Because there was only one small non-legal post, it was grouped together with the small legal posts to protect the confidentiality of those who applied for that post. It should be noted that if any individual was an applicant for more than one of these exercises, then they will be counted in these statistics more than once.

### **Eligible pool**

The small selection exercises were grouped; consequently there is no eligible pool relevant to all the posts.

### **Gender**

52 (36%) of the 144 applicants were women and 88 (61%) were men. Of the 61 shortlisted applicants, 20 (33%) were women and 38 (62%) were men. Of the 17 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (41%) were women and ten (59%) were men.

### **Ethnicity**

108 (75%) of the 144 applicants were white and 30 (21%) were from a BAME background. Of the 61 shortlisted applicants, 51 (84%) were white and eight (13%) were from a BAME background. Of the 17 applicants recommended for appointment, 15 (88%) were white, one (6%) was from a BAME background and one did not declare their ethnicity.

### **Professional background**

45 (31%) of the 144 applicants were solicitors and 39 (27%) were barristers. Of the 61 shortlisted applicants, 15 (25%) were solicitors and 22 (36%) were barristers. Of the 17 applicants recommended for appointment, two (12%) were solicitors, seven (41%) were barristers, five (29%) were salaried judicial office holders and three applicants did not declare their professional background.

### **Disability status**

Eight of the 144 applicants had a disability (6%). Of the 61 shortlisted applicants, four (7%) had a disability. Of the 17 applicants recommended for appointment none had a disability.

### **Age**

31 of the 144 applicants were aged 45 or less (22%) and 108 (75%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 61 shortlisted applicants, five (8%) were aged 45 or less and 54 (89%) were aged between 46 and 65. Of the 17 applicants recommended for appointment, three (18%) were aged 45 or less, 13 (76%) were aged between 46 and 65 and one was aged over 65.

## **Sexual orientation (all exercises) (Table 12)**

For the first time, information is presented on the sexual orientation and religious belief of applicants in the recruitment exercises JAC has carried out. As with the other information presented in this report, the results come from the diversity monitoring form included in the application form. In order to protect the confidentiality of applicants for these questions results have been grouped across all exercises.

The 2011 Census did not include a question regarding sexual orientation. However, the Household Survey in 2012<sup>5</sup> did so, on an experimental basis, and the information from that survey can be approximately compared with the results from the diversity monitoring form in the absence of eligible pool information.

Of the 2,062 applicants in the exercises presented in this bulletin, 69 (3%) identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual, compared to 1.5% of respondents in the Household Survey. 86% identified themselves as heterosexual and 11% did not provide a completed answer.

17 (3%) of the shortlisted candidates identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual as did six (2%) of the recommended candidates.

## **Religious belief (all exercises) (Table 12)**

The 2011 Census included a question regarding religious belief<sup>6</sup> and the information from the Census can be approximately compared with the results from the diversity monitoring form in the absence of eligible pool information.

Compared to the results of the Census, applicants were less likely to report their religion as Christian (48% compared to 59%). They were as likely to report their religion as Muslim (5%) and nearly as likely to report they had no religion (23% compared to 25%). They were more likely to report their religion as Jewish (4% compared to 0.5%) and Hindu (3% compared to 1.5%). Applicants were also more likely not to provide a completed answer (17% compared to 7%).

Around 13% of applicants achieved recommendation, and, when broken down by religious belief this proportion was between 10% and 15% for all religious groups except for Muslims, among whom 6% of applicants achieved recommendation.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/integrated-household-survey/integrated-household-survey/january-to-december-2012/stb-integrated-household-survey-january-to-december-2012.html> provides details of the survey.

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/census/2011-census/key-statistics-for-local-authorities-in-england-and-wales/rpt-religion.html> provides details of the Census results.

## **Explanatory Notes**

For a description of the methodology used to create these statistics please see the Definitions and Measurement paper at:

<http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/823.htm>

## **Glossary of terms**

A glossary of terms used in this bulletin is available from the JAC website:

<http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/823.htm>

# Annex A: Analysis of the trends in the diversity of applications and recommendations made by the JAC

## Background

This ad hoc publication presents updated information regarding an analysis of the trends in the diversity of applications and recommendations made by the Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC). This analysis is designed to complement the Official Statistics in the main part of this bulletin, but does not itself come under the Official Statistics umbrella. Much of the data presented in this bulletin comes from management information and has not been subject to the same level of quality assurance as results presented in Official Statistic bulletins.

Previous results are available in Annex A of *Judicial Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics, October 2012 to March 2013* [http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/static/documents/Official\\_Statistics\\_June\\_2013.pdf](http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/static/documents/Official_Statistics_June_2013.pdf) and the same results were published again in *Judicial Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics, April 2013 to September 2013* [http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/static/documents/JAC\\_publication\\_official\\_statistics\\_2013.pdf](http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/static/documents/JAC_publication_official_statistics_2013.pdf)

Users should refer to those documents for a full description of the methodology and also to the *Glossary and Definitions and Measurement* paper for definitions of the terms used in this analysis <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/diversity-data.htm>.

Tables A1-A3 in this notice are updated from previous results to include the results of all exercises that closed up to the end of September 2013.

In general, results are very similar to previous trends results but include all results up to end September 2013.

### **Results since the JAC was formed compared to before the JAC:**

Comparisons with the pre-JAC era can only be made for court results because of data availability.

- Post-JAC, applications from women are significantly higher for 6/7 posts, with recommendations being significantly higher for 3/7 posts. Other posts also show increases but these do not meet tests of statistical significance.
- BAME applications are significantly higher post-JAC for 6/7 posts. BAME recommendations are significantly higher for one of the posts. Other posts show increases that are not statistically significant.
- Solicitor applications post-JAC are significantly lower for 4/7 posts, but are significantly higher for High Court and Recorder. Solicitor recommendations are significantly lower for 3/7 posts, but significantly higher for Recorder.

**Results since the JAC was formed for court posts:**

- Applications from women are significantly higher for three posts, while 6/7 posts show either significant rises or increases that are not statistically significant. Recommendations of women show rises in 5/7 posts, but these increases are not statistically significant.
- BAME applications are significantly higher for one post, with 6/7 posts showing either significant increases or increases that are not statistically significant. Recommendations for BAME candidates have increased in 5/7 posts, but none of these are statistically significant.
- Women and BAME show no significantly lower results for either applications or recommendations.
- Solicitor applications are significantly lower for 4/7 posts but are significantly higher for High Court. Solicitor recommendations are significantly lower for one post.

**Results since the JAC was formed for tribunal posts:**

- Applications from women are significantly up for first-tier salaried and first-tier fee-paid posts, with recommendations increasing significantly for first-tier fee-paid posts.
- BAME applications are significantly up for first-tier fee-paid posts; there are no significant results for BAME tribunal recommendations. Following the most recent disappointing results for BAME, there is a general pattern of non-statistically significant falls in BAME recommendations for tribunal posts.
- Women and BAME show no significant reductions in either applications or recommendations.
- Solicitor applications are significantly up among the upper-tier fee-paid and regional posts, but significantly down among salaried employment, first-tier salaried and first-tier fee-paid roles. Solicitor recommendations are significantly lower for first-tier salaried posts.

Tables A4-A17 detail the information that underlies the analysis presented in Tables A1-A3.



**Table A1: changes over time in the proportion of applicants and recommendations who are women, by post**

		Applications		Recommendations		KEY
<b>Court Judiciary</b>		Compared to pre JAC	Within JAC	Compared to pre JAC	Within JAC	
	High Court Judge					
	Circuit Judge					
	District Judge (magistrates)					
	District Judge (civil)					
	Deputy District Judge (mags)					
	Deputy District Judge (civil)					
	Recorder					
<b>Tribunal Judiciary</b>	Leadership					
	Regional					
	Upper-tier salaried					
	Upper-tier fee-paid					
	Combined (leadership, regional and upper-tier)					
	Employment salaried					
	First-tier salaried					
	First-tier fee-paid					

**KEY**

- Significant improvement
- Non-significant improvement
- No change
- Non-significant worsening
- Significant worsening
- Data not available

**Table A2: changes over time in the proportion of applicants and recommendations from a BAME background, by post**

		Applications		Recommendations		KEY
Court	Judiciary	Compared to pre JAC	Within JAC	Compared to pre JAC	Within JAC	
Court	High Court Judge	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement
	Circuit Judge	Significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement
	District Judge (magistrates)	Significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	District Judge (civil)	Significant improvement	Significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement
	Deputy District Judge (mags)	Significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement
	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Significant improvement	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant improvement
	Recorder	Significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement
Tribunal	Leadership	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	Regional	Data not available	Non-significant improvement	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	Upper-tier salaried	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	Upper-tier fee-paid	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	Combined (leadership, regional and upper-tier)	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	Employment salaried	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening
	First-tier salaried	Data not available	Non-significant improvement	Data not available	Non-significant improvement	Non-significant improvement
	First-tier fee-paid	Data not available	Significant improvement	Data not available	Non-significant worsening	Non-significant worsening

**Table A3: changes over time in the proportion of applicants and recommendations from a professional background of solicitor, by post**

		Applications		Recommendations		KEY
		Compared to pre JAC	Within JAC	Compared to pre JAC	Within JAC	
<b>Court Judiciary</b>	High Court Judge					Significant improvement
	Circuit Judge					Non-significant improvement
	District Judge (magistrates)					No change
	District Judge (civil)					Non-significant worsening
	Deputy District Judge (mags)					Significant worsening
	Deputy District Judge (civil)					Significant worsening
	Recorder					Significant worsening
<b>Tribunal Judiciary</b>	Leadership					Significant improvement
	Regional					Non-significant improvement
	Upper-tier salaried					Non-significant improvement
	Upper-tier fee-paid					Significant improvement
	Combined (leadership, regional and upper-tier)					Non-significant improvement
	Employment salaried					Non-significant improvement
	First-tier salaried					Significant worsening
	First-tier fee-paid					Non-significant worsening

**Table A4: The proportion of applicants to court positions who are women**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	11.3%	13.1%	19.3%	20.2%	33.2%	24.0%	19.3%
Overall JAC figures	14.4%	23.2%	39.7%	36.8%	45.3%	40.8%	30.6%

**Table A5: The number of applicants to court positions who are women**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	31	176	233	87	901	349	297
Overall JAC figures	71	241	497	263	1443	932	1133

**Table A6: The proportion of applicants to court positions from a BAME background**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	2.2%	3.5%	3.2%	4.9%	7.8%	9.2%	6.8%
Overall JAC figures	3.6%	8.8%	12.1%	13.7%	14.9%	17.7%	13.1%

**Table A7: The number of applicants to court positions from a BAME background**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	6	47	39	21	211	134	104
Overall JAC figures	18	92	152	98	473	404	484

**Table A8: The proportion of applicants to court positions who were solicitors**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	1.5%	12.1%	90.6%	61.9%	80.6%	63.2%	13.0%
Overall JAC figures	8.3%	10.3%	74.7%	53.8%	69.3%	55.5%	22.7%

**Table A9: The number of applicants to court positions who were solicitors**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	4	163	1093	267	2191	918	200
Overall JAC figures	41	107	935	385	2208	1268	842

**Table A10: The proportion of recommended candidates to court positions who are women**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	12.7%	20.5%	28.2%	29.1%	39.0%	25.8%	17.1%
Overall JAC figures	22.7%	25.7%	38.8%	43.9%	45.6%	44.4%	31.8%

**Table A11: The number of recommended candidates to court positions who are women**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	7	43	37	16	186	42	44
Overall JAC figures	17	62	76	29	160	24	133

**Table A12: The proportion of recommended candidates to court positions from a BAME background**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	1.8%	1.9%	6.1%	3.6%	5.9%	6.1%	7.8%
Overall JAC figures	2.7%	3.3%	7.1%	4.5%	8.3%	18.5%	8.9%

**Table A13: The number of recommended candidates to court positions from a BAME background**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	1	4	8	2	28	10	20
Overall JAC figures	2	8	14	3	29	10	37

**Table A14: The proportion of recommended candidates to court positions who were solicitors**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	0.0%	10.5%	89.3%	61.8%	77.1%	65.0%	3.5%
Overall JAC figures	0.0%	4.6%	71.9%	57.6%	53.0%	59.3%	9.1%

**Table A15: The number of recommended candidates to court positions who were solicitors**

	High Court	Circuit Judge	District Judge (civil)	District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Deputy District Judge (civil)	Deputy District Judge (magistrates' courts)	Recorder
Overall Pre JAC figures	0	22	117	34	368	106	9
Overall JAC figures	0	11	141	38	186	32	38

**Table A16: The proportion of applicants and recommended candidates to leadership legal positions who were women, BAME and solicitors**

Post	Applications			Recommendations		
	Women	BAME	Solicitors	Women	BAME	Solicitors
Leadership	15.1%	6.9%	22.6%	5.9%	0.0%	11.8%
Regional	26.3%	8.4%	23.2%	43.5%	8.7%	13.0%
Upper salaried positions	32.5%	16.9%	28.6%	33.3%	9.5%	9.5%
Upper (feepaid)	34.8%	22.7%	23.5%	30.6%	12.2%	14.3%
Salaried employment Judge	45.1%	14.9%	58.4%	52.5%	8.5%	55.9%
First tier salaried positions	40.1%	21.6%	47.2%	45.4%	7.1%	39.7%
First tier fee-paid positions	43.0%	17.9%	60.7%	48.2%	7.7%	50.4%

**Table A17: The number of applicants and recommended candidates to legal positions who were women, BAME and solicitors, by category of post**

Post	Applications				Recommendations			
	Women	BAME	Solicitors	Total	Women	BAME	Solicitors	Total
Leadership	24	11	36	159	1	0	2	17
Regional	25	8	22	95	10	2	3	23
Upper salaried positions	50	26	44	154	7	2	2	21
Upper (feepaid)	123	80	83	353	15	6	7	49
Salaried employment Judge	115	38	149	255	31	5	33	59
First tier salaried positions	557	300	655	1,388	64	10	56	141
First tier fee-paid positions	2,524	1,050	3,561	5,863	326	52	341	676

## Contacts

Enquires or comments about the statistics in this bulletin should be directed to:

### **Adrian Shepherd**

Statistician

Judicial Appointments Commission

7.06, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Tel: 020 3334 2483

Email: [Adrian.shepherd@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Adrian.shepherd@justice.gsi.gov.uk)

General enquiries on the content of this bulletin should be directed to:

### **Teresa Amis**

Judicial Appointments Commission

5.06, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Tel: 020 3334 5936

Email: [teresa.amis@jac.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:teresa.amis@jac.gsi.gov.uk)

Press enquiries on the content of this bulletin should be directed to the JAC Outreach Team:

### **David Venables**

Judicial Appointments Commission

5.06, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Tel: 020 3334 5362

Email: [david.venables@jac.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:david.venables@jac.gsi.gov.uk)

General information about the Judicial Appointments Commission is available from: <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/about-jac.htm>