

Judicial Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics, October 2011 to March 2012

**Judicial Appointments Commission
Statistics Bulletin**

Published 14 June 2012

Contents

Introductory Note	4
Background	6
Main Findings	8
Commentary for completed exercises by type of judicial office:	
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber	13
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))	14
Designated Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber, Designated Immigration Judge	15
Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))	16
District Judge (Civil)	17
Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))	18
Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for (HESC) Mental Health	19
Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care (HESC) Chamber	20
Fee-paid Medical Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) Wales	21
Circuit Judge	22
Fee-paid Specialist Lay Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (HESC) (Mental Health) and of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) for Wales	23
Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber	24
Recorder	25

Grouped, small selection exercises for legal posts	26
Grouped, small selection exercises for non-legal posts	27
Annex A–Revision to Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics for Lawyer Chairman of the Residential Property Tribunal Service, originally published 1 December 2011	28
Explanatory Notes	29
Contacts	38

Introductory Note

This bulletin has been prepared by the Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC). It presents statistics on recommendations for the appointment of judges for completed selection exercises.

The definition of when a selection exercise is considered to be completed has changed. In previous publications in this series, a selection exercise was counted as completed when a formal project closure meeting, known as 'the closedown meeting' occurred. In this publication and in future, a selection exercise is considered to be completed on the date that recommendation(s) for appointment for each selection exercise are sent to the Lord Chancellor. Because the closedown meeting can happen several months after the recommendation, this will improve the timeliness of the statistics. This change was announced in the report published in December 2011.

As a result of this change, this report presents statistics for two groups of selection exercises and recommendations:

- Exercises for which recommendations were sent to the Lord Chancellor between 1 October 2011 and 31 March 2012.
- Exercises for which recommendations were sent to the Lord Chancellor prior to 1 October 2011 but for which the closedown meeting occurred after 30 September 2011 and which have not been presented in previous publications in this series.

This is the sixth bi-annual set of statistics on completed selection exercises and recommendations for appointment to be published by JAC.

The statistics are used to monitor and evaluate the diversity of JAC selections for judicial office.

The **Main Findings** include a description of the progression of each diversity group¹, through the three diversity monitoring stages² of selection exercises.

The **Commentary** includes an overview of each selection exercise by diversity group covering the eligible pool³, the number of eligible and shortlisted applicants, and the number of applicants recommended for appointment including percentage point differences⁴. It also includes the corresponding proportions for each of the three diversity monitoring stages of selection exercises.

¹ Each diversity group refers to: gender, ethnic background, professional background and disability status of eligible applicants.

² The three diversity monitoring stages refer to: eligible applications received; shortlisted applicants; and recommendation for appointment.

³ Eligible pool refers to: the approximation of the number of people who are able to meet the job-specific entry requirements laid down for that particular judicial post.

⁴ Percentage point difference is the difference between two percentages.

Tables are presented that supplement the commentary. They contain absolute numbers and proportions of applications, shortlisted candidates and selected 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.

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 it is not considered in the selection process. Some applicants have chosen not to declare their diversity group or filled in the form incorrectly, so these applicants have been placed in the “Incomplete” group in the tables.

Annex A presents comprehensive results for recruitment for the post of Lawyer Chairman of the Residential Property Tribunal Service, which was presented in the previous publication in this series but which incorrectly showed partial results.

The **Background** lists each post covered by a selection exercise included in this report.

Information about data sources, statistical revisions, any forthcoming changes, stages in the selection process, description of posts and symbols and conventions used in this bulletin are given in the **Explanatory Notes**.

The JAC, in consultation with the relevant data suppliers (Bar Council, Law Society, Judicial Office etc) is currently working on updating and refining the estimates of the eligible pool for future Official Statistics bulletins.

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.

Background

This bulletin provides statistics relating to the following thirteen selection exercises run by the JAC:

- Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber
- Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))
- Designated Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber, Designated Immigration Judge
- Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))
- District Judge (Civil)
- Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))
- Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for Health, Education and Social Care (HESC) Mental Health
- Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care (HESC) Chamber
- Fee-paid Medical Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) Wales
- Circuit Judge 2011 (Heavyweight Crime)
- Fee-paid Specialist Lay Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (HESC) (Mental Health) and of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) for Wales
- Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber and
- Recorder.

There were also fourteen small exercises which were completed. Each of these exercises had less than ten recommendations for appointment. For the purpose of this report their figures have been grouped together in order to protect applicant confidentiality and to provide more meaningful counts and results. Exercises have been grouped into legal and non-legal posts. It should be noted that if any individual was an eligible applicant for more than one of these exercises, then they will be counted in these statistics more than once.

Legal

- Senior Circuit Judge
- Registrar in Bankruptcy of the High Court and Master, Chancery Division
- Regional Tribunal Judge Social Entitlement Chamber (SSCS)
- Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for MHRT Wales
- Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal - Tax and Chancery Chamber
- Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)
- High Court, Chancery Division
- Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health) and
- Regional Employment Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales).

Non-legal

- Fee-paid Dental Practitioner of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care Chamber, Primary Health Lists and Care Standards
- Salaried Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, Social Security and Child Support
- Fee-paid Specialist Transport Member of the Upper Tribunal, Administrative Appeals Chamber and Transport Tribunal
- Fee-paid Specialist Member General Regulatory Chamber (Environment) and
- Fee-paid President of the Transport Tribunal.

More information about these posts and the selection exercises can be found in the **Explanatory Notes** section near the end of this report.

Main Findings

Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber

- The eligible pool was made up of 39 per cent women, nine per cent from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 86 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 40 per cent to 56 per cent and male applicants decreased from 50 per cent to 36 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 28 per cent to 17 per cent, and White applicants increased from 59 per cent to 69 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))

- The eligible pool was made up of 37 per cent women, eight per cent from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 86 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 50 per cent to 54 per cent and male applicants decreased from 45 per cent to 43 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 14 per cent to eight per cent, and White applicants increased from 79 per cent to 86 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Designated Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber, Designated Immigration Judge

- The eligible pool was made up of 20 per cent women, 4 per cent of people from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 37 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 26 per cent to 30 per cent and male applicants increased from 65 per cent to 70 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 20 per cent to none, and White applicants increased from 65 per cent to 100 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))

- The eligible pool was made up of 19 per cent women, five per cent from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 40 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 45 per cent to 54 per cent and male applicants decreased from 52 per cent to 46 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 15 per cent to three per cent, and White applicants increased from 81 per cent to 95 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

District Judge (Civil)

- The eligible pool was made up of 19 per cent women, five per cent from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 40 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants decreased from 45 per cent to 43 per cent and male applicants increased from 51 per cent to 55 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 14 per cent to seven per cent, and White applicants increased from 82 per cent to 91 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))

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

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 34 per cent to 38 per cent and male applicants decreased from 63 per cent to 60 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 24 per cent to 19 per cent, and White applicants increased from 72 per cent to 77 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for Health, Education and Social Care (HESC) Mental Health

- Eligible pool figures cannot be calculated because of the specialised nature of the criteria for the post.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 15 per cent to 20 per cent and male applicants decreased from 82 per cent to 73 per cent, the remaining applicant did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 6 per cent to none, and White applicants increased from 91 per cent to 93 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care (HESC) Chamber

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

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 30 per cent to 31 per cent and male applicants increased from 67 per cent to 69 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 37 per cent to 33 per cent, and White applicants increased from 52 per cent to 59 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) Wales

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

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants decreased from 35 per cent to 30 per cent and male applicants increased from 65 per cent to 70 per cent; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 35 per cent to 30 per cent, and White applicants increased from 47 per cent to 50 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Circuit Judge 2011 (Heavyweight Crime)

- The eligible pool was made up of 20 per cent women, four per cent of people from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 37 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants decreased from 14 per cent to eight per cent and male applicants increased from 85 per cent to 92 per cent, the remaining applicant did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 13 per cent to eight per cent, and White applicants increased from 87 per cent to 92 per cent; the remaining applicant did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Fee-paid Specialist Lay Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (HESC) (Mental Health) and of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) for Wales

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

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants decreased from 56 per cent to 51 per cent and male applicants increased from 39 per cent to 45 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 11 per cent to four per cent, and White applicants increased from 83 per cent to 91 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber

- The eligible pool was made up of 20 per cent women, four per cent from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, and 37 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 32 per cent to 50 per cent and male applicants decreased from 55 per cent to 30 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 29 per cent to none, and White applicants increased from 55 per cent to 60 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Recorder

- The eligible pool was made up of 37 per cent women, eight per cent of people from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds, and 86 per cent solicitors.

As candidates progressed from application to recommendation for appointment, the proportion of

- Female applicants increased from 35 per cent to 36 per cent and male applicants increased from 61 per cent to 64 per cent, the remaining applicants did not declare their gender; and
- Applicants from BAME backgrounds decreased from 13 per cent to 8 per cent, and White applicants increased from 82 per cent to 92 per cent; the remaining applicants did not declare their background or completed the form incorrectly.

Commentary

In this section, the results of the 12 selection exercises with 10 or more recommendations are presented.

Descriptions of each post can be found in the Explanatory Notes section.

Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal - Immigration and Asylum Chamber (2011) (Table 1)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 103,000 people; 61 per cent male and 39 per cent female. Around nine per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 86 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 871 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 86 (10 per cent) were shortlisted and 36 (42 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

352 (40 per cent) of the 871 eligible applicants were women and 432 (50 per cent) were men. Of the 86 shortlisted applicants, 40 (47 per cent) were women and 38 (44 per cent) were men. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, 13 (36 per cent) were men and 20 (56 per cent) were women and three applicants did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

517 (59 per cent) of the 871 eligible applicants were white and 247 (28 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 86 shortlisted applicants, 64 (74 per cent) were white and 14 (16 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, 25 (69 per cent) were white, six applicants (17 per cent) were from a BAME background, and five applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

463 (53 per cent) of the 871 eligible applicants were solicitors and 235 (27 per cent) were barristers. Of the 86 shortlisted applicants, 46 (53 per cent) were solicitors and 27 (31 per cent) were barristers. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, 16 (44 per cent) were solicitors, 12 (33 per cent) were barristers, five (14 per cent) were from another professional background and three did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

41 of the 871 eligible applicants were disabled (five per cent). Of the 86 shortlisted applicants, two (two per cent) was disabled. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, none was disabled.

Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS)) (Table 2)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 91,000 people; 63 per cent male and 37 per cent female. Around eight per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 86 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 715 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 269 (38 per cent) were shortlisted and 142 (53 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

358 (50 per cent) of the 715 eligible applicants were women and 324 (45 per cent) were men. Of the 269 shortlisted applicants, 133 (49 per cent) were women and 128 (48 per cent) were men. Of the 142 applicants recommended for appointment, 61 (43 per cent) were men, 77 (54 per cent) were women and four applicants did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

565 (79 per cent) of the 715 eligible applicants were white and 99 (14 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 269 shortlisted applicants, 230 (86 per cent) were white and 23 (9 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 142 applicants recommended for appointment, 122 (86 per cent) were white, 12 applicants (eight per cent) were from a BAME background and eight applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

427 (60 per cent) of the 715 eligible applicants were solicitors and 136 (19 per cent) were barristers. Of the 269 shortlisted applicants, 151 (56 per cent) were solicitors and 60 (22 per cent) were barristers. Of the 142 applicants recommended for appointment, 68 (48 per cent) were solicitors, 47 (33 per cent) were barristers, 17 (12 per cent) came from another professional background, and ten did not declare professional background.

Disability status

44 of the 715 eligible applicants were disabled (six per cent). Of the 269 shortlisted applicants, 14 (five per cent) was disabled. Of the 142 applicants recommended for appointment, eight (six per cent) were disabled.

Designated Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber, Designated Immigration Judge (Table 3)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 3,600 people; 80 per cent male and 20 per cent female. Around four per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 37 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 54 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 24 (44 per cent) were shortlisted and 10 (42 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

14 (26 per cent) of the 54 eligible applicants were women and 35 (65 per cent) were men. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, seven (29 per cent) were women and 15 (63 per cent) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (70 per cent) were men and three (30 per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

35 (65 per cent) of the 54 eligible applicants were white and 11 (20 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, 18 (75 per cent) were white and two (eight per cent) were from a BAME background. All of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment were white.

Professional background

19 (35 per cent) of the 54 eligible applicants were salaried judicial office holders, nine (17 per cent) were solicitors and four (seven per cent) were barristers. Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, 13 (54 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, one (four per cent) was a solicitor and two (eight per cent) were barristers. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (70 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, one (10 per cent) was from another professional background and two applicants did not declare their background.

Disability status

Three of the 54 eligible applicants were disabled (six per cent). Of the 24 shortlisted applicants, two (eight per cent) was disabled. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, one (10 per cent) was disabled.

Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS)) (Table 4)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 3,800 people; 81 per cent male and 19 per cent female. Around five per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 40 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 210 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 79 (38 per cent) were shortlisted and 37 (47 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

95 (45 per cent) of the 210 eligible applicants were women and 110 (52 per cent) were men. Of the 79 shortlisted applicants, 38 (48 per cent) were women and 40 (51 per cent) were men. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, 17 (46 per cent) were men and 20 (54 per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

171 (81 per cent) of the 210 eligible applicants were white and 31 (15 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 79 shortlisted applicants, 74 (94 per cent) were white and three (four per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, 35 (95 per cent) were white, one applicant (three per cent) was from a BAME background and one applicant did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

81 (39 per cent) of the 210 eligible applicants were solicitors and 26 (12 per cent) were barristers. Of the 79 shortlisted applicants, 27 (34 per cent) were solicitors and seven (nine per cent) were barristers. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, 11 (30 per cent) were solicitors, one (three per cent) was a barrister, 18 (49 per cent) were from another professional background and seven applicants did not declare their background.

Disability status

19 of the 210 eligible applicants were disabled (nine per cent). Of the 79 shortlisted applicants, three (four per cent) were disabled. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, two (five per cent) were disabled.

District Judge (Civil) (Table 5)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 3,800 people; 81 per cent male and 19 per cent female. Around five per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 40 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 483 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 153 (32 per cent) were shortlisted and 56 (37 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

218 (45 per cent) of the 483 eligible applicants were women and 248 (51 per cent) were men. Of the 153 shortlisted applicants, 67 (44 per cent) were women and 82 (54 per cent) were men. Of the 56 applicants recommended for appointment, 31 (55 per cent) were men, 24 (43 per cent) were women and one candidate did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

395 (82 per cent) of the 483 eligible applicants were white and 69 (14 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 153 shortlisted applicants, 137 (90 per cent) were white and 11 (seven per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 56 applicants recommended for appointment, 51 (91 per cent) were white, four (seven per cent) were from a BAME background and one applicant did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

342 (71 per cent) of the 483 eligible applicants were solicitors and 82 (17 per cent) were barristers. Of the 153 shortlisted applicants, 107 (70 per cent) were solicitors and 28 (18 per cent) were barristers. Of the 56 applicants recommended for appointment, 41 (73 per cent) were solicitors, 10 (18 per cent) were barristers, one was a salaried judicial office holder and four did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

19 of the 483 eligible applicants were disabled (four per cent). Of the 153 shortlisted applicants, six (four per cent) were disabled. Of the 56 applicants recommended for appointment, two (four per cent) were disabled.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS)) (Table 6)

Eligible pool

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

Gender

56 (34 per cent) of the 163 eligible applicants were women and 103 (63 per cent) were men. Of the 158 shortlisted applicants, 54 (34 per cent) were women and 100 (63 per cent) were men. Of the 112 applicants recommended for appointment, 67 (60 per cent) were men, 42 (38 per cent) were women and three candidates did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

117 (72 per cent) of the 163 eligible applicants were white and 39 (24 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 158 shortlisted applicants, 114 (72 per cent) were white and 37 (23 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 112 applicants recommended for appointment, 86 (77 per cent) were white, 21 (19 per cent) were from a BAME background and five applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession - all applicants had to be medically qualified.

Disability status

Five of the 163 eligible applicants were disabled (three per cent). Of the 158 shortlisted applicants, five (three per cent) were disabled. Of the 112 applicants recommended for appointment, three (three per cent) were disabled.

Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for Health, Education and Social Care (Mental Health) (Table 7)

Eligible pool

Eligible pool figures cannot be calculated because of the specialised nature of the criteria for the post.

Gender

Five (15 per cent) of the 34 eligible applicants were women and 28 (82 per cent) were men. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, five (16 per cent) were women and 26 (81 per cent) were men. Of the 15 applicants recommended for appointment, 11 (73 per cent) were men, three (20 per cent) were women and one candidate did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

31 (91 per cent) of the 34 eligible applicants were white and two (six per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, 31 (97 per cent) were white and none was from a BAME background. Of the 15 applicants recommended for appointment, 14 (93 per cent) were white and one applicant did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

Two (six per cent) of the 34 eligible applicants were salaried judicial office holders, 2 (six per cent) were solicitors and 27 (79 per cent) were barristers. Of the 32 shortlisted applicants, two (six per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, 1 (three per cent) was a solicitor and 27 (84 per cent) were barristers. Of the 15 applicants recommended for appointment, two (13 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, 11 (73 per cent) were barristers, one was a solicitor and one applicant did not declare their background.

Disability status

Of the 34 eligible applicants, none was disabled.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care (HESC) Chamber (Table 8)

Eligible pool

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

Gender

18 (30 per cent) of the 60 eligible applicants were women and 40 (67 per cent) were men. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, 16 (29 per cent) were women and 38 (69 per cent) were men. Of the 39 applicants recommended for appointment, 27 (69 per cent) were men and 12 (31 per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

31 (52 per cent) of the 60 eligible applicants were white and 22 (37 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, 30 (55 per cent) were white and 20 (36 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 39 applicants recommended for appointment, 23 (59 per cent) were white, 13 (33 per cent) were from a BAME background and three applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession – all had to be medically qualified.

Disability status

One (two per cent) of the 60 eligible applicants was disabled. Of the 55 shortlisted applicants, none was disabled.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) Wales (Table 9)

Eligible pool

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

Gender

Six (35 per cent) of the 17 eligible applicants were women and 11 (65 per cent) were men. Of the 13 shortlisted applicants, five (38 per cent) were women and eight (62 per cent) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (70 per cent) were men and three (30 per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

Eight (47 per cent) of the 17 eligible applicants were white and six (35 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 13 shortlisted applicants, seven (54 per cent) were white and four (31 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, five (50 per cent) were white, three (30 per cent) were from a BAME background and two applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

None of the applicants had a background in the legal profession – all had to be medically qualified.

Disability status

One (six per cent) of the 17 eligible applicants was disabled. Of the 13 shortlisted applicants, none was disabled.

Circuit Judge 2011 (Heavyweight Crime) (Table 10)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 3,600 people; 80 per cent male and 20 per cent female. Around four per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 37 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 126 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 57 (45 per cent) were shortlisted and 25 (44 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

18 (14 per cent) of the 126 eligible applicants were women and 107 (85 per cent) were men. Of the 57 shortlisted applicants, six (11 per cent) were women and 50 (88 per cent) were men. Of the 25 applicants recommended for appointment, 23 (92 per cent) were men and two (eight per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

109 (87 per cent) of the 126 eligible applicants were white and 16 (13 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 57 shortlisted applicants, 52 (91 per cent) were white and five (nine per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 25 applicants recommended for appointment, 23 (92 per cent) were white and two (eight per cent) were from a BAME background.

Professional background

109 (87 per cent) of the 126 eligible applicants were barristers, six (five per cent) were solicitors and six (five per cent) were salaried judicial office holders. Of the 57 shortlisted applicants, 53 (93 per cent) were barristers and two (four per cent) were salaried judicial office holders. Of the 25 applicants recommended for appointment, all were barristers.

Disability status

Two (two per cent) of the 66 eligible applicants were disabled. Of the 57 shortlisted applicants, none was disabled.

Fee-paid Specialist Lay Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (HESC) (Mental Health) and of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) for Wales (Table 11)

Eligible pool

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

Gender

238 (56 per cent) of the 427 eligible applicants were women and 166 (39 per cent) were men. Of the 135 shortlisted applicants, 74 (55 per cent) were women and 57 (42 per cent) were men. Of the 55 applicants recommended for appointment, 25 (45 per cent) were men, 28 (51 per cent) were women and two applicants did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

354 (83 per cent) of the 427 eligible applicants were white and 45 (11 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 135 shortlisted applicants, 123 (91 per cent) were white and seven (five per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 55 applicants recommended for appointment, 50 (91 per cent) were white, two (four per cent) were from a BAME background and three applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

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

Disability status

33 of the 427 eligible applicants were disabled (eight per cent). Of the 135 shortlisted applicants, eight (six per cent) were disabled. Of the 55 applicants recommended for appointment, three (five per cent) were disabled.

Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber (Table 12)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 3,600 people; 80 per cent male and 20 per cent female. Around four per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 37 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 62 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 22 (35 per cent) were shortlisted and 10 (45 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

20 (32 per cent) of the 62 eligible applicants were women and 34 (55 per cent) were men. Of the 22 shortlisted applicants, 11 (50 per cent) were women and eight (36 per cent) were men. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, three (30 per cent) were men, five (50 per cent) were women and two applicants did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

34 (55 per cent) of the 62 eligible applicants were white and 18 (29 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 22 shortlisted applicants, 15 (68 per cent) were white and two (nine per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, six (60 per cent) were white, none was from a BAME background and four applicants did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

15 (24 per cent) of the 62 eligible applicants were solicitors, 12 (19 per cent) were barristers. Of the 22 shortlisted applicants, five (23 per cent) were solicitors and six (27 per cent) were barristers. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, three (30 per cent) were solicitors, one (10 per cent) was a barrister, two (20 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, two (20 per cent) were from another professional background, and two applicants did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

Five of the 62 eligible applicants were disabled (eight per cent). Of the 22 shortlisted applicants, three (14 per cent) were disabled. Of the 10 applicants recommended for appointment, three (30 per cent) were disabled.

Recorder 2011 (Table 13)

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 91,000 people; 63 per cent male and 37 per cent female. Around eight per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 86 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Of the 1,430 eligible applicants in this selection exercise, 265 (19 per cent) were shortlisted and 108 (41 per cent) of these were recommended for appointment.

Gender

497 (35 per cent) of the 1,430 eligible applicants were women and 879 (61 per cent) were men. Of the 265 shortlisted applicants, 79 (30 per cent) were women and 182 (69 per cent) were men. Of the 108 applicants recommended for appointment, 69 (64 per cent) were men and 39 (36 per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

1,179 (82 per cent) of the 1,430 eligible applicants were white and 192 (13 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 265 shortlisted applicants, 228 (86 per cent) were white and 32 (12 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 108 applicants recommended for appointment, 99 (92 per cent) were white and nine (eight per cent) were from a BAME background.

Professional background

317 (22 per cent) of the 1,430 eligible applicants were solicitors, 960 (67 per cent) were barristers. Of the 265 shortlisted applicants, 36 (14 per cent) were solicitors and 205 (77 per cent) were barristers. Of the 108 applicants recommended for appointment, seven (six per cent) were solicitors, 92 (85 per cent) were barristers, seven (six per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, and two applicants did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

46 of the 1,430 eligible applicants were disabled (three per cent). Of the 265 shortlisted applicants, nine (three per cent) were disabled. Of the 108 applicants recommended for appointment, four (four per cent) were disabled.

Grouped, small selection exercises for legal posts (Table 14)

This subsection relates to the nine small selection exercises which were completed during this period for legal posts. These exercises had less than ten recommendations for appointment. For the purpose of this report their figures have been grouped together in order to protect applicant confidentiality and to provide more meaningful counts and results. It should be noted that if any individual was an eligible 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 was no eligible pool.

Gender

68 (28 per cent) of the 244 eligible applicants were women and 173 (71 per cent) were men. Of the 100 shortlisted applicants, 24 (24 per cent) were women and 74 (74 per cent) were men. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, 27 (73 per cent) were men, nine (24 per cent) were women, and one applicant did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

210 (86 per cent) of the 244 eligible applicants were white and 29 (12 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 100 shortlisted applicants, 92 (92 per cent) were white and four (four per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, 33 (89 per cent) were white, three (eight per cent) were from a BAME background and one applicant did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

83 (34 per cent) of the 244 eligible applicants were solicitors and 84 (34 per cent) were barristers. Of the 100 shortlisted applicants, 21 (21 per cent) were solicitors and 41 (41 per cent) were barristers. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, eight (22 per cent) were solicitors, 11 (30 per cent) were barristers, 14 (38 per cent) were salaried judicial office holders, two (five per cent) were from another profession and two applicants did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

Seven of the 244 eligible applicants were disabled (three per cent). Of the 100 shortlisted applicants, one (one per cent) was disabled. Of the 37 applicants recommended for appointment, none was disabled.

Grouped, small selection exercises for non-legal posts (Table 15)

This subsection relates to the five small selection exercises which were completed during this period for non-legal posts. These exercises had less than ten recommendations for appointment. For the purpose of this report their figures have been grouped together in order to protect applicant confidentiality and to provide more meaningful counts and results. It should be noted that if any individual was an eligible 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 was no eligible pool.

Gender

43 (31 per cent) of the 140 eligible applicants were women and 95 (68 per cent) were men. Of the 42 shortlisted applicants, 12 (29 per cent) were women and 30 (71 per cent) were men. Of the 22 applicants recommended for appointment, 14 (64 per cent) were men and eight (36 per cent) were women.

Ethnicity

105 (75 per cent) of the 140 eligible applicants were white and 32 (23 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 42 shortlisted applicants, 34 (81 per cent) were white and eight (19 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 22 applicants recommended for appointment, 19 (86 per cent) were white and three (14 per cent) were from a BAME background.

Professional background

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

Disability status

Six of the 140 eligible applicants were disabled (four per cent). Of the 42 shortlisted applicants, two (five per cent) were disabled. Of the 22 applicants recommended for appointment, one (five per cent) was disabled.

Annex A – Revision to statistics for Lawyer Chairman of the Residential Property Tribunal Service, originally published 1st December 2011 (Table A1)

The previous publication in this series, published in December 2011 presented statistics on the recruitment exercise for the post of Lawyer Chairman of the Residential Property Tribunal Service. It has since become apparent that the results presented did not completely represent the statistics of the selection and recommendations process for this post. They are now found below.

Eligible pool

The eligible pool for this selection exercise contained around 91,000 people; the male female split was 63 per cent to 37 per cent. Around eight per cent of the eligible pool were from a BAME background. Some 86 per cent of the eligible pool were solicitors and the rest were barristers. The disability status of the eligible pool was not available.

Gender

104 (43 per cent) of the 244 eligible applicants were women and 129 (53 per cent) were men. Of the 76 shortlisted applicants, 33 (43 per cent) were women and 40 (53 per cent) were men. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, 22 (61 per cent) were men, 12 (33 per cent) were women, and two did not declare their gender.

Ethnicity

190 (78 per cent) of the 244 eligible applicants were white and 38 (16 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 76 shortlisted applicants, 62 (82 per cent) were white and 10 (13 per cent) were from a BAME background. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, 28 (78 per cent) were white, six (17 per cent) were from a BAME background, and two did not declare their ethnicity.

Professional background

151 (62 per cent) of the 244 eligible applicants were solicitors and 47 (19 per cent) were barristers. Of the 76 shortlisted applicants, 45 (59 per cent) were solicitors and 23 (30 per cent) were barristers. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, 18 (50 per cent) were solicitors, 13 (36 per cent) were barristers, two (six per cent) were from another profession and three applicants did not declare their professional background.

Disability status

17 of the 244 eligible applicants were disabled (seven per cent). Of the 76 shortlisted applicants, six (eight per cent) were disabled. Of the 36 applicants recommended for appointment, three (eight per cent) were disabled.

Explanatory Notes

Data sources

The main source of data for details of applicants for this report was the Equitas database, which is maintained by the JAC. It contains records of all the completed selection exercises using data provided by the candidates on the JAC Application Monitoring Form.

The report also draws data from the Law Society, Bar Council and Judicial Office publications to derive data for the eligible pools of potential applicants. The Judicial Office provides data on serving judicial office holders. The Law Society and Bar Council provide data on solicitors and barristers who are on the Roll (solicitors) and have been called to the Bar (barristers).

Revisions

The quality assured statistics in this bulletin are provisional and are therefore liable to revision to take account of any late amendments to the administrative databases from which these statistics were sourced. The standard process for revising the published statistics to account for these late amendments is to publish them in the next edition of this bulletin.

This, and previous bulletins, along with downloadable Excel tables, are available from the JAC website: <http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-jac/823.htm>

Forthcoming changes

1. The JAC, in consultation with the relevant data suppliers (Bar Council, Law Society, Judicial Office etc) is currently working on updating and refining the estimates of the eligible pool for future Official Statistics bulletins.
2. It is intended that future publications will include reports of the age profile of applicants in addition to gender, ethnicity, professional background and disability, which are currently reported.

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>

Stages in the selection process

There are three stages in each selection process at which the diversity of applicants is officially recorded; application; shortlisting; and recommendation for appointment. In general, around two to three times as many applicants as there are vacancies are shortlisted, using either a qualifying test or a paper sift. Those shortlisted are invited to a selection day involving an interview and, in the case of entry level positions, a role play.

The Commissioners of the JAC, sitting as the Selection and Character Committee make the selection decision based on a report of the selection day, references, self assessment and the result of statutory consultation with the judiciary. The Commission then makes recommendations to the Lord Chancellor.

Further information on the selection process is available on the JAC website:
<http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/selection-process/352.htm>

Description of posts in this bulletin

For each of these posts for England and Wales the selection process is determined by the JAC under the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 (CRA), and is set out on the JAC website:
<http://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/selection-process/selection-exercises/past-exercises.htm>

Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act (TCE) 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 18 candidates for immediate appointment and 18 candidates for future appointment.

Shortlisting was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was initially asked to select 84 candidates for immediate appointment and this was revised upwards to 127 and then 162.

Shortlisting was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Designated Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber, Designated Immigration Judge

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act (TCE) 2007 and Section 5 and paragraph 7 of Schedule 3 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement (TCE) Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select five candidates for immediate appointment and five candidates for future appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support (SSCS))

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select 27 candidates for immediate appointment and ten candidates for future appointment.

Shortlisting was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

District Judge (Civil)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 9 of the County Courts Act 1984, as amended by the Courts and Legal Services Act 1990 and Paragraph 15 of Schedule 10 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select one candidate for immediate appointment and 55 candidates for future appointment.

Shortlisting was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, Social Security and Child Support (SSCS)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007. All applicants had to be medically qualified.

The JAC was asked to select 115 candidates for immediate appointment.

There was no requirement for shortlisting and all those meeting the eligibility criteria were invited to interview.

Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for (HESC) Mental Health

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007. All applicants had to be Recorders with at least one of the following:

- Recent sentencing experience in the Crown Court of Class 2 offences or Class 1 offences
- Substantial experience in practice or judicially of mental health or mental capacity law
- Substantial experience in practice or judicially of the judicial assessment of serious risk (for example with the Parole Board or for public law children cases)

The JAC was asked to select 15 candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care (HESC) Chamber

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007. All applicants had to be medically qualified.

The JAC was asked to select 40 candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Medical Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) Wales

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007. All applicants had to be medically qualified.

The JAC was asked to select 10 candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Circuit Judge 2011 (Heavyweight crime)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 16(3) of the Courts Act 1971. Candidates for this heavyweight crime post needed sufficient relevant experience either of dealing with serious criminal cases over at least a five year period or of trying serious offences as a Recorder over three years.

The JAC was initially asked to select 27 candidates for immediate appointment and this was revised downwards to 26.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Specialist Lay Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (HESC) (Mental Health) and of the Mental Health Review Tribunal (MHRT) for Wales

Members of the First-tier Tribunal, who are not judges, are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007. Candidates were required to have substantial experience of working in the area of mental health.

The JAC was asked to select 55 candidates for immediate appointment: 40 for the HESC post and 15 for MHRT.

Shortlisting was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Immigration and Asylum Chamber

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 5 and paragraph 7 of Schedule 3 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement (TCE) Act 2007. The Lord Chancellor set out an expectation that successful candidates would already have directly relevant experience sitting as an immigration judge in a salaried or fee-paid capacity.

The JAC was asked to select 10 candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Recorder

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 21(2) of the Courts Act 1971, as amended by paragraph 9, Schedule 10 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act (TCE) 2007.

The JAC was initially asked to select up to 98 candidates for immediate appointment. This was revised to 108: 81 in Crime and 27 in Family (Public Law).

Shortlisting was by qualifying test. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Senior Circuit Judge

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 16(3) of the Courts Act 1971, as amended by section 71 and Schedule 10 to the Courts and Legal Services Act 1990, and by section 50 and Schedule 10 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement (TCE) Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select nine candidates for future appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Registrar in Bankruptcy of the High Court and Master, Chancery Division

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 89(1) and Part II of Schedule 2 to the Senior Courts Act 1981, as amended by paragraph 13 of Schedule 10 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select two candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Regional Tribunal Judge Social Entitlement Chamber (SSCS)

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select three candidates for immediate appointment.

All candidates were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Restricted Patient Panel Judges for MHRT Wales

Holders of this office are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was initially asked to select 10 candidates for immediate appointment and this was revised downwards.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal - Tax and Chancery Chamber

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and Section 5 and paragraph 1 of Schedule 3 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select three candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and Section 5 and paragraph 1 of Schedule 3 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select three candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

High Court, Chancery Division

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Section 10(3)(c) of the Senior Courts Act 1981, as amended by paragraph 13 of Schedule 10 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act (TCE) 2007.

The JAC was asked to select five candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health)

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007.

The JAC was asked to select one candidate for immediate appointment and three candidates for future appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Regional Employment Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Regulation 6(1) of the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2004, as amended by Schedule 1 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Order 2008.

The JAC was asked to select two candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Dental Practitioner of the First-tier Tribunal, Health Education and Social Care Chamber, Primary Health Lists and Care Standards

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement (TCE) Act 2007 and under paragraph 2(2) of that Schedule.

The JAC was asked to select five candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Salaried Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber, Social Security and Child Support

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and under paragraph 2(2) of that Schedule.

The JAC was initially asked to select seven candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Specialist Transport Member of the Upper Tribunal, Administrative Appeals Chamber and Transport Tribunal

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 3 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and under paragraph 2(2) of that Schedule

The JAC was asked to select three candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid Specialist Member General Regulatory Chamber (Environment)

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 2 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and under paragraph 2(2) of that Schedule.

The JAC was initially asked to select up to eight candidates for immediate appointment.

Shortlisting was by paper sift. Those shortlisted were invited to a selection day.

Fee-paid President of the Transport Tribunal

Holders of these offices are appointed by the Lord Chancellor under Transport Act 1985, schedule 4, as amended by the Tribunals Courts and Enforcement Act 2007, part 2, 50, (6).

The JAC was asked to select one candidate for immediate appointment.

There was only one applicant. The applicant was interviewed and was successful.

Symbols and conventions

0 = Nil

n/a = Not available

- = Not applicable

Italics indicate a percentage calculated from a denominator of 10 or less

Contacts

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

Adrian Shepherd

Statistician

Judicial Appointments Commission

Steel House, 11 Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9LH

Tel: 020 3334 2483

Email: Adrian.shepherd@justice.gsi.gov.uk

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

Angela Seesurrun

Judicial Appointments Commission

Steel House, 11 Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9LH

Tel: 020 3334 0386

Email: angela.seesurrun@jac.gsi.gov.uk

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

Rebecca Astles

Judicial Appointments Commission

Steel House, 11 Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9LH

Tel: 020 3334 0329

Email: rebecca.astles@jac.gsi.gov.uk

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