Judicial Selection and Recommendations for Appointment Statistics, October 2014 to March 2015

Judicial Appointments Commission Statistics Bulletin

Contents

Executive Summary

This six monthly bulletin presents statistics on recommendations for judicial posts made between 1 October 2014 and 31 March 2015. A total of 305 recommendations across 21 exercises were made for judicial posts between 1 October and 31 March 2015. The 305 recommendations comprise 249 for legal posts and 56 for a non-legal post.

Statistics relating to the diversity of applicants and recommendations are presented for the following posts:

- Circuit Judge
- Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal
- Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)
- Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (HESC), Mental Health)
- Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)
- Fee-paid Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)
- Deputy District Judge (Civil)
- High Court
- Combined group of 13 exercises

The combined exercises were for posts with fewer than 10 recommendations, all of which were legal posts. These exercises have been combined to maintain candidate confidentiality.

In total, the 21 exercises attracted 2,323 applicants, of whom 1,114 applied for the Deputy District Judge exercise.

Female candidates

When considering all 21 exercises, 42% (979) of all applicants, 37% (266) of the shortlisted candidates and 43% (132) of recommended candidates were women. Overall, the proportions of female applicants were similar to the proportions of women in the posts' respective eligible pools. The only exception was the Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) exercise; 32% of the eligible pool were women, whereas 52% of applicants and 92% of recommended candidates for this post were women. This is a marked increase compared to when this exercise was previously run in 2011, when the proportion of recommended candidates who were women was 33%.

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

Overall, 17% (401) of all applicants, 14% (100) of the shortlisted candidates and 13% (41) of recommended candidates declared they were from a BAME background. Four legal posts had an equal to or higher proportion of recommended candidates than their eligible pool, however this is based on small numbers of overall recommendations and should be interpreted with care. The exercise with the largest proportion of recommended BAME candidates was the Fee-Paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (HESC, Mental Health), where 21 (38%) out of 56 recommended candidates were from a BAME background.

Candidates with a professional background of solicitor

In the 20 exercises for legal posts, candidates with a professional background of solicitor represented 45% (1,050) of applicants, 31% (225) of the shortlisted candidates and 22% (67) of recommendations. Smaller proportions of those within this group were recommended to posts than the proportions in the respective eligible pools. The exercise with the largest proportion of recommended solicitors was the Fee-paid Judge of the First Tier (Tax Chamber), where 15 (54%) out of 28 recommended candidates had a professional background of solicitor.

Disability

Candidates who declared a disability represented 5% (111) of all applicants, 4% (26) of the shortlisted candidates and 4% (11) of recommendations. The proportions of recommended candidates who had declared a disability across all exercises ranged from 0% to 10%. Eligible pool information on disability is not available to make comparisons.

Age

When considering all exercises, 43% (992) of all applicants, 38% (277) of the shortlisted candidates and 41% (125) of recommended candidates were aged 45 and under. People aged 46 and over represented 51% (1,186) of all applicants, 58% (420) of the shortlisted candidates and 55% (169) of recommended candidates. Out of the eight exercises, seven attracted higher proportions of applications from the 46 and over age group, particularly for the High Court Judge where 92% of applicants were aged 46 and over.

Sexual orientation and religious belief

To protect candidate confidentiality, information relating to sexual orientation and religious belief has been presented as an aggregate across all exercises.

Out of the total 2,323 applications received, 4% (91) of applicants, 5% (38) of shortlisted candidates and 4% (12) of recommended candidates identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual. There were 290 (12%) applicants who either declined to respond or did not provide a completed answer.

When considering religious belief, out of the 2,323 applications received, 1,981 (85%) provided a response. The highest proportions for reported religion were Church of England (682, 29%) and Roman Catholic (270, 12%). Out of the total 305 candidates recommended for appointment during this period, 49% (148) reported their religion as Church of England, Roman Catholic or other Christian, 28% (84) reported no religion and 11% (35) either declined to respond or did not provide a completed answer.

Equal Merit Provision

This is the first bulletin to be published since the implementation of the Equal Merit Provision policy took effect for exercises launched after 1 July 2014. In line with the policy seven out of the 305 recommendations reported in this bulletin were made following the application of the provision.

Introduction

This bulletin presents statistics on applications, shortlisting and recommendations for the appointment of judges in selection exercises that were completed between 1 October 2014 and 31 March 2015. It was originally published on 4 June 2015, however an error was identified in the categorisation of shortlisted and rejected candidates reported previously and as a result, the publication has been revised and reissued. The revised results show that a smaller number of candidates were shortlisted for the majority of exercises than previously reported in June, for example for the Deputy District Judge (Civil) exercise it was previously reported that 965 candidates were shortlisted whereas the corrected number of shortlisted candidates is 245. It is important to note that these changes have only impacted the number of shortlisted candidates; the number of recommendations for each post remains unchanged.

The statistics are used to monitor and evaluate the diversity of applications and Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) recommendations for judicial office. This is the first bulletin to be published since the implementation of the Equal Merit Provision policy took effect for exercises launched after 1 July 2014. For more information about this policy please refer to the information provided on the JAC website: https://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/equal-merit-provision.

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 diversity characteristic[1].

To maintain confidentiality and to ensure candidates may not be personally identified, exercises for posts with fewer than 10 recommendations are amalgamated and presented as a grouped exercise.

Recommendations can take two forms. In most cases, recommendations are for appointment to an immediate post, so the appointment can take place following the recommendation (Section 87 of the Constitutional Reform Act). In some cases, recommendations are also made under a duty to identify persons for future requests where the JAC identifies candidates for possible future appointments under Section 94 of the Constitutional Reform Act. Results from both forms of recommendations where available are presented in the tables which accompany this bulletin.

All the diversity statistics in this report are based on self-declared information applicants have provided on the JAC Application Monitoring Form – none of this information is considered at any stage of the selection process unless the Equal Merit Provision is applied at the final stage in line with Commission policy. Completion is voluntary and not all applicants choose to declare their diversity characteristics so there is some missing information; others do not complete the form correctly – these applicants are grouped together and included in the "Incomplete" group.

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

---

[1] Characteristics covered in this report include gender, ethnic background, professional background, disability status, age of applicants, religious belief and sexual orientation.

Further information about data sources, statistical methodological revisions, any forthcoming changes and stages in the selection process is provided in the Definitions and Measurement document that accompanies this statistical bulletin.

Results

Selection Exercises

Between 1 October 2014 and 31 March 2015, 2,323 candidates applied 726 were shortlisted and 305 recommendations were made to the post of judicial office holder. Diversity characteristics of applicants are presented for eight exercises (seven legal and one non-legal) with 10 or more recommendations (accompanying Excel Tables 1-8). Summary tables by diversity characteristics are presented within this report.

The Circuit Judge exercise (Table 1) was carried out in 2014 and was reported on in the December 2014 publication. An additional 21 recommendations were made between 1 October 2014 and 31 March 2015 so the exercise has been presented again with updated figures. Additional recommendations were also made for the Fee-paid Arbitrator of the Motor Insurers' Bureau and Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber; Special Educational Needs and Disability) posts. As there were fewer than 10 recommendations, these exercises will not be republished in full, but included with the small selection exercises (please refer to the revisions policy in the Definitions and Measurement bulletin).

Thirteen exercises (all of which were for legal posts) with 10 or fewer recommendations have been combined to maintain candidate confidentiality and have been presented in Table *i*. These exercises led to a total of 29 recommendations (see Table 9).

Recruitment exercises resulting in 10 or more recommendations have been previously run for six posts presented in this report; the results of which have been provided in Table 11.

Equal Merit Provision

The Crime and Courts Act 2013 enabled the Commission to consider the 'tie-break' clause introduced by the Equality Act 2010 when making recommendations for judicial appointment. The Commission published its policy in April 2014 following public consultation, and has applied the policy to all exercises launched after 1 July 2014. This bulletin publishes the results for the first time. In line with the policy, seven out of the 305 recommendations reported in this bulletin were made following the application of the provision.

Table *i*. Grouped small selection exercises

Selection Exercise	No. of applications received	No. of recommendations made
President of the First-tier Tribunal (General Regulatory Chamber)	13	1
Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)	34	4
Fee-paid Arbitrator of the Motor Insurers' Bureau*	17	4
Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (HESC; Special Educational Needs and Disability)*	18	2
Senior Circuit Judge	3	1
Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Tax and Chancery)	74	7
Regional Employment Judge	8	1
Principal Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Property Chamber)	11	1
Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (HESC, Mental Health)	12	1
Bankruptcy Master	7	1
Chancery Master	10	2
Deputy High Court Judges (Intellectual Property Enterprise Court)	4	3
Common Serjeant	6	1
Total	**217**	**29**

* Previously reported in the June 2014 publication: https://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/news/jac-official-statistics-june-2014

Eligible pool

Eligible pool information is provided for the seven legal exercises with 10 or more recommendations (Tables 1-3 and 5-8). Comparisons with the eligible pool are made where relevant to provide additional context. Four different eligible pools were referred to for these exercises:

- For the Police Appeals Tribunal Chairman, Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber) and Deputy District Judge (Tables 2, 3 and 7), the eligible pool consisted of solicitors, barristers and fellows of CILEx with five or more years of legal experience. This accounted for 111,576 potential candidates, of whom 44% were female, 10% declared they were from a BAME background, and 85% were from a professional background of solicitor.

- For the High Court Judge and Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) posts (Tables 5 and 8), the pool reflected the Additional Selection Criteria that candidates should have judicial experience, and consisted of 5,335 potential candidates. Of this pool, 32% were female, 6% declared they were from a BAME background, and 49% were from a professional background of solicitor.

- For the Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) (Table 6) the eligible pool consisted of 94,314 potential candidates who have seven years' experience as a solicitor or barrister. Of this pool, 40% were female, 9% declared they were from a BAME background, and 89% were from a professional background of solicitor.

- As the Circuit Judge selection exercise (Table 1) was planned in 2013 (although the launch was delayed until 2014), the 2013 eligible pool will be referred to in this publication. The eligibility criteria for Circuit Judge stipulated that candidates should have judicial experience. The eligible pool at that time consisted of 5,570 potential candidates; 30% were female, 6% declared were from a BAME background and 47% had a professional background of solicitor.

It is not possible to calculate an eligible pool for the 13 grouped exercises due to differences in the eligibility criteria between posts. Eligible pool data is not available for the non-legal posts (Fee-Paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber, Mental Health; Table 4).

Female candidates

Table *ii* shows the proportion of female candidates in each of the eight exercises who were recommended, with comparisons to eligible pools and previous exercises where available.

The proportion of applicants who were female was equal to or greater than the proportion of females in the eligible pool in five out of the seven legal posts. A smaller proportion of female candidates applied for the Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber) and High Court than were represented in the eligible pools for the posts.

Generally the proportion of female candidates increased through the process from application to recommendation. The only decreases in proportions can be seen in two of the exercises; the Fee-paid Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber), where 44% of applicants, 41% of shortlisted candidates and 40% of recommendations were female, and the Deputy District Judge where 46% of applicants, 32% of shortlisted candidates and 41% of recommendations were female.

Women have been proportionately more successful in Circuit Judge exercises in the last two years compared to previous exercises; 8% of recommendations in 2012 were women, whereas women represented 48% of the additional recommended candidates in 2013 and 33% (7) of additional recommended candidates in 2014. The Deputy District Judge, High Court Judge and Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier (Tax Chamber) exercises all saw small declines in the proportions of recommended candidates who were women since the previous exercises for these posts.

Out of the eight posts, the Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) had the largest proportion of applicants who were women (52%) and 11 (92%) out of 12 recommended candidates were women. This is the highest proportion of recommended candidates who were women for this post to date; in 2011 one third (4) of recommendations were women; however this should be interpreted with care as it is based on a small number of recommendations. The High Court post had the smallest proportion of recommended candidates who were women (30%) out of the eight posts, however as with the aforementioned exercise, this is based on small numbers (three women out of 10 recommended) and is comparable to the proportion of women in the eligible pool (32%).

Within the combined small exercises 35% (75) of applicants, 39% (35) of shortlisted candidates and 38% (11) of recommendations were female.

Table *ii.* Recommended candidates who were women (1st October 2014 to 31st March 2015)

Exercise	Total number of recommendations for appointment	Proportion of women in the eligible pool	Proportion of applicants who were women	Number and proportion of recommended candidates who were women	Proportion of recommended candidates in past exercises who were women
Circuit Judge 2014*	53	30%	31%	22 (42%)	8% - 48%
Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal	10	44%	48%	6 (60%)	-
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)	28	44%	33%	12 (43%)	47%
Fee-Paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber, Mental Health)	56	-	36%	23 (41%)	27% - 50%
Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	12	32%	52%	11 (92%)	33%
Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	20	40%	44%	8 (40%)	-
Deputy District Judge (Civil)	87	44%	46%	36 (41%)	42% - 58%
High Court Judge	10	32%	27%	3 (30%)	14% - 36%
Small exercises	29	-	35%	11 (38%)	-

*Includes recommendations previously reported

Candidates from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic background

Table *iii* shows the number of recommended candidates who declared they were from a BAME background in each exercise, with eligible pool comparisons for the seven legal posts.

The proportion of applicants who declared they were from BAME backgrounds was equal to or greater than the proportion in the eligible pool in five of the legal posts. The proportions of applicants from a BAME background for the Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber) and High Court Judge were smaller than the proportions in the respective eligible pools.

Four legal posts had an equal to or higher proportion of recommended candidates than their eligible pool, for example the Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal for Immigration and Asylum Chamber (30% compared to 9%), the Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal for Immigration and Asylum Chamber (8% compared to 6%) and the High Court Judge, where two (20%) recommendations declared they were from a BAME background compared to 6% in the eligible pool. When considering previous High Court Judge exercises, this is the highest proportion of recommended candidates who declared they were from a BAME background to date, compared to 15% (2) in 2010. Care needs to be applied when interpreting these figures due to the small number of recommendations.

The proportion of people who declared they were from a BAME background decreased through the process from application to recommendation in seven out of the eight exercises. The only increase in proportions throughout the process could be seen in the High Court exercise where 5% (4) of applicants, 7% (2) of shortlisted candidates and 20% (2) of recommendations were from a BAME background.

Candidates who declared they were from a BAME background were most successful in the Fee-paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal, HESC (Mental Health), where they represented 38% (21) of the recommendations.

Within the combined small exercises 6% (12) of applicants, 2% (2) of shortlisted candidates and 3% (1) of recommended candidates declared they were from a BAME background.

Table *iii*. Recommended candidates who declared they were from a BAME background (1st October 2014 to 31st March 2015)

Exercise	Total number of recommendations for appointment	Proportion of people from a BAME background in the eligible pool	Proportion of applicants who were from a BAME background	Number and proportion of recommended candidates who were from a BAME background	Proportion of recommended candidates from a BAME background in past exercises
Circuit Judge 2014*	53	6%	12%	2 (4%)	0% - 9%
Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal	10	10%	17%	1 (10%)	-
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)	28	10%	6%	1 (4%)	13%
Fee-Paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber, Mental Health)	56	-	43%	21 (38%)	21% - 41%
Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	12	6%	37%	1 (8%)	17%
Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	20	9%	41%	6 (30%)	-
Deputy District Judge (Civil)	87	10%	16%	6 (7%)	6% - 9%
High Court Judge	10	6%	5%	2 (20%)	0% - 15%
Small exercises	29	-	6%	1 (3%)	-

*Includes recommendations previously reported

Table *iv*. Recommended candidates with a professional background of solicitor (1st October 2014 to 31st March 2015)

Legal exercises	Total number of recommendations for appointment	Proportion of solicitors in the eligible pool	Proportion of applicants who were solicitors	Number and proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors	Proportion of recommended candidates who were solicitors in past exercises
Circuit Judge 2014*	53	47%	13%	3 (6%)	0% - 9%
Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal	10	85%	51%	2 (20%)	-
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)	28	85%	52%	15 (54%)	60%
Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	12	49%	37%	4 (33%)	0%
Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	20	89%	41%	5 (25%)	-
Deputy District Judge (Civil)	87	85%	58%	30 (34%)	49% - 68%
High Court Judge	10	49%	7%	0	0%
Small exercises	29	-	42%	8 (28%)	-

*Includes recommendations previously reported

Candidates from a professional background of solicitor

Table *iv* shows the proportion of recommended candidates from a professional background of solicitor in each exercise, with eligible pool and past exercise comparisons where available for the seven legal exercises and grouped small exercises.

There were smaller proportions of applicants and recommended candidates with a professional background of solicitor than in the respective eligible pool across all seven legal exercises.

Compared to previous exercises smaller proportions of recommended candidates had professional background of solicitor in the Deputy District Judge exercise (34% compared to 52% in 2012).

The proportion of people with a professional background of solicitor decreased through the process from application to recommendation in six out of the seven exercises. Proportions in the Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber) exercise remained stable however, throughout where 52% (57) of applicants, 58% (36) of shortlisted candidates and 54% (15) of recommendations were solicitors.

Within the combined small exercises 42% (91) of applicants, 40% (36) of shortlisted candidates and 28% (8) of recommendations were from a professional background of solicitor.

Candidates with a disability

Table *v* shows the proportion of recommended candidates who declared a disability, and past exercise comparisons where available (due to low numbers, trends over time may be subject to random fluctuation). Eligible pool information is not available for disability.

Candidates with a declared disability were more successful compared to previous exercises for the Deputy District Judge (6% of recommendations compared to 1% in 2012), High Court Judge (10% compared to none in 2013) and Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber (8% compared to none in 2011) exercises.

The proportion of candidates with a declared disability increased through the process from application to recommendation in four out of the eight exercises. The largest increase in proportions can be seen in the High Court Judge exercise where five applicants (7%), two shortlisted candidates (7%) and one recommendation (10%) had declared a disability.

Within the combined small exercises five (2%) applicants, two (2%) shortlisted candidates and one (3%) recommended candidate declared a disability.

Table *v*. Recommended candidates who declared a disability (1st October 2014 to 31st March 2015)

Exercise	Total number of recommendations for appointment	Proportion of applicants who declared a disability	Number and proportion of recommended candidates who declared a disability	Proportion of recommended candidates in previous exercises who declared a disability
Circuit Judge 2014*	53	4%	1 (2%)	0% - 6%
Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal	10	7%	0	-
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)	28	2%	0	0%
Fee-Paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber, Mental Health)	56	3%	1 (2%)	0% - 5%
Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	12	6%	1 (8%)	0%
Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	20	4%	1 (5%)	-
Deputy District Judge (Civil)	87	5%	5 (6%)	1% - 3%
High Court Judge	10	7%	1 (10%)	0% - 5%
Small exercises	29	2%	1 (3%)	-

*Includes recommendations previously reported

Table *vi*. Recommended candidates by age (1st October 2014 to 31st March 2015)

Exercise	Proportion of applicants aged 45 and under	Proportion of applicants aged 46 and over	Number and proportion of recommended candidates aged 45 and under	Number and proportion of recommended candidates aged 46 and over
Circuit Judge 2014*	16%	81%	13 (25%)	40 (75%)
Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal	51%	38%	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)	30%	63%	8 (29%)	19 (68%)
Fee-Paid Medical Member of the First-tier Tribunal (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber, Mental Health)	23%	65%	16 (29%)	34 (61%)
Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	40%	56%	6 (50%)	6 (50%)
Fee-paid Judge of the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)	44%	50%	10 (50%)	10 (50%)
Deputy District Judge (Civil)	55%	38%	59 (68%)	25 (29%)
High Court Judge	4%	92%	1 (10%)	9 (90%)
Small exercises	23%	72%	6 (21%)	23 (79%)

*Includes recommendations previously reported

Candidates by age

Table *vi* compares the proportion of recommended candidates in two age brackets: those aged 45 or under, and those aged 46 and over. Eligible pool and previous exercise comparison data are not available by age.

Out of the eight exercises, six attracted higher proportions of applications from the 46 and over age group. The highest proportion of applicants in this age group can be seen in the Circuit Judge (81%) and High Court Judge (92%) exercises. This trend can also be observed in the recommendations.

Within the combined small exercises, 73% (159) of applicants and 79% (23) of recommended candidates were aged 46 years and over.

Sexual orientation (all exercises) (Table 10)

Information is presented on the sexual orientation and religious belief of applicants. In order to protect the confidentiality of applicants these results have been grouped across all exercises.

In the absence of eligible pool information, the UK Integrated Household Survey (2013)[2] has been used as an approximation for sexual orientation proportions in the general population and compared with the results from the diversity monitoring. This was necessary, as the 2011 Census did not include a question on sexual orientation.

Of the 2,323 applicants in the exercises presented in this bulletin, 3.9% (91) identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual, compared to 1.6% of respondents in the Household Survey. Twelve per cent did not provide a completed answer and the remaining 84% identified themselves as heterosexual. This is in line with previous data.

Of 726 shortlisted candidates, 5% (38) identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual and 4% (12) of the 305 recommended candidates identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual.

Religious belief (all exercises) (Table 10)

The 2011 Census included a question regarding religious belief[3] and, in the absence of eligible pool information, has been used as an approximation to compare with the results from the diversity monitoring form.

Compared to the results of the Census;

- fewer applicants reported their religion as Christian (48% compared to 59%),
- the same proportion of applicants reported their religion as Muslim (5%),
- more applicants reported their religion as Jewish (3.5% compared to 0.5%),

---

[2] http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/integrated-household-survey/integrated-household-survey/january-to-december-2013/index.html provides details of the survey.
[3] 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.

- applicants were slightly less likely to report they had no religion (22% compared to 25%) and
- more applicants did not provide a completed answer (15% compared to 7%).

Table *vii* shows the proportion of candidates at each stage of the recruitment process broken down by religious belief.

Table *vii.* Recommended candidates by religious beliefs

	2011 Census	Applications	Shortlisted	Recommended
Church of England, Roman Catholic or Other Christian	59%	1,125 (48%)	339 (47%)	148 (49%)
Muslim	5%	111 (5%)	25 (3%)	10 (3%)
Hindu	1.5%	64 (3%)	19 (3%)	11 (4%)
Jewish	0.5%	81 (3%)	30 (4%)	12 (4%)
Sikh	0.8%	47 (2%)	12 (2%)	2 (0.7%)
Buddhist	0.4%	10 (0.4%)	7 (1%)	2 (0.7%)
Other religion	0.4%	38 (2%)	8 (1%)	1 (0.3%)
No religion	25%	505 (22%)	185 (25%)	84 (28%)
Declined/Incomplete	7%	342 (15%)	101 (14%)	35 (11%)

Explanatory Notes

For a description of the methodology used to create these statistics please see the Definitions and Measurement document published alongside this bulletin.

Glossary of Terms

A glossary of terms used in this bulletin is available from the JAC website: https://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sync/basic_page/glossary_of_terms_0.pdf

Contacts

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

Miranda Crusco
Statistician
Judicial Appointments Commission
7.07, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ
Tel: 020 3334 2820
Email: miranda.crusco@justice.gsi.gov.uk

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

Alan Crouch
Judicial Appointments Commission
1st floor, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ
Tel: 020 3334 5406
Email: alan.crouch@jac.gsi.gov.uk

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

Nora Brodian
Judicial Appointments Commission
1st floor, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ
Tel: 020 3334 5362
Email: communications@jac.gsi.gov.uk

General information about the Judicial Appointments Commission is available from https://jac.judiciary.gov.uk/about-us