



Annex C: Evidence from the Judicial Appointments Commission to the  
Senior Salaries Review Body: Breakdown of pay group data and key salaried exercises

February 2018

Annex C: Breakdown of data by pay group and key salaried exercises

Salaried Pay group	2012–13			2013–14			2014–15			2015–16			2016–17			2017–18 (part year) <sup>1</sup>		
	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A + B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A + B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A + B grades compared to selections	Shortfall
4	14	171% (24)	-	10	160% (16)	-	10	150% (15)	1	-	-	-	8	125% (10)	6	17	100% (17)	8
5	11	227% (25)	-	8	125% (10)	-	7	157% (11)	-	2	50% (1)	-	21	129% (27)	11	6	100% (6)	-
6.1	-	-	-	64	122% (78)	-	69	100% (69)	-	63	78% (49)	-	48	65% (31)	0	113	82% (93)	12.5
6.2	2	50% (1)	-	-	-	-	2	150% (3)	-	-	-	-	1	200% (2)	-	-	-	-
7	46	111% (51)	1	85	85% (72)	1	9	89% (8)	1	90	100% (90)	1	2	100% (2)	-	182	61% (111)	6
Total	74	136% (101)	1	169	103% (174)	1	98	108% (106)	2	155	90% (140)	1	80	90% (72)	17	318	71% (227)	26.5

Fee-paid posts	2012–13			2013–14			2014–15			2015–16			2016–17			2017–18 (part year) <sup>1</sup>		
	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	Total number of selections	% A + B grades compared to selections	Shortfall	Total number of selections	% A + B graded candidates compared to no. of selections	Shortfall	Total number of selections	% A + B graded candidates compared to no. of selections	Shortfall
Legal	337	67% (226)	65	134	112% (150)	-	157	82% (129)	8	137	107% (147)	-	73	126% (92)	4	9	200% (18)	-
Non-legal	186	79% (147)	1	503	75% (375)	8	55	80% (44)	-	48	94% (45)	22	137	99% (136)	2	-	-	-
Total	523	71% (371)	66	637	82% (525)	8	212	82% (174)	8	185	104% (192)	22	210	109% (228)	6	9	200% (18)	-
<b>All posts</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>79% (472)</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>87% (699)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>90% (280)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>98% (332)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>103% (300)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>75% (245)</b>	<b>26.5</b>

<sup>1</sup> The 2017–18 figures cover three quarters of the reporting year from April to December 2017.

Annex C: Breakdown of data by pay group and key salaried exercises

The table above shows the breakdown of selections and candidate gradings in salaried exercises by pay group, and by fee-paid roles. It is important to note that gradings are an internal assessment measure of a candidate's performance in a particular selection exercise and against the specific criteria for that role at that time; they do not indicate performance upon appointment. Caution should be exercised when comparing gradings awarded across a period of years.

Where the percentage of outstanding (A) and strong (B) grades compared to selections is greater than 100%, there were more outstanding and strong candidates than there were candidates selected. In some competitions (for example in pay group 4 in 2016–17) there were both more outstanding and strong candidates than the total number of selections, and also a shortfall in vacancies filled. This occurs when outstanding or strong candidates cannot be placed in one or more specific legal jurisdiction (or geographical location as occurred in pay group 5 2016–17). In High Court exercises during this period, only candidates assessed as outstanding or strong were recommended for appointment.

Role	2012–13			2013–14			2014–15			2015–16			2016–17			2017–18 (part year) <sup>2</sup>		
	Vacancies	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Vacancies	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Vacancies	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Vacancies	No. of selections	% A and B grades compared to selections	Vacancies	No. of selections	% A + B grades compared to selections	Vacancies	No. of selections	% A + B grades compared to selections
High Court Judge	14	14	171% (24)	10	10	160% (16)	11	10	150% (15)	-	-	-	14	8	125% (10)	25	17	100% (17)
Circuit Judge	-	-	-	54	54	119% (64)	32	53	102% (54)	61	62	77% (48)	55	44	57% (25)	116.5	104	76% (79)
District Judge (Mags)		16	94% (15)		1	200% (2)	-	-	-		20	95% (19)	-	-	-	17	17	71% (12)
District Judge (Civil)		-	-		54	83% (45)	-	-	-		61	107% (65)	-	-	-	100.5	96	55% (53)

<sup>2</sup> The 2017–18 figures cover three quarters of the reporting year from April to December 2017.

Annex C: Breakdown of data by pay group and key salaried exercises

Upper Tribunal	3	3	200% (6)	8	8	125% (10)	6	12	75% (9)	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	180% (9)
Salaried First-tier Tribunal	5	5	160% (8)	32	31	81% (25)	10	10	100% (10)	4	4	75% (3)	4	4	125% (6)	65	64	66% (42)

The table above indicates the grades of candidates in some of the highest-profile roles that the JAC selects for. In High Court, District Judge (Mags) and District Judge (Civil and Family) there have been decreases in the percentages of A and B graded candidates compared to selections. This decreasing trend was evident in Circuit Judge over the reporting years 2013–14 to 2016–17, although both Circuit Judge and Upper Tribunal roles saw an increase in percentages of A and B candidates in exercises reporting in 2017–18 from 2016–17.

Upper Tribunal data is included as a high-level comparator, for which the quality data trend has been different from the recent High Court and Circuit Judge exercises, but has not produced a steady trend taken over the last five reporting years. In these roles, other than Upper Tribunal roles, there has been a decreasing trend in the percentage of candidates graded A and B to the number of selections made.

It is important to note that the numbers of candidates assessed as A or B grade do not reflect the same downward trend as the proportions to vacancies. For example, both the last High Court and Circuit Judge competitions resulted in the highest number of A and B graded candidates from any such exercise across the period 2012-18.

<b>Pay Groups of salaried judges</b>	<b>Category of judges included</b>
4	High Court Judges - President, Employment Appeal Tribunal - Presidents of the Upper Tribunal
5	Senior Circuit Judges - Specialist Circuit Judges - Circuit Judges of the Central Criminal Court
6.1	Circuit Judges - Senior Costs Judges - Chief Chancery Master - Chief Taxing Master
6.2	Deputy Senior District Judge (Magistrates Court) - Principal Judge, First-tier Tribunal (Property Chamber)
7	District Judges - Costs Judges - Employment Judges - Judges of the First-tier Tribunal