

## Contents

Data included in this evidence pack:

- Table C1 – Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for all JAC exercises from 2011-12 to 2021-22, overall figures by year
- Tables C2(a) to C2(g) – Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for specific posts from 2011-12 to 2021-22, by year:
  - C2(a) – High Court Judge
  - C2(b) – Circuit Judge
  - C2(c) – District Judge
  - C2(d) – District Judge (Magistrates’ Court)
  - C2(e) – Judge of the First-tier Tribunal
  - C2(f) – Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)
  - C2(g) – Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)
- Tables C3(a) and C3(b) – Vacancies, applications and recommendations for individual JAC exercises reporting in 2021-22:
  - C3(a) – Court selection exercises
  - C3(b) – Tribunals selection exercises

For information about the diversity characteristics of individuals applying to and being recommended in JAC exercises reporting in 2021-22, see the [Diversity of the Judiciary 2022](#) report and associated data tables. For previous years’ diversity data, links to previous years’ statistics can be found on the JAC website: <https://judicialappointments.gov.uk/statistics-about-judicial-appointments/>.

**Table C1: Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for all JAC exercises from 2011-12 to 2021-22, overall figures by year**  
*Figures in this table have been compiled from published SSRB evidence and statistics, except for the number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day for the most recent year (2021-22).*

Year	Vacancies	Number of exercises reported in-year	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	25	5,490	No data	No data	746	7.4	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	No data	36	4,637	No data	No data	597	7.8	No data	No data	No data
2013-14	No data	35	5,591	No data	No data	806	6.9	No data	699	87%
2014-15	312	30	2,056	No data	No data	312	6.6	0	258	83%
2015-16	359	22	2,588	301	39	340	7.6	19	331	97%
2016-17	297	26	2,199	286	4	290	7.6	7	300	103%
2017-18	909	28	5,125	690	59	749	6.8	160	598	80%
2018-19	1,083	23	4,917	1,017	14	1,031	4.8	52	587	57%
2019-20	1,143	35	8,148	964	15	979	8.3	164	678	69%
2020-21	961	35	3,574	848	21	869	4.1	92	564	65%
2021-22	1,397	31	9,052	1,244	0	1,244	7.3	153	736	59%

**Notes:**

Prior to 2015-16 selections for immediate appointment and for a list for possible future appointment (under s94 CRA) were not separated for reporting purposes.

The number of vacancies the JAC has been asked to fill increased significantly in 2017-18 and has been gradually increasing since. The smaller number of vacancies in 2020-21 was largely due to that fact that two large exercises did not report within the reporting window for that year (Deputy District Judge and Fee-paid First-tier Tribunal Judge and Employment Judge). Additionally, many of the exercises that reported in the 2020-21 window were for roles which historically attract few applications per vacancy, hence the much lower applicants per selection figure seen last year.

Figures presented refer to individual applicants on a headcount basis, as opposed to the number of posts they apply for within an exercise. For example, individuals may apply simultaneously to both Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal, which are 2 separate posts, where they are run in a single selection exercise. However, where a candidate was successfully appointed to both posts applied for, this is reflected in the Selected figures by being counted twice, so that the extent to which the JAC was able to fill the vacancy request can be accurately calculated.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C2(a): High Court Judge**

*Figures in this table have been compiled from published SSRB evidence and statistics, except for the number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day for the most recent year (2021-22).*

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	14	No data	14	0	14	No data	0	24	171%
2013-14	10	No data	10	0	10	No data	0	16	160%
2014-15	11	73	10	0	10	7.3	1	15	150%
2015-16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2016-17	14	56	8	0	8	7.0	6	10	125%
2017-18	25	129	17	0	17	7.6	8	19	112%
2018-19	25	52	10	0	10	5.2	15	10	100%
2019-20	25	64	17	0	17	3.8	8	17	100%
2020-21	25	45	17	0	17	2.6	8	17	100%
2021-22	17	41	9	0	9	4.6	8	9	100%

**Notes:**

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section for explanation.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C2(b): Circuit Judge**

Figures in this table have been compiled from published SSRB evidence and statistics, except for the number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day for the most recent year (2021-22).

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013-14	54	No data	No data	No data	54	No data	0	64	119%
2014-15	53	232	21	32	53	4.4	0	54	102%
2015-16	62	246	48	14	62	4.0	0	48	77%
2016-17	55	184	42	2	44	4.2	11	25	57%
2017-18	116.5	401	98	6	104	3.9	13	89	86%
2018-19	94	200	60	12	72	2.8	22	53	74%
2019-20	50	164	30	13	43	3.8	7	29	67%
2020-21	63	175	53	0	53	3.3	10	41	77%
2021-22	92	225	62	0	62	3.6	30	39	63%

**Notes:**

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section above.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C2(c): District Judge**

*Figures in this table have been compiled from published SSRB evidence and statistics, except for the number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day for the most recent year (2021-22).*

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013-14	54	No data	No data	No data	54	No data	0	45	83%
2014-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2015-16	61	199	45	16	61	3.3	0	65	107%
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	100.5	271	70	26	96	2.8	5	53	55%
2018-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2019-20	110	190	47	0	47	4.0	63	27	57%
2020-21	75	141	24	0	24	5.9	51	10	42%
2021-22	106	249	57	0	57	4.4	49	22	39%

**Notes:**

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section above.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C2(d): District Judge (Magistrates' Court)**

*Application and selection figures in this table have been compiled from published statistics. However, figures for number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day have not previously been published.*

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2013-14	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2014-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2015-16	18	190	15	3	18	10.6	0	17	94%
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	17	127	12	5	17	7.5	0	12	71%
2018-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2019-20	25	93	17	0	17	5.5	8	9	53%
2020-21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2021-22	32	176	32	0	32	5.5	0	19	59%

**Notes:**

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section above.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C2(e): Judge of the First-tier Tribunal**

*Application and selection figures in this table have been compiled from published statistics. However, figures for number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day have not previously been published.*

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2013-14	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2014-15	6	46	6	0	6	7.7	0	4	67%
2015-16	1	23	1	0	1	23.0	0	1	100%
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	65	956	45	19	64	14.9	1	42	66%
2018-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2019-20	112	767	112	0	112	6.8	0	57	51%
2020-21	70	332	50	20	70	4.7	0	35	50%
2021-22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Notes:**

Prior to 2017-18, exercises for the First-tier Tribunal were chamber specific. From 2017-18 onwards, exercises have been generic, recruiting to all chambers.

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section above.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.



**Table C2(f): Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)**

*Application and selection figures in this table have been compiled from published statistics. However, figures for number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day have not previously been published.*

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2013-14	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2014-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2015-16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2018-19	59	420	59	0	59	7.1	0	23	39%
2019-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2020-21	25	62	21	0	21	3.0	4	9	43%
2021-22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Notes:**

Employment Tribunal fees introduced in 2013 caused cases to drop. Recruitment stagnated as fewer judges were needed until the abolition of fees in 2017.

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section above.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C2(g): Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)**

*Application and selection figures in this table have been compiled from published statistics. However, figures for number of vacancies and number of candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day have not previously been published.*

Year	Vacancies (s87 & s94)	Applications	Recommended for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total (s87 & s94)	Applicants per selection	Shortfall against vacancies	Number of A and B candidates at selection day	A & B candidates as a percentage of total selections
2011-12	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2012-13	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2013-14	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
2014-15	33	109	22	6	28	3.9	5	15	54%
2015-16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	30	50	15	0	15	3.3	15	10	67%
2018-19	285	1,623	285	0	285	5.7	0	161	56%
2019-20	219	1,764	219	0	219	8.1	0	148	68%
2020-21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2021-22	374	2,623	374	0	374	7.0	0	229	61%

**Notes:**

Prior to 2018-19, exercises for the First-tier Tribunal were chamber specific, and recruitment to the Employment Tribunal ran in isolation. From 2018-19 onwards, exercises have been generic, recruiting to all chambers as well as to the Employment Tribunal.

Where a row contains “-” for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given time period.

Where an entry in the above table reads “No data”, see the Data Sources & Caveats section above.

The JAC assesses candidates at selection days as outstanding (A), strong (B), selectable (C) or not presently selectable (D). 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.

**Table C3(a): Vacancies, applications and recommendations for individual JAC exercises reporting in 2021-22 – Courts**

*Figures in this table have been compiled from published statistics, except for the number of vacancies, which have not been previously published.*

Exercise Number	Exercise Title	Number of Immediate Vacancies (s87)	Number of Future List Vacancies (s94)	Number of Applicants	Recommendations for Immediate Appointment (s87)	Shortfall against VR (s87)	Selections for Future List (s94)	Shortfall against VR (s94)
<b><i>Salaried Exercises</i></b>								
JAC00019	District Judge	106	0	249	57	49	0	0
JAC00020	High Court Judge	17	0	41	9	8	0	0
JAC00032	District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)	32	0	176	32	0	0	0
JAC00036	Chief Chancery Master	1	0	4	1	0	0	0
JAC00056	Chancery Master	1	1	4	0	1	0	1
JAC00062	Circuit Judge	78	14	225	62	16	0	14
JAC00064	Senior Circuit Judge, Resident Judge	1	0	2	1	0	0	0
JAC00065	Senior Circuit Judge, Designated Civil Judge	1	0	4	1	0	0	0
JAC00092	Specialist Circuit Judge	2	0	9	2	0	0	0
<b><i>Fee Paid Exercises</i></b>								
JAC00007	Deputy District Judge	150	0	2,246	136	14	0	0
JAC00024	s9(4) Deputy High Court Judge	40	0	216	40	0	0	0
JAC00033	Recorder	164	0	1,043	164	0	0	0
JAC00035	s9(1) Authorisation to Act as Judges of the High Court	39	0	64	39	0	0	0

JAC00044	Deputy Costs Judge	5	0	60	5	0	0	0
JAC00051	Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts)	55	0	1,000	55	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>692</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5,343</b>	<b>604</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>

**Table C3(b): Vacancies, applications and recommendations for individual JAC exercises reporting in 2021-22 – Tribunals**

*Figures in this table have been compiled from published statistics, except for the number of vacancies, which have not been previously published.*

Exercise Number	Exercise Title	Legal or Non-Legal	Number of Immediate Vacancies (s87)	Number of Future List Vacancies (s94)	Number of Applicants	Recommendations for Immediate Appointment (s87)	Shortfall against VR (s87)	Selections for Future List (s94)	Shortfall against VR (s94)
<b>Salaried Exercises</b>									
JAC00049	President of the Competition Appeal Tribunal	Legal	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
JAC00061	Salaried Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Administrative Appeals Chamber	Legal	4	0	45	4	0	0	0
JAC00063	Regional Judge of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber	Legal	2	0	10	2	0	0	0
JAC00090	Chamber President of First-tier Tribunal, General Regulatory Chamber	Legal	1	0	9	1	0	0	0
<b>Fee Paid Exercises</b>									
JAC00010	Fee-paid Specialist Lay Members, First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health) and Fee-paid Specialist Lay Members of the Mental Health Review Tribunal for Wales	Non-legal	136	0	322	120*	0*	0	0
JAC00014	Fee-paid Legal Members of the Mental Health Review Tribunal for Wales	Legal	20	0	200	19	1	0	0

JAC00017	Fee Paid Member of the Upper Tribunal assigned to the Administrative Appeals Chamber (Traffic) and First-tier Tribunal General Regulatory Chamber (Transport)	Non-legal	10	0	16	6	4	0	0
JAC00021	Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)	Legal	374	0	2,623	250**	0**	0	0
JAC00027***	Chair of the Valuation Tribunal for England	Non-legal	41	0	58	41	0	0	0
JAC00031	Fee Paid Medical Member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal for Wales	Non-legal	17	0	26	14	3	0	0
JAC00037	Employment Appeal Tribunal Lay Members, for England, Wales & Scotland	Non-legal	19	0	200	13	6	0	0
JAC00048	Fee-paid Valuer Chairs and Fee-paid Valuer Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Residential Property	Non-legal	25	0	44	14	11	0	0
JAC00052	Fee-paid Member of the First-tier Tribunal assigned to the General Regulatory Chamber (Environment)	Non-legal	6	0	12	2	4	0	0

JAC00068	Fee-paid Judge of the Restricted Patients Panel, First-tier Tribunal, Health, Education and Social Care Chamber (Mental Health)	Legal	30	0	62	9	21	0	0
JAC00069	Chair of the Plant Varieties and Seeds Tribunal	Legal	1	0	51	1	0	0	0
JAC00073	Deputy Judge of the Upper Tribunal, Tax and Chancery Chamber	Legal	3	0	30	3	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>690</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,709</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

\* 16 individuals applied for and were recommended to both roles in exercise JAC00010, meaning that the VR of 136 was met.

\*\* 124 individuals applied to and were recommended for both roles in exercise JAC00021, meaning that the VR of 374 was met.

\*\*\* There is no remuneration for the post of Chairman of the Valuation Tribunal for England, it is carried out on a voluntary basis.