

Background

The Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) is responsible for selecting candidates for judicial office on merit, through fair and open competition. It is an executive non-departmental public body sponsored by the Ministry of Justice. An outline of selection processes is provided on its website.

The JAC

The JAC was established by the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 (CRA). It has responsibility for selecting candidates for judicial office in courts and tribunals in England and Wales, and for some tribunals with a UK-wide jurisdiction.

The Commission has 3 main statutory duties under the CRA:

- To select candidates solely on merit
- To select only people of good character
- To have regard to the need to encourage diversity in the range of persons available for selection for appointment.

The JAC runs a selection exercise in response to a vacancy request from the Lord Chancellor setting out the number of posts, the jurisdiction and/or the circuit or region. Each year the JAC agrees with the MoJ, HM Courts & Tribunals Service and Judicial Office which selection exercises are to be programmed for the following financial year.

Evidence for the SSRB

In response to an annual request for evidence from the Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB), the JAC provides written evidence relating to judicial selection exercises, which is then published on the JAC website for wider access. This evidence is used by the SSRB to inform their annual review of judicial pay and their recommendation for the pay award for the judiciary. We also provide evidence to support the SSRB's major reviews of judicial salary structures when these take place.

Contents

Included in this evidence pack:

- Data sources and caveats
- JAC commentary on current trends
- Table C1 – Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for all JAC exercises from 2011-12 to 2025-26, overall figures by year
- Tables C2(a) to C2(g) – Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for specific salaried posts from 2012-13 to 2025-26*, 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)
- Tables C3(a) to C3(e) – Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for specific fee-paid posts from 2016-17 to 2025-26*, by year:
 - C3(a) – S9(4) Deputy High Court Judge
 - C3(b) – Recorder
 - C3(c) – Deputy District Judge
 - C3(d) – Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court)
 - C3(e) – Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)

For information about the diversity characteristics of individuals applying to and being recommended in JAC exercises reporting in 2025-26, see the [Diversity of the Judiciary 2026](#) statistics report and associated data tables. Links to previous years' statistics can be found on the [Gov.uk website](#), with years earlier than 2020 saved on the [JAC's archived statistics page](#).

*Where a selection exercise falling into the 2026-27 window is currently ongoing, this is indicated in the tables. Where an exercise falling into the 2026-27 window has already completed, as of 15 September 2026, data for this exercise is provided.

Data Sources & Caveats

Figures presented for the years 2011-12 to 2013-14 are taken from the JAC's Annual Report for the relevant year whilst figures for 2014-15 onwards are taken from the JAC's Official Statistics (now part of the combined Diversity of the Judiciary Report) and data from the JAC Programme Office.

Data presented in this evidence pack is presented on a slightly different basis to the Official Statistics, where the number of applications and recommendations within selection exercises is presented for diversity purposes. As a result, the number of applicants and selections within selection exercises may differ slightly. Most notably, when the same individual is recommended for two roles in the same exercise (e.g., an individual recommended as both a Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and a Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal in Table C2(g)), this is counted as two selections here, but one in the Official Statistics.

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 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.

Where the percentage of outstanding and strong grades compared to selections is greater than 100%, there were more outstanding and strong candidates than there were candidates selected. This usually indicates that the number of vacancies available was less than the number of candidates assessed as outstanding or strong. In some competitions 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 the specific legal jurisdiction or geographical location where vacancies arise. For example, see the row for 2014-15 in Table C2(a).

In Tables C2 and C3, where a row contains "-" for every entry, this indicates that there was no selection exercise for this role reporting in the given period. Data on individual exercises is not held for years prior to 2012-13, hence these tables begin one year later than Table C1. Data for key fee-paid courts roles was collated for the first time as part of evidence for the 2026 annual pay review. Data for these exercises is not held for years prior to 2016-17.

Figures for the ongoing reporting year 2026-27 remain subject to minor changes, following full quality assurance of statistics at the end of the year.

JAC Commentary on Trends

This enclosed evidence covers the reporting period 2011-12 to 2025-26, consistent with previous evidence submissions. Recognising that at time of producing this evidence we are midway through the reporting year 2026-27, with several key exercises for the year having launched and a small number completed, we have included, where possible, data from the current year and provide up to date commentary below on trends observed.

- The number of vacancies the JAC was requested to fill remained stable at 1,051 for 2025-26, compared with 1,066 in 2024-25 and 1,010 in 2023-24. In response to a request from the Ministry of Justice, the JAC has now increased its capacity, to deliver up to 40 exercises and up to 1200 recommendations each year. However, vacancy requests at present remain below the peak levels of 1,200+ seen in 2021-22 and 2022-23.
- A larger number of vacancies were for future appointments (s94) than in previous years. These were predominantly for Deputy District Judges (Magistrates' Courts) (86) and Fee-paid Lay Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Property Chamber (60). For the former, this was to allow flexibility to respond quickly to the Independent Review of the Criminal Courts. Following receipt of a further vacancy request, all candidates selected for the list have since been considered for appointment and the list subsequently closed. For the latter, the s94 list was established to react to increased demand on the chamber resulting from the Leasehold and Freehold Reform Act (LFRA) and the Renters Rights Act (RRA). We are currently in the process of selecting candidates from the list to recommend for immediate appointment.
- The JAC processed a slightly smaller number of applications than in the previous year, and therefore, the number of applicants per selection decreased to 6.3, which is slightly lower than the average for recent years.
- 2025/26 saw shortfalls between the number of candidates selected for appointment and the number of vacancies in 6 legal exercises, out of 26. These came to a total of 71 immediate vacancies out of 658 (11%), or 76 out of 751 (10%) including future vacancies (s94s).
- The majority (41) of this shortfall occurred in the District Judge exercise recruiting to the South East circuit, against a vacancy request of 80. This followed the JAC taking a regional approach to District Judge recruitment in 2025-26, with another separate competition recruiting to circuits outside of the South East, for which the full vacancy request was met. Although there was a shortfall for the South East, the approach yielded a significantly higher number of recommendations for this circuit than previous national exercises. Given persistent shortfalls for District Judge since 2019-20 (see Table C2(c)), these results were more positive, and lessons from these exercises have shaped the approach to future recruitment.
- 31 of the other 35 unfilled vacancies were in exercises recruiting for salaried judges of the First-tier Tribunal – 22 immediate vacancies out of 94 in a large exercise recruiting to 4 chambers, and 9 vacancies out of 15 (4 immediate and 5 future) for an exercise recruiting to the Property Chamber only. A third exercise, with a vacancy request of 4, recruiting to the Tax Chamber only, had no shortfall. This continues a trend of shortfalls for salaried judges of the First-tier Tribunal exercises in the last three years (Table C2(e)).
- There were very small shortfalls for Circuit Judge (1, against a vacancy request of 38) and Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (2, against a vacancy request of 36). For the latter, this was a positive result in the context of more substantial shortfalls in the previous two exercises.
- There was a shortfall of just 1 across all legal fee-paid roles¹, which reflects the long-term trends, demonstrated by tables C3 (a) to (e), that fee-paid positions see high numbers of applications and the JAC is rarely unable to meet vacancy requests in these exercises.

¹ This was for Fee-paid Appointed Person of the Appeal Tribunal (Registered and Unregistered Design)

- Overall, the ratio of candidates assessed as outstanding or strong at selection days to candidates selected decreased in 2025-26 to 52%, from 54% the previous year, and follows a sustained long-term decrease. We emphasise throughout this evidence pack that this metric should be treated with a high degree of caution.
- As in previous years, District Judge and Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal exercises have had A/B ratios of less than 50%. A new trend has been that legal fee-paid exercises, which historically had high A/B ratios, had overall the same A/B ratio as legal salaried exercises (both 53%). Taking Recorder as an example (Table C3(b)), the exercise reporting in 2025-26 had an A/B ratio of 45%, significantly lower than the previous year (68%), and the absolute number of candidates at selection day assessed as being strong or outstanding was 39, compared with 68 in 2024-25 and 128 in 2019-20. One exception to note is that while the A/B ratio for Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts) was lower than usual at 40% (Table C3(d)), this was a result of the vacancy request being extended to accept all selectable candidates – the absolute number of strong or outstanding candidates at selection day was significantly higher than in previous exercises.
- The JAC was asked to fill a smaller number of vacancies for non-legal tribunal member roles in 2025-26 (300) than in 2024-25 (539). 242 candidates were recommended for these roles, with a combined shortfall of 58 (19%).
- The shortfalls comprised 35 Fee-paid Lay Members of the First-tier Tribunal Property Chamber (Residential Property), all future list vacancies against a vacancy request of 40 immediate vacancies and 60 future list²; 12³ Fee-paid Valuer Chairs and Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Property Chamber (Residential Property) against a vacancy request of 30; 7 Fee-paid Medical Members of the Mental Health Review Tribunal for Wales, against a vacancy request of 20; and 4 Fee-paid Medical Members of the First-tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber (Social Security and Child Support), against a vacancy request of 130.

² 60 was understood to be an ambitious target, with this being the first time the JAC had run a competition for this role. However, given the expectation of significant increases in workload for the chamber, aiming for a high number to include on a s94 list was considered an efficient and flexible means to manage uncertainty.

³ This shortfall breaks down as 10 Chairs and 2 Members.

Table C1: Vacancies, applications, recommendations and gradings for all JAC exercises from 2011-12 to 2025-26, overall figures by year

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published 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 (2025-26).

Year	Vacancies	Number of exercises reported in-year	Applications	Selected for immediate appointments (s87)	Selected for future appointments (s94)	Total selections (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	1,383	31	9,052	1,244	0	1,244	7.3	139	736	59%
2022-23	1,233	36	7,366	1,094	0	1,094	6.7	139	696	64%
2023-24	1,010	35	6,964	862	5	867	8.1	143	555	64%
2024-25	1,066	34	6,378	914	30	944	6.8	122	507	54%
2025-26	1,051	34	5,801	804	113	917	6.3	134	480	52%

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 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 previously published statistics, except for the number of applications, selections and candidates assessed as A (outstanding) or B (strong) at selection day for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
2012-13	14	81	14	0	14	5.8	0	24	171%
2013-14	10	73	10	0	10	7.3	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%
2022-23	10	47	10	0	10	4.7	0	12	120%
2023-24	2	18	2	0	2	9.0	0	4	200%
2024-25	5	24	5	0	5	4.8	0	5	100%
2025-26	10	60	10	0	10	6.0	0	19	190%
2026-27 to date	14	74	14	0	14	5.3	0	24	171%

Notes:

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 previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
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	78	225	62	0	62	3.6	16	39	63%
2022-23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2023-24	92	250	92	0	92	2.7	0	54	59%
2024-25	52	215	42	0	42	5.1	10	26	62%
2025-26	38	175	37	0	37	4.8	1	19	51%
2026-27 to date	64	278	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Notes:

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 previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
2012-13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013-14	54	322	No data	No data	54	6.0	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%
2022-23	100	247	67	0	67	3.7	33	27	40%
2023-24	100	237	49	0	49	4.8	51	19	39%
2024-25	100	291	51	0	51	5.7	49	20	39%
2025-26	110	327	67	2	69	4.7	41	30	43%
2026-27 to date	70	206	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Notes: The 2025-26 row captures two District Judge exercises. One recruited for 80 vacancies in London and the South East only, while the other recruited for 30 vacancies (including 2 future list vacancies) on all circuits other than London and the South East. The 2026-27 row captures a single ongoing national exercise.

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)

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
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%
2022-23	25	116	19	0	19	6.1	6	6	32%
2023-24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2024-25	30	197	25	0	25	7.9	5	10	40%
2025-26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2026-27 to date	30	153	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Notes:

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

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2022-23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2023-24	70	358	47	0	47	7.6	23	13	28%
2024-25	18	143	12	0	12	11.9	6	6	50%
2025-26	113	470	82	0	82	5.7	31	26	32%
2026-27 to date	82	536	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Notes:

Prior to 2017-18, exercises for the First-tier Tribunal were chamber specific. From 2017-18 to 2022-23, exercises were purely generic, recruiting to all chambers. Whilst we continue to operate generic recruitment campaigns for the First-tier Tribunal, since 2022-23, we have also run specific recruitment for the Tax and Property chambers given the specialist nature of the roles, in addition to recruitment for the General Regulatory Chamber due to the chamber's small headcount and array of jurisdictions.

The 2024-25 row captures two chamber-specific exercises, recruiting to the General Regulatory and Property chambers. The 2025-26 row captures two chamber-specific exercises, recruiting to the Property and Tax chambers, as well as one larger combined exercise recruiting to a further four chambers. The

2026-27 row captures two exercises, one recruiting to the Immigration and Asylum Chamber, and another combined exercise for the Health Education and Social Care (HESC) and Social Entitlement (SEC) chambers.

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)

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2022-23	50	138	35	0	35	3.9	15	16	46%
2023-24	50	75	20	0	20	3.8	30	5	25%
2024-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2025-26	36	136	34	0	34	4.0	2	17	50%
2026-27 to date	55	131	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Notes:

The number of applications for 2025-26 has been revised from the figure previously published (137) following quality assurance.

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

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): S9(4) Deputy High Court Judge

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
2016-17	21	297	21	0	21	14.1	0	39	186%
2017-18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2018-19	31	190	31	0	31	6.1	0	31	100%
2019-20	20	142	20	0	20	7.1	0	20	100%
2020-21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2021-22	40	216	40	0	40	5.4	0	50	125%
2022-23	28	238	28	0	28	8.5	0	45	161%
2023-24	28	199	28	0	28	7.1	0	40	143%
2024-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2025-26	27	252	27	0	27	9.3	0	46	170%
2026-27 to date	45	307	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Notes:

Data is not available for selection exercises reporting prior to 2016-17 for this role.

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(b): Recorder

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics.

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
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	150	2425	150	0	150	16.2	0	157	105%
2018-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2019-20	160	1233	160	0	160	7.7	0	128	80%
2020-21	121	1001	121	0	121	8.3	0	76	63%
2021-22	164	1043	164	0	164	6.4	0	97	59%
2022-23	164	1,292	164	0	164	7.9	0	88	54%
2023-24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2024-25	100	1,134	100	0	100	11.3	0	68	68%
2025-26	87	1,180	87	0	87	13.6	0	39	45%
2026-27 to date	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes:

Data is not available for selection exercises reporting prior to 2016-17 for this role. There is a Recorder exercise currently ongoing, with a vacancy request of 128, but it is not due to report until the 2027-28 reporting year.

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(c): Deputy District Judge

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics.

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
2016-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017-18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2018-19	325	1,704	320	0	320	5.3	5	151	47%
2019-20	200	1,417	151	0	151	9.4	49	77	51%
2020-21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2021-22	150	2,246	136	0	136	16.5	14	58	43%
2022-23	213	2,266	213	0	213	10.6	0	123	58%
2023-24	116	2,135	116	0	116	18.4	0	47	41%
2024-25	155	2,267	125	30	155	14.6	0	71	46%
2025-26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2026-27 to date	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes:

Data is not available for selection exercises reporting prior to 2016-17 for this role.

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(d): Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Court)

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics.

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
2016-17	18	1,148	18	0	18	63.8	0	20	111%
2017-18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2018-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2019-20	30	874	30	0	30	29.1	0	34	113%
2020-21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2021-22	55	1,000	55	0	55	18.2	0	27	49%
2022-23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2023-24	15	635	15	0	15	42.3	0	24	160%
2024-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2025-26	136	849	50	86	136	6.2	0	55	40%
2026-27 to date	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes:

Data is not available for selection exercises reporting prior to 2016-17 for this role.

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(e): Fee-paid Judge of the First-tier Tribunal and Fee-paid Judge of the Employment Tribunals (England and Wales)

Figures in this table have been compiled from previously published statistics, except for the number of applications for the most recent year (2026-27).

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
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%
2022-23	217	1,346	217	0	217	6.2	0	173	80%
2023-24	231	1,775	231	0	231	7.7	0	178	77%
2024-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2025-26	166	1,540	166	0	166	9.3	0	79	48%
2026-27 to date	265	2,569	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

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 to 2023-24, exercises were generic, recruiting to all chambers as well as to the Employment Tribunals. In 2025-26, a single exercise recruited to the First-tier Tribunal only, with no vacancies for the Employment Tribunals. For 2026-27, there are three separate exercises recruiting for fee-paid judges of the First-tier Tribunal: two chamber-specific exercises, for the Property and Immigration and Asylum Chambers, and one generic exercise for a further three chambers. There is no ongoing recruitment for fee-paid judges of the Employment Tribunals. This should be noted when considering year-on-year trends.

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.