

## Annex A: Supporting Tables



### **Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales)**

- Table 1.1 Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009
- Table 1.2 Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009
- Table 1.3 Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009
- Table 1.4 Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009
- Table 1.5 Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009

### **Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales)**

- Table 2.1 Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 2.2 Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 2.3 Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 2.4 Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 2.5 Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

### **Salaried Judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland)**

- Table 3.1 Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Salaried Judge of First-Tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 3.2 Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

- Table 3.3 Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 3.4 Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Scotland and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 3.5 Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

#### **Recorder (South Eastern Circuit)**

- Table 4.1 Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 4.2 Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 4.3 Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 4.4 Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009
- Table 4.5 Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

#### **Grouped small exercises**

- Table 5.1 Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009
- Table 5.2 Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009
- Table 5.3 Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009
- Table 5.4 Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009

Table 1.1: Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009

Group	Size of eligible pool		Applications received	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage of group in eligible pool
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	57,639	63%	369	0.6%
Female	33,415	37%	250	0.7%
Unknown (1)	n/a	n/a	5	n/a
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	83,807	92%	527	0.6%
BME	7,247	8%	82	1.1%
Unknown / any other (1)	n/a	n/a	15	n/a
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	77,909	86%	452	0.6%
Barrister	13,145	14%	142	1.0%
Unknown / any other (1)	n/a	n/a	30	n/a
<b>All</b>	<b>91,054</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>0.7%</b>

Sources: Law Society, Judicial Office, Bar Council, Judicial Appointments Commission Equitas database.

(1) Figures used for the eligible pool do not have unknown demographics.

Table 1.2: Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009

<b>Group</b>	<b>Applications received</b>	<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>Recommendations for appointment</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	369	40	16
Female	250	35	20
Unknown	5	0	0
<b>Ethnic background</b>			
White	527	68	33
BME	82	5	2
Unknown	7	1	0
Any other	8	1	1
<b>Professional background</b>			
Solicitor	452	62	27
Barrister	142	12	8
ILEX	14	0	0
Unknown / any other	16	1	1
<b>Disability status</b>			
Candidate with disability	37	5	2
Candidate without disability	587	70	34
<b>All</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>36</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 1.3: Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Shortlisted	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	369	59%	40	11%
Female	250	40%	35	14%
Unknown	5	1%	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	527	84%	68	13%
BME	82	13%	5	6%
Unknown / any other	15	2%	2	(13%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	452	72%	62	14%
Barrister	142	23%	12	8%
ILEX	14	2%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	16	3%	1	(6%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	37	6%	5	14%
Candidate without disability	587	94%	70	12%
<b>All</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>12%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 1.4: Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	369	59%	16	4%
Female	250	40%	20	8%
Unknown	5	1%	1	(20%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	527	85%	33	6%
BME	82	13%	2	2%
Unknown / any other	15	2%	1	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	452	72%	27	6%
Barrister	142	23%	8	6%
ILEX	14	2%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	16	3%	1	(6%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	37	6%	2	5%
Candidate without disability	587	94%	34	6%
<b>All</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>6%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 1.5: Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Fee Paid Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed between April-September 2009

Group	Shortlisted		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of applications from group	Number	Percentage of shortlisted applicants from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	40	11%	16	40%
Female	35	14%	20	57%
Unknown	5	(0%)	1	(20%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	68	13%	33	49%
BME	5	6%	2	(40%)
Unknown / any other	2	(13%)	1	(1%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	62	14%	27	44%
Barrister	12	9%	8	(67%)
ILEX	0	(0%)	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	1	(6%)	1	(100%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	5	14%	2	(40%)
Candidate without disability	70	12%	34	49%
<b>All</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>47%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 2.1: Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Size of eligible pool		Applications received	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage of group in eligible pool
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	3,093	81%	77	2%
Female	727	19%	53	7%
Unknown (1)	n/a	n/a	3	n/a
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	2,970	78%	109	4% (2)
BME	156	4%	20	13% (2)
Unknown / any other (1)	694	18%	4	1% (2)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	1,536	40%	90	6%
Barrister	2,284	60%	36	1%
Unknown / any other (1)	n/a	n/a	7	n/a
<b>All</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>3%</b>

Sources: Law Society, Judicial Office, Bar Council, Judicial Appointments Commission Equitas database.

(1) Figures used for the eligible pool do not have unknown demographics.

(2) Figures for applications received as a percentage of the eligible pool by ethnic background are distorted by large proportion of eligible pool being unknown.

Table 2.2: Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

<b>Group</b>	<b>Applications received</b>	<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>Recommendations for appointment</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	77	26	14
Female	53	23	13
Unknown	3	1	0
<b>Ethnic background</b>			
White	109	45	24
BME	20	4	3
Unknown	3	0	0
Any other	1	1	0
<b>Professional background</b>			
Solicitor	91	35	18
Barrister	36	14	9
ILEX	2	0	0
Unknown / any other	4	1	0
<b>Disability status</b>			
Candidate with disability	7	2	2
Candidate without disability	126	48	25
<b>All</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>27</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 2.3: Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Shortlisted	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	77	58%	26	34%
Female	53	40%	23	43%
Unknown	3	2%	1	(33%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	109	82%	45	41%
BME	20	15%	4	20%
Unknown / any other	4	3%	1	(25%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	91	68%	35	38%
Barrister	36	27%	14	39%
ILEX	2	2%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	4	3%	1	(25%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	7	5%	2	(29%)
Candidate without disability	126	95%	48	38%
<b>All</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>38%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 2.4: Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	77	58%	14	18%
Female	53	40%	13	25%
Unknown	3	2%	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	109	82%	24	22%
BME	20	15%	3	15%
Unknown / any other	4	3%	0	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	91	68%	18	20%
Barrister	36	27%	9	25%
ILEX	2	2%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	4	3%	0	(0%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	7	5%	2	(29%)
Candidate without disability	126	95%	25	20%
<b>All</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 2.5: Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the Employment Tribunal (England and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Shortlisted		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of applications from group	Number	Percentage of shortlisted applicants from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	26	34%	14	54%
Female	23	43%	13	57%
Unknown	1	(33%)	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	45	41%	24	56%
BME	4	20%	3	(75%)
Unknown / any other	1	(25%)	0	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	35	38%	18	51%
Barrister	14	39%	9	(64%)
ILEX	0	(0%)	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	1	(25%)	0	(0%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	2	(29%)	2	(100%)
Candidate without disability	48	38%	25	52%
<b>All</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>54%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 3.1: Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Salaried Judge of First-Tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Size of eligible pool		Applications received	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage of group in eligible pool
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	3,093	81%	113	4%
Female	727	19%	95	13%
Unknown (1)	n/a	n/a	5	n/a
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	2,970	78%	173	6% (2)
BME	156	4%	35	22% (2)
Unknown / any other (1)	694	18%	5	1% (2)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	1,536	40%	146	10%
Barrister	2,284	60%	43	2%
Unknown / any other (1)	n/a	n/a	24	n/a
<b>All</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>6%</b>

Sources: Law Society, Judicial Office, Bar Council, Judicial Appointments Commission Equitas database.

(1) Figures used for the eligible pool do not have unknown demographics.

(2) Figures for applications received as a percentage of the eligible pool by ethnic background are distorted by large proportion of eligible pool being unknown.

Table 3.2: Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

<b>Group</b>	<b>Applications received</b>	<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>Recommendations for appointment</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	113	16	7
Female	95	18	10
Unknown	5	0	0
<b>Ethnic background</b>			
White	173	32	15
BME	35	2	2
Unknown	4	0	0
Any other	1	0	0
<b>Professional background</b>			
Solicitor	146	29	16
Barrister	43	5	1
ILEX	3	0	0
Unknown / any other	21	0	0
<b>Disability status</b>			
Candidate with disability	15	2	0
Candidate without disability	198	32	17
<b>All</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 3.3: Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Salaried Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Shortlisted	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	113	53%	16	14%
Female	95	45%	18	19%
Unknown	5	2%	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	173	81%	32	18%
BME	35	16%	2	6%
Unknown / any other	5	3%	0	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	146	69%	29	20%
Barrister	43	20%	5	12%
ILEX	3	1%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	21	10%	0	0%
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	15	7%	2	(13%)
Candidate without disability	198	93%	32	16%
<b>All</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>16%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 3.4: Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Scotland and Wales) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	113	53%	7	6%
Female	95	45%	10	11%
Unknown	5	2%	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	173	81%	15	9%
BME	35	16%	2	6%
Unknown / any other	5	3%	0	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	146	69%	16	11%
Barrister	43	20%	1	2%
ILEX	3	1%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	21	10%	0	0%
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	15	7%	0	(0%)
Candidate without disability	198	93%	17	9%
<b>All</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 3.5: Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Salaried Judge of First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) (England, Wales and Scotland) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Shortlisted		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of applications from group	Number	Percentage of shortlisted applicants from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	16	14%	7	(44%)
Female	18	19%	10	(56%)
Unknown	0	(0%)	0	n/a
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	32	18%	15	47%
BME	2	6%	2	(100%)
Unknown / any other	0	(0%)	0	n/a
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	29	20%	16	55%
Barrister	5	12%	1	(20%)
ILEX	0	(0%)	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	0	0%	0	n/a
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	2	(13%)	0	(0%)
Candidate without disability	32	16%	17	53%
<b>All</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>50%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 4.1: Size of the eligible pool, and applications received as a proportion of the eligible pool, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Size of eligible pool		Applications received	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage of group in eligible pool
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	52,425	65%	637	1.2%
Female	27,656	35%	308	1.1%
Unknown (1)	n/a	n/a	37	n/a
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	74,413	93%	779	1.0%
BME	5,668	7%	137	2.4%
Unknown / any other (1)	n/a	n/a	66	n/a
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	68,091	85%	249	0.4%
Barrister	11,990	15%	675	5.6%
Unknown / any other (1)	n/a	n/a	58	n/a
<b>All</b>	<b>80,081</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>1.2%</b>

Sources: Law Society, Judicial Office, Bar Council, Judicial Appointments Commission Equitas database.

(1) Figures used for the eligible pool do not have unknown demographics.

Table 4.2: Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

<b>Group</b>	<b>Applications received</b>	<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>Recommendations for appointment</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	637	216	78
Female	308	87	47
Unknown	37	8	3
<b>Ethnic background</b>			
White	779	262	108
BME	137	36	17
Unknown	49	10	0
Any other	17	3	3
<b>Professional background</b>			
Solicitor	249	46	14
Barrister	675	250	110
ILEX	0	0	0
Unknown / any other	58	15	4
<b>Disability status</b>			
Candidate with disability	33	9	4
Candidate without disability	949	302	124
<b>All</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>128</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 4.3: Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Shortlisted	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	637	65%	216	34%
Female	308	31%	87	28%
Unknown	37	4%	8	22%
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	779	79%	262	34%
BME	137	14%	36	26%
Unknown / any other	66	7%	13	20%
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	249	25%	46	18%
Barrister	675	69%	250	37%
ILEX	0	0%	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	58	6%	15	26%
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	33	3%	9	27%
Candidate without disability	949	97%	302	32%
<b>All</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>32%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 4.4: Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	637	65%	78	12%
Female	308	31%	47	15%
Unknown	37	4%	3	8%
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	779	79%	108	14%
BME	137	14%	17	12%
Unknown / any other	66	7%	3	5%
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	249	25%	14	6%
Barrister	675	69%	110	16%
ILEX	0	0%	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	58	6%	4	7%
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	33	3%	4	12%
Candidate without disability	949	97%	124	13%
<b>All</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>13%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 4.5: Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the Recorder (South Eastern Circuit) selection exercise completed April-September 2009

Group	Shortlisted		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of applications from group	Number	Percentage of shortlisted applicants from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	216	34%	78	36%
Female	87	28%	47	54%
Unknown	8	22%	3	(38%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	262	34%	108	41%
BME	36	26%	17	47%
Unknown / any other	13	20%	3	(23%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	46	18%	14	30%
Barrister	250	37%	110	44%
ILEX	0	n/a	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	15	26%	4	(27%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	9	27%	4	(44%)
Candidate without disability	302	32%	124	41%
<b>All</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>41%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 5.1: Number of applications received, applicants shortlisted and recommendations for appointment, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009

<b>Group</b>	<b>Applications received</b>	<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>Recommendations for appointment</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	120	34	14
Female	38	12	2
Unknown	4	1	0
<b>Ethnic background</b>			
White	139	45	15
BME	14	1	1
Unknown	8	1	0
Any other	1	0	0
<b>Professional background</b>			
Solicitor	49	9	2
Barrister	58	24	10
ILEX	2	0	0
Unknown / any other	53	14	4
<b>Disability status</b>			
Candidate with disability	10	1	0
Candidate without disability	152	46	16
<b>All</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>16</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Table 5.2: Candidates' progress from application stage to shortlist, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Shortlisted	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	120	74%	34	28%
Female	38	23%	12	32%
Unknown	4	2%	1	(25%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	139	86%	45	32%
BME	14	9%	1	(7%)
Unknown / any other	9	6%	1	(11%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	49	30%	9	18%
Barrister	58	36%	24	41%
ILEX	2	1%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	53	33%	14	26%
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	10	6%	1	(10%)
Candidate without disability	152	94%	46	30%
<b>All</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>29%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 5.3: Candidates' progress from application stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009

Group	Applications received		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of all applications	Number	Percentage of applications from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	120	74%	14	12%
Female	38	23%	2	5%
Unknown	4	2%	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	139	86%	15	11%
BME	14	9%	1	(7%)
Unknown / any other	9	6%	0	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	49	30%	2	4%
Barrister	58	36%	10	17%
ILEX	2	1%	0	(0%)
Unknown / any other	53	33%	4	8%
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	10	6%	0	(0%)
Candidate without disability	152	94%	16	11%
<b>All</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10%</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.

Table 5.4: Candidates' progress from shortlist stage to recommendation for appointment, by group, for the grouped small exercises completed April-September 2009

Group	Shortlisted		Recommendations for appointment	
	Number	Percentage of applications from group	Number	Percentage of shortlisted applicants from group
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	34	28%	14	41%
Female	12	32%	2	(17%)
Unknown	1	(25%)	0	(0%)
<b>Ethnic background</b>				
White	45	32%	15	33%
BME	1	(7%)	1	(100%)
Unknown / any other	1	(11%)	0	(0%)
<b>Professional background</b>				
Solicitor	9	18%	2	(22%)
Barrister	24	41%	10	42%
ILEX	0	(0%)	0	n/a
Unknown / any other	14	26%	4	(29%)
<b>Disability status</b>				
Candidate with disability	1	(10%)	0	(0%)
Candidate without disability	46	30%	16	53%
<b>All</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>34</b>

Source: Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) Equitas Database.

Percentages in parentheses are based on denominators of 20 or fewer and should be treated with caution.