

Suggested Criteria For Judicial Appointment

Revised January 2024
Emerita Professor Kathy Mack

Commissioned by the AIJA

The Secretariat
The Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Incorporated
Level 12, 170 Phillip Street
Sydney New South Wales 2000
Australia

T (61 2) 8099 2611
www.aija.org.au

The AIJA is a research and educational institute, which has been in existence since 1976. It is funded by the Commonwealth, states and territories and the New Zealand Ministry of Justice, and by subscription income from its membership. The principal objectives of the Institute include research into judicial administration and the development and conduct of educational programs for judicial officers, court administrators and members of the legal profession in relation to court administration and judicial systems. The AIJA is an Incorporated Association under the Associations Incorporation Act 1991 (ACT) and is governed by its Rules. The AIJA members include judges, magistrates, tribunal members, court administrators, legal practitioners, academic lawyers, court librarians and others with an interest in judicial administration.

The Institute also delivers programs of education to support those working in the field of judicial administration, including specific programs for court administrators, court librarians, magistrates and judges. The AIJA has also been involved in developing courses in specialised areas, including gender awareness, cultural awareness, court technology and case management.

© The Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Incorporated

Original published 2015
ISBN: 978-1-875527-14-4

Revised edition published [January 2024]
ISBN: 978-1-875527-67-0

Author

Kathy Mack is Emerita Professor, Flinders University, College of Business, Government and Law. Before coming to Australia, Kathy practiced law in California, mainly criminal law. She is the author of a monograph, book chapters and articles on ADR and articles on legal education and evidence. Since 1994, in collaboration with Matthew Flinders Distinguished Professor Sharyn Roach Anleu, she has been engaged in socio-legal research into the Australian courts and judiciary, beginning with an investigation of the production of guilty pleas, and continuing with research into the everyday work of the judiciary, through the Judicial Research Project at Flinders University. Their latest books are *Judging and Emotion: A Socio-Legal Analysis* (Routledge, 2021) and *Performing Judicial Authority in the Lower Courts* (Palgrave, 2017).

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the AIJA and the then-President Justice Jenny Blokland for the opportunity to undertake this project. I am grateful to Justice Blokland, to Justice Malcolm Blue, Chair of the AIJA Research Committee, and to its members for their thoughtful consideration, feedback and support throughout. Alison McDonald's helpfulness and efficiency benefitted the project at many stages. Jordan Tutton deserves special thanks for his extensive research and careful preparation of the appendices. Input and advice from Professor Sharyn Roach Anleu was especially valuable, as were the thoughts of the judicial officers consulted for their views in relation to judicial appointment.

Foreword

In September 2015, the AIJA published a short booklet, *Suggested Criteria for Judicial Appointments*. The purpose of the booklet was to contribute to and inform public discussion and debate which was taking place at that time. The AIJA specifically determined that the booklet would not deal with issues relevant to procedures for appointment on the basis that procedures for appointment were exclusively in the domain of the executive.

In 2021 the publication was referenced in the Australian Law Reform Commission, Report No 138 *Without Fear or Favour: Judicial Impartiality and the Law on Bias* (December 2021). The publication was also the topic of discussion for an Australian Academy of Law seminar addressed by The Hon. Tom Bathurst KC; Walter Sofronoff KC and The Hon. Justice Jenny Blokland in her capacity as President of the AIJA.

Given the renewed interest in the topic, Justice Blokland believed that it was timely to update the 2015 work. With the support of the AIJA's Research Committee and Council, Emerita Professor Kathy Mack of Flinders University was commissioned to review and update the work.

I thank Emerita Professor Kathy Mack for the comprehensive update she has undertaken and her time consulting with the AIJA's Research Committee.

The usefulness of the booklet as a resource for governments and courts has been greatly enhanced by updated references to other relevant Commonwealth jurisdictions; explicit and clearly articulated updated criteria; and new content and expert commentary on the judicial appointment process, including approaches to possible criteria such as potential character impediments, diversity and merit, decision-making abilities, communication, emotion and emotion management, and leadership.

I also wish to acknowledge the substantial contribution of Justice Blokland in seeing this project through to completion during her recent term as President of the AIJA.

I trust that the 2024 version of *Suggested Criteria for Judicial Appointments* continues to provide meaningful and helpful guidance for governments and courts in navigating their respective judicial appointment processes.



The Hon. Justice Murray Aldridge
Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia,
President, Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Inc.

Contents

Foreword	4
Introduction	6
Overview	6
Appointment processes	7
Diversity	7
Eligibility	7
Criteria	8
Commentary	11
Character: Potential impediments	11
Diversity and merit	11
Ability to make decisions	12
Communication, emotion and emotion management	12
Leadership	13
Appendices	14
Appendix A: Developing the revised criteria	14
Appendix B: Appointment criteria sources	15
Appendix C: Bibliography	17

Introduction

The purpose of judicial appointment criteria and processes is to identify and appoint people who will be good judges, recognising that there are many ways to be a good judge, and that merit comes in many forms. These criteria articulate core values, skills, and abilities necessary for good judging, in light of the varied expectations judicial officers must meet. They are relatively detailed in identifying qualities and competencies needed for judicial work.

Applying valid criteria through fair and sufficiently transparent processes will demonstrate that judicial appointments are indeed merit-based, rather than reflecting political or other forms of patronage or affected by (implicit) bias for or against certain kinds of candidates (ALRC 2021: 438 [12.23]). This should ensure a highly qualified and diverse judiciary, worthy of the public confidence essential to the judicial function.

Concrete, specific criteria still have an important and positive role, even in judicial appointment processes that lack transparency, as in some Australian jurisdictions today (ALRC 2021: 433–53; Evans and Williams 2008). Stating criteria that are explicitly linked to key elements of everyday judicial work may motivate the appointing authority, those consulted about potential appointments, and possible candidates to have regard to them.

Overview

In 2015, the AIJA published *Suggested Criteria for Judicial Appointments* (*'Suggested Criteria'*). Updating the *Suggested Criteria* is now timely, as there is increasing recognition of the need for explicit criteria as a key component of a fair and effective appointment process (ALRC 2021: 433–53).

These revised criteria have been developed through review and analysis of multiple sources: existing criteria in Australia and internationally; a wide range of policy and reform proposals; judicial writings; and academic research into the nature of everyday judicial work and judicial selection, as well as consultation with judicial officers. (See the Appendices for further detail and sources.)

Several key points emerged from that analysis. One is the need to broaden the scope of criteria, to consider qualities needed for the changing nature of judging. Interactive and interpersonal qualities, including attention to emotion awareness and management, are emphasised in the criteria.

The criteria are deliberately chosen to be more concrete, to reflect the actual nature and variety of judicial work. A closer connection with everyday judicial work recognises that more varied skills, and a wider concept of merit, are required, compared to the qualities developed through traditional professional legal practice, especially at the bar.

Criteria are organised into categories: values, skills, interpersonal and interactive abilities, and leadership. The category of personal qualities (previously in the *Suggested Criteria*) is not used, and generic qualities such as 'temperament' are not included. The goal of these selection criteria is to identify what candidates must be able to do and how they will perform as judicial officers, rather than looking for a certain kind of person.

Different courts have different needs. Some abilities will be more important in certain contexts than in others, such as writing detailed judgments or communicating with unrepresented litigants. Some tasks are inapplicable to a particular court, such as communicating with jurors. These variations have not been spelled out. Assessing the applicability and relative importance of criteria is a matter for the assessment process and appointing authorities.

Appointment processes

For criteria to be meaningful, appointment processes must be able to accurately assess the extent to which candidates for judicial office possess the desired qualities. Candidates must be able to demonstrate these capacities, and to evaluate for themselves whether they are fit for the role – not to over-assess or under-assess their suitability. This is particularly difficult when the process is not transparent, and candidates are unaware they are being considered until they are chosen.

As well as assessing qualities against specific criteria, appointing authorities will need to consider candidates in an overall sense. Not all candidates for judicial office will meet all criteria to the same extent. As Sackville points out: while it may be possible 'to formulate appropriate criteria ... there will always be room for judgment in determining what candidate best meets them' (2005: 140). It will be necessary to weigh different combinations of the strengths and weaknesses presented by different candidates. Appointment processes must be sufficiently transparent to demonstrate that this judgement is being made by applying criteria fairly and equally to all candidates. If criteria are not applied through a fair and transparent process, the presence of criteria can generate the appearance of a merit-based process, without the substance.

Diversity

The importance of a diverse judiciary is widely acknowledged and clearly explained in the AIJA Report on *Judicial Diversity in Australia* (Opeskin and Roach Anleu 2023: 11) and in the ALRC Report into judicial impartiality, *Without Fear or Favour* (2021: 449–53). A diverse judiciary promotes public confidence in, and supports the legitimacy of, the courts and their decisions. A diverse judiciary will have broader perspectives available to decision-makers, potentially reducing the risk of biased or ill-informed judgments. It may also elicit greater respect and trust from the public, and especially from those who have been excluded in the past (Russell 2006: 434). A judiciary that reflects the diversity of Australian society along key dimensions serves an important symbolic function (Opeskin and Roach Anleu 2023). As Stephen Gageler SC (as he then was) states: 'Judges are not representatives of sectional interests within the community, but sectional interests within the community need to feel that the law administered by judges applies equally to them all' (2008: 160). Supporting diversity in judicial appointments also helps to ensure that the judiciary is drawn from the widest possible talent pool, and that all meritorious candidates have equal opportunity to fair consideration for appointment (ALRC 2021: 451).

As Opeskin and Roach Anleu point out, in the AIJA judicial diversity report, 'diversity, or lack thereof, is a characteristic of a group, not an individual' (2023: 11). For these purposes, it is a particular court or the judiciary more generally which needs to be diverse. The goal of having a diverse judiciary may make an individual candidate's identity characteristics or lived experience significant as part of the appointment process, but this cannot be articulated in criteria applicable to individuals.

Diversity nonetheless remains a significant aspect of individual selection criteria. Good judging requires a high degree of cultural awareness, involving insight into the needs and perspectives of court participants from many backgrounds, and some direct engagement with or experience of those varied perspectives. Judicial officers should understand the social and legal issues arising in a diverse society. They must respect and be able to engage appropriately with all court users (ALRC 2021: 442 [12.31], [12.32]). These qualities are addressed as criteria within the heading 'Inclusivity', in the category 'Values'.

Eligibility

All Australian jurisdictions have statutory requirements such as citizenship, residency, holding a practising certificate, or being qualified to practice in named jurisdictions for a certain amount of time. These requirements have not been catalogued here.

Criteria

Values

Demonstrated commitment to:

Impartiality

- Maintaining an open, independent mind while hearing evidence and submissions, and when making a decision
- Avoiding apparent and actual bias
- Observing the rule of law

Integrity

- Maintaining good character
- Recognising and dealing appropriately with actual or potential conflicts of interest
- Meeting the expectations of the *Guide to Judicial Conduct* and *Attaining Judicial Excellence: A Guide for the NJCA*

Inclusivity

- Respecting all individuals and communities served by the courts
- Recognising social disadvantage and equity needs of individuals, groups and communities
- Understanding and adapting to change, especially social change

Skills

Demonstrated ability to:

Make decisions

- Make timely, well-reasoned, fair and consistent decisions
- Weigh evidence to determine facts, identify applicable law, and exercise sound judgement to reach a result
- Be resilient when faced with stressful decisions

Apply legal expertise

- Maintain and enhance knowledge of law, procedure, underlying principles, and their application, as appropriate to the jurisdiction
- Quickly absorb and analyse complex, competing facts and legal argument
- Engage in professional development

Manage proceedings

- Treat others with respect, and so inspire respect and confidence
- Exercise authority calmly and professionally, particularly when challenged
- Maintain control of courtroom, using fair direction or intervention
- Specialised abilities for a particular court

Note: Criteria in relation to the category of interpersonal and interactive abilities are also important for managing proceedings, as well as in judicial work more generally.

Manage workload

- Work well under heavy workload, large case volume and time pressure, while maintaining high standards
- Organise time, and set and meet priorities, including production of written judgments
- Case manage individual matters effectively
- Manage large daily lists efficiently
- Use IT and master new IT processes

Interpersonal and interactive abilities

Demonstrated ability to:

Manage demeanour

- Speak calmly, courteously, and patiently, even when necessary to be forceful
- Balance seriousness, impersonal formality and informality
- Use or display humour with care, never at the expense of a court participant or relying on stereotypes
- Maintain appropriate demeanour even under pressure
- Avoid display of sarcasm, harshness, anger, rudeness, or hostility

Communicate effectively

- Listen attentively
- Ask clear, concise, relevant and understandable questions
- Explain complex, competing factual and legal material, including decisions and reasoning, clearly and concisely, orally and in writing, as appropriate to the audience[s]
- Understand social media and use it appropriately

Manage emotion

- Be aware of and thoughtfully manage own emotion and the feelings of others, consistent with the judicial role
- Balance confidence and humility
- Be willing to seek assistance and support when experiencing difficulties, especially with stress or trauma

Interact appropriately

- Engage constructively and collegially with others, including judicial colleagues, court administrators and staff, and others in the workplace
- Engage appropriately with a wide range of court participants, including skilled or unskilled legal representatives, represented and unrepresented parties, witnesses, jurors, and court staff
- Be considerate, tactful, and empathetic with others

Leadership

Demonstrated ability to provide effective leadership, as appropriate to the particular judicial office, including:

- Motivate, support and encourage performance of others
- Maintain and improve judicial and court performance
- Represent the court and judiciary externally
- Use resources efficiently and effectively
- Introduce and manage change
- Contribute to the development of court and legal policy
- Form and implement strategic objectives

Commentary

This section provides further explanation for the inclusion of certain criteria, and the exclusion of others, in these revised criteria.

Character: Potential impediments

Character is addressed positively within these criteria, requiring demonstrated qualities of integrity, respect and absence of bias. Some jurisdictions (for example, Canada, Northern Ireland, and England and Wales) address the issue of character by specifying aspects of poor character as possible impediments to appointment.

Areas identified include criminal history, civil actions, financial difficulties, professional (mis)conduct, and presence on social media and online networks. In the jurisdictions that have such criteria, any information disclosed would not necessarily amount to an absolute bar to appointment, but might warrant further investigation. None of these jurisdictions specify prior sexual harassment complaints as requiring disclosure, a concern raised by the ALRC (2021: 443 [12.33]; see also Szoke 2021). Such conduct might be caught by disclosure of professional conduct complaints and any outcome.

Including these elements as criteria would require appointing authorities to seek extensive and confidential information from potential candidates as well as from a range of government or other organisations. While such an inquiry may be undertaken to determine whether a candidate meets the stated qualities of integrity, whether and how to do so is a matter for appointing authorities, and so is not specified in the criteria.

One possible circumstance stated as an impediment is ‘any debilitating physical or mental medical condition, including drug or alcohol dependency, that would be likely to impair the candidate’s ability to perform the duties of a judge’ (Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs 2016). It is important that judicial officers have the physical and mental capacity to meet their judicial obligations (see *Bruce v Cole* (1998), *In re Judge Maiden* (2019)). It is equally important that judicial candidates are not rejected on the grounds of any condition which does not significantly limit their ability to undertake judicial office, or which cannot be addressed by reasonable adjustment. Judicial officers have served well with a range of limitations on their capacities.

Diversity and merit

Where non-traditional or under-represented attributes are or appear to be a factor in judicial appointment, some may perceive that the person appointed lacks merit, as that concept has been constructed. Appointment on merit and achieving a diverse judiciary are sometimes seen as conflicting goals (see, eg, van Zyl Smit 2015: [1.2.14]). The crucial issue is not a purported tension between diversity and merit, but how merit is constructed, conceptualised and assessed (Hamilton 1999; Lynch 2017; Malleson 2006; Thornton 2023). Merit has often been assumed from a limited range of professional experiences. This has produced a judiciary lacking diversity and with some judicial officers sometimes lacking the qualities and skills needed for good judging (Kerr 2022). Determining merit requires recognising that merit can be displayed in varied ways. As Sackville points out: ‘[t]he more difficult question is how the criteria are to be applied to candidates with different kinds of experience and different attributes (or drawbacks)’ (2007: 130; see also Evans and Williams 2008: 313-14).

Similarly, some may perceive a non-traditional appointment as an implied threat to judicial impartiality: ‘Some commentators suggest that greater diversity means that various standpoints and experiences will necessarily compromise impartiality, harbour bias, and encourage advocacy’ (Opeskin and Roach Anleu 2023: 10 fn 4). These objections do not recognise that all judicial officers, whatever their identity and whether regarded as diverse or traditional, bring with them a background and life experiences which shape their views and conduct as judicial officers (Minow 1992; Lyon and Sossin 2014; see also Harris and Sen 2019; Rachlinski and Wistrich 2017).

This does not mean that judicial decisions are personal and unconstrained. They are governed by a commitment to the rule of law and to the central value of impartiality (Roach Anleu and Mack 2021). Impartiality is a quality all judicial officers strive to achieve, using several considered strategies (Roach Anleu and Mack 2021: 63–70). It is not a fixed state, nor is it uniquely possessed by those with the personal and social characteristics that have traditionally dominated the judiciary.

The place of identity characteristics, and varied lived experiences, in judicial appointment are ultimately matters for policy and process, not criteria to apply to individual candidates. Appointing authorities should act to increase the pool of qualified candidates from varied backgrounds and to ensure fair application of explicit criteria. Validated, concrete criteria have a significant role to play in selecting judicial officers who display the merit needed in courts today, including a deep commitment to impartiality. Good appointment processes promote diversity and merit together, by fairly and transparently applying valid criteria, reflecting the qualities actually needed for judicial work.

Ability to make decisions

One especially important judicial ability is making decisions. It is central to the judicial role, though the sometimes relentless demand for judicial decision making has potential to cause stress and trauma. As one respondent to the Judicial Research Project's *National Surveys* wrote:

Overall, I've enjoyed it. You only find out if you have an aptitude for it when you actually do it. Some of the best lawyers find they can't make decisions, and their life becomes hell. I have found I can make decisions for others, and sleep at night. I'm one of the lucky ones.¹

This ability to 'make decisions for others, and sleep at night' is essential to good judging and to judicial wellbeing. This is reflected in the criterion of 'Being resilient when faced with stressful decisions.' However, it can be difficult for appointing authorities to assess this quality and for a potential candidate to self-assess and to demonstrate. Previous tribunal, judicial or other adjudicatory experience may enable a candidate to demonstrate the desired capacities, and to effectively assess their own suitability for judicial work. Such appointments were frowned on in the past, as conflicting with the ideal of judicial independence. However, research finds that around 30% of judicial officers report such previous experience, with larger proportions in the higher courts and higher proportions of women in all court levels reporting such previous experience (Mack and Roach Anleu 2012: 324–5; see also Bartlett and Douglas 2018). This may suggest an implicit expectation that women must demonstrate their capacity to exercise judicial authority in a way that is not required of male candidates. Such implicit bias may also present an obstacle to candidates from other under-represented backgrounds or who possess non-traditional identity characteristics.

Communication, emotion and emotion management

The ALRC specifically identifies the need for judicial competencies to emphasise 'skills and attributes that are important to upholding confidence in judicial impartiality including communication skills, emotion management skills and cultural awareness' (ALRC 2021: 434 [12.13]; see also Elek et al 2017; Maroney 2012; Maroney and Gross 2014; Roach Anleu and Mack 2021). These qualities are strongly reflected throughout the criteria.

Judicial communication skills, including listening, are identified as part of a wide range of interactive and interpersonal abilities. These qualities are critical to effective court management and central to court users' perceptions of legitimacy of judicial authority (Burke and Leben 2007; Tyler 2006). Such abilities and conduct are also important for judicial officers as part of a respectful well-functioning workplace (Judicial Commission of Victoria 2022). The importance of cultural awareness is addressed in these criteria as an important value under the sub-heading 'Inclusivity'.

Undesirable judicial conduct, including bullying and harassment (Dodds-Streeton and O'Connor 2022; Judicial Commission of Victoria 2022; Mack and Roach Anleu 2023; Szoke 2021), and judicial stress, trauma and wellbeing (Hunter et al 2021; O'Sullivan et al 2022; Schrever et al 2019) all entail judicial emotion, and the intersection of judicial emotion with the feelings and behaviour of others. Improved emotion awareness will enable judicial officers to better manage their own responses to the demands of their work and so reduce undesirable conduct and improve wellbeing.

¹ This data is from the *National Survey of Australian Judges 2007* and the *National Survey of Australian Magistrates 2007* undertaken by the Judicial Research Project. For more information on the survey research method see Roach Anleu and Mack (2017: 176–86), and <<https://sites.flinders.edu.au/judicialresearchproject>>.

Some judicial officers struggle under what can seem to be the overwhelming demands of their work (ALRC 2021; Judicial Commission of Victoria 2022; Mack and Roach Anleu 2023). Applying these criteria in a sufficiently transparent and fair process will mean that those appointed to judicial office will have greater capacity to meet the sometimes unrelenting demands of the role, while maintaining their own wellbeing and serving the public well. This will improve the substance and appearance of impartiality, increase public confidence in the judiciary and support the legitimacy of judicial officers and their courts.

Leadership

Relatively few judicial officers will have explicit or formal leadership roles within courts as a whole or large divisions of courts. Nonetheless, many judicial roles require leadership qualities, perhaps in relation to immediate court staff or associates, to mentoring, or to institutional efficacy more generally (see, eg, Bochner, Stein and Bleby 2023). Even in relatively small courts, there may be judicial officers in charge of regions or specialist lists. For example, the Magistrates Court of South Australia comprises 41 magistrates, with one chief magistrate, one supervising regional manager, and eight magistrates as regional managers, who also sit as magistrates (Courts Administration Authority 2023). Judicial officers, including retired judicial officers, may undertake a range of external roles beyond their everyday work, which entail leadership qualities, such as chairing committees or roles in professional associations.

This important topic was addressed in the previous *Suggested Criteria* and in England and Wales. The criteria tend to be expressed fairly generally, rather than specifically relating to courts, and that is the case with these criteria.

Appendices

Appendix A: Developing the revised criteria

The first step in developing the revised criteria was to review existing criteria from all Australian jurisdictions, where such criteria are available, including those for different courts within a jurisdiction. Other sources include criteria from other countries including Canada, New Zealand, England and Wales, Northern Ireland, South Africa, and the USA (see Appendix B).

The next step in building these criteria was to identify frequently appearing, consensus qualities, which might be regarded as the most important or essential judicial qualities. This was a useful first step, but tended to produce a least common denominator set of skills or attributes, often stated abstractly or generically, such as independence, honesty, intellectual ability, or professional skills. This review of existing criteria revealed that the content and expression of selection criteria has changed considerably in some jurisdictions since the AJJA *Suggested Criteria* were published in 2015. It was therefore important to move beyond simple amalgamation.

A literature review analysed academic research, judicial writings and speeches, and policy reports from government and other sources addressing current judicial appointment processes and proposing reforms, as well as providing data and insights about everyday judicial work. This review also covered material relating to essential or desirable judicial qualities such the National Center for State Courts' *Elements of Judicial Excellence* (Elek et al 2017), National Judicial College of Australia's *Attaining Judicial Excellence* (2019), and the Judicial College of Victoria's *Framework of Judicial Abilities and Qualities* (2008) (see Appendix B). Other sources include data from the Judicial Research Project² identifying values, skills, and qualities regarded as essential or very important by the judiciary and by the public; codes or guidelines for judicial conduct and for judicial performance evaluation (see Appendix C); and consultation with judicial officers in individual capacities or in their role in relation to a professional organisation.

The material analysed consistently emphasises the need for transparency in judicial appointment, based on explicit criteria, as particularly important to foster judicial legitimacy and public confidence. Linked to this is the need to generate criteria that are underpinned by a clear vision of judicial work today, supported by available empirical data.

² Since 1999, the Judicial Research Project, Flinders University, has undertaken wide-ranging empirical and conceptual research into Australian judicial officers and courts, conducting multiple studies including national judicial surveys, court observations and interviews with judicial officers from all courts in all states and territories. The Project, led by Matthew Flinders Distinguished Professor Sharyn Roach Anleu and Emerita Professor Kathy Mack documents the changing nature and organisation of judicial work, institutional and individual elements driving judicial performance, and meanings of judicial impartiality and independence. Project research is conducted and reported independently of the courts and government. See <<https://sites.flinders.edu.au/judicialresearchproject/>>.

Appendix B: Appointment criteria sources

Australia

Attorney-General's Department (Cth) *Judicial Appointments*, 'Personal and professional qualities' (Web Page, online at 12 October 2023) <<https://www.ag.gov.au/legal-system/courts/judicial-appointments>>

Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration, *Suggested Criteria for Judicial Appointments* (September 2015)

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Without Fear or Favour: Judicial Impartiality and the Law on Bias* (ALRC Report 138, 2021) Appendix H2

Department of Justice and Attorney-General (Qld), *Review of the Judicial Appointments Process in Queensland* (Discussion Paper, October 2015)

Attachments 1–8 set out and compare criteria from several Australian jurisdictions with the *Suggested Criteria*.

Judicial College of Victoria, *Framework of Judicial Abilities and Qualities for Victorian Judicial Officers* (September 2008)

Judicial Conference of Australia, *Judicial Appointments: A Comparative Study* (Research Paper, December 2015)

Law Council of Australia, *Policy on the Process of Judicial Appointments* (Policy Statement, June 2021)

National Judicial College of Australia, *Attaining Judicial Excellence: A Guide for the NJCA* (November 2019)

International

Canada

Judges Act, RSC 1985, c J-1

Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs, 'Appendix A: Assessment Criteria, Candidates for Federal Judicial Appointment', *Guidelines for Judicial Advisory Committee Members* (Web Page, October 2016) <<https://www.fja.gc.ca/appointments-nominations/committees-comites/guidelines-lignes-eng.html#AppendixA>>

England and Wales (including some UK-wide tribunals)

Constitutional Reform Act 2005 (UK)

Courts and Tribunals *Judiciary, Judicial Skills and Abilities Framework* (March 2014)

Judicial Appointments Commission, *Good Character Guidance from 2021* (Web Page, November 2020) <<https://judicialappointments.gov.uk/guidance-on-the-application-process-2/good-character/good-character-guidance>>

New Zealand

Attorney-General's Judicial Appointments Unit, *Judicial Appointments: Office of District Court Judge* (Information booklet, June 2019)

Attorney-General's Judicial Appointments Unit, *Judicial Appointments Protocol* (November 2019) (addressing the High Court, Court of Appeal, and the Supreme Court)

Northern Ireland

Justice (Northern Ireland) Act 2002 (UK)

Northern Ireland Judicial Appointments Commission, *The Selection Process* (Web Page, online at 12 October 2023) <<https://www.nijac.gov.uk/selection-process>>

Northern Ireland Judicial Appointments Commission, *Introducing the Judicial Profile and the Person Specification* (Web Page, 23 March 2023) <<https://www.nijac.gov.uk/publications/introducing-judicial-profile-and-person-specification>>

South Africa

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 1996 (South Africa)

Judicial Service Commission, *Summary and Explanation of the Criteria and Guidelines Used by the Judicial Service Commission When Considering Candidates for Judicial Appointment* (2022)

United States of America

American Bar Association, Committee on Judicial Performance Evaluation, *Black Letter Guidelines for the Evaluation of Judicial Performance* (2005)

American Bar Association, Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, *What It Is and How It Works* (2020)

Elek, Jennifer K et al, *Elements of Judicial Excellence: A Framework to Support the Professional Development of State Trial Court Judges* (National Center for State Courts, Project Final Report, December 2017)

Appendix C: Bibliography

- Appleby, Gabrielle et al, 'Contemporary Challenges Facing the Australian Judiciary: An Empirical Interruption' (2019) 42(2) *Melbourne University Law Review* 299
- Attorney-General's Department (Cth), Judicial Appointments: Ensuring a Strong and Independent Judiciary Through a Transparent Process (April 2010)
- Australian Law Reform Commission, Without Fear or Favour: Judicial Impartiality and the Law on Bias (ALRC Report 138, December 2021)
- Backhouse, Constance, 'Turning the Tables on RDS: Racially Revealing Questions Asked by White Judges' (2021) 44(1) *Dalhousie Law Journal* 181
- Francesca Bartlett and Heather Douglas, '"Benchmarking" a Supreme Court and Federal Court Judge in Australia' (2018) 8(9) *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 1355
- Bathurst, TF, 'Trust in the Judiciary' (2021) 14(4) *Judicial Review* 263
- Bobek, Michal (ed), Selecting Europe's Judges: A Critical Review of the Appointment Procedures to the European Courts (Oxford University Press, 2015)
- Bochner, Katrina, Laura Stein and Chris Bleby, 'Understanding and Navigating the Power Imbalance between Associates and Judges' (2023) 32(2) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 47
- Bowskill, Helen, 'Cumulative Trauma and Stress as a Judicial Officer' (Speech, Brisbane Magistrates Court, 25 March 2021)
- Brennan, Gerard, 'The State of the Judicature' (1998) 72(1) *Australian Law Journal* 33
- Brewer, Karen, James Dingemans and Peter Slinn, Judicial Appointments Commissions: A Model Clause for Constitutions (Report for the Commonwealth Lawyers Association, Commonwealth Legal Education Association and Commonwealth Magistrates' and Judges' Association, May 2013)
- Bruce v Cole* [1998] NSWSC 260, 45 NSWLR 163
- Burke, Kevin and Steve Leben, 'Procedural Fairness: A Key Ingredient in Public Satisfaction' (2007) 44 *Court Review* 4
- Cavanagh, Vanessa and Elena Marchetti, 'Judicial Indigenous Cross-Cultural Training: What Is Available, How Good Is It and Can It Be Improved?' (2015) 19(2) *Australian Indigenous Law Review* 45
- Conduct Division of the Judicial Commission of NSW, In re Magistrate Burns (Report, December 2018)
- Conduct Division of the Judicial Commission of NSW, In re Judge Maiden (Report, March 2019)
- Coroners Court of Victoria, Finding into Death Without Inquest of Stephen Myall (COR 2018 1210, 4 August 2020)
- Coroners Court of Victoria, Finding into Death Without Inquest of Jacinta Dwyer (COR 2017 5371, 9 December 2020)
- The Council of Chief Justices of Australia and New Zealand, Guide to Judicial Conduct (AIJA, 3rd ed, amended 2023)
- Courts Administration Authority (SA), Judicial Officer Appropriate Workplace Conduct Policy (August 2022)
- Courts Administration Authority (SA), 'Magistrates Court Judicial Officers', *Our Judiciary* (2023) <<https://www.courts.sa.gov.au/our-judiciary/>>
- Darbyshire, Penny, *Sitting in Judgment: The Working Lives of Judges* (Hart Publishing, 2011)
- Davis, Rachel and George Williams, 'Reform of the Judicial Appointments Process: Gender and the Bench of the High Court of Australia' (2003) 27(3) *Melbourne University Law Review* 819

de Waele, Henri, 'Not Quite the Bed that Procrustes Built: Dissecting the System for Selecting Judges of the Court of Justice in the European Union' in Michal Bobek (ed), *Selecting Europe's Judges: A Critical Review of the Appointment Procedures to the European Courts* (Oxford University Press, 2015) 24

Devlin, Richard et al, 'A Mixed Bag: Critical Reflections on the Revised Ethical Principles for Judges' (2022) 100(3) *Canadian Bar Review* 325

Dodds-Streeton, Julie and Jack O'Connor, *Review of Recruitment and Working Arrangements of Judicial Staff Who Work in a Primary Relationship with Judicial Officers in Victorian Courts and VCAT* (Report, August 2022)

Doyle, John, 'Choosing our Judges' (2013) 34(2) *Adelaide Law Review* 223

Evans, Simon and John Williams, 'Appointing Australian Judges: A New Model' (2008) 30(2) *Sydney Law Review* 295

Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, *Judicial Workplace Conduct Policy* (September 2021)

Gageler, Stephen, 'Judicial Appointment' (2008) 30(1) *Sydney Law Review* 159

Gageler, Stephen, 'Judicial Legitimacy' (2023) 97(1) *Australian Law Journal* 28

Gibbs, Harry, 'The Appointment of Judges' (1987) 61(1) *Australian Law Journal* 7

Gleeson, Jacqueline, 'Advancing Judicial Legitimacy: The Stakes and the Means' (2023) 15(1) *Judicial Review* 1

Gleeson, Murray, 'Judicial Selection and Training: Two Sides of the One Coin' (2003) 77(9) *Australian Law Journal* 591

Gee, Graham and Erika Rackley (eds), *Debating Judicial Appointments in an Age of Diversity* (Routledge, 2017)

Genn, Hazel, *Judging Civil Justice* (Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Hamilton, Barbara, 'Criteria for Judicial Appointment and "Merit"' (1999) 15 *Queensland University of Technology Law Journal* 10

Harris, Allison P and Maya Sen, 'Bias and Judging' (2019) 22 *Annual Review of Political Science* 241

High Court of Australia, *Justices' Policy on Workplace Conduct* (April 2023)

Hunter, Jill, Richard Kemp, Kevin O'Sullivan and Prue Vines, 'A Fragile Bastion: UNSW Judicial Traumatic Stress Study' (2021) 33(1) *Judicial Officers' Bulletin* 1

Judicial Commission of Victoria, *Judicial Conduct Guideline: Sexual Harassment* (February 2022)

Judicial Commission of Victoria, *Judicial Bullying* (Consultation Paper, July 2022)

Judicial Commission of Victoria, *Judicial Bullying: Consultation and Recommendations* (Summary Paper, May 2023)

Kerr, Jessica, 'Making Judges in a Recognition Judiciary' (2022) 31(4) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 217

Kyrou, Emiliou, 'Attributes of a Good Judge' (2013) 23(2) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 130

Lavarch, Michael, *Judicial Appointments: Procedure and Criteria* (Discussion Paper, September 1993)

Lynch, Andrew, 'Diversity Without a Judicial Appointments Commission: The Australian Experience' in Graham Gee and Erika Rackley (eds), *Debating Judicial Appointments in an Age of Diversity* (Routledge, 2017) 101

Lynch, Andrew, 'Judicial Influence on Judicial Appointments' (2023) 97(9) *Australian Law Journal* 607

Lyon, Sabrina, and Lorne Sossin, 'Data and Diversity in the Canadian Justice Community' (2014) 11 *Journal of Law and Equality* 85

- Mack, Kathy and Sharyn Roach Anleu, “Getting Through the List”: Judgecraft and Legitimacy in the Lower Courts (2007) 16(3) *Social and Legal Studies* 341
- Mack, Kathy and Sharyn Roach Anleu, ‘The National Survey of Australian Judges: An Overview of Findings’ (2008) 18(1) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 5
- Mack, Kathy and Sharyn Roach Anleu, ‘Entering the Australian Judiciary: Gender and Court Hierarchy’ (2012) 34(3) *Law & Policy* 313
- Mack, Kathy and Sharyn Roach Anleu, ‘Managing Judicial Performance: The (Changing) Ethical Infrastructure’ (2023) 97(9) *Australian Law Journal* 664
- Mack, Kathy, Anne Wallace and Sharyn Roach Anleu, *Judicial Workload: Time, Tasks and Work Organisation* (AIJA, 2012)
- Malleson, Kate, ‘Rethinking the Merit Principle in Judicial Selection’ (2006) 33(1) *Journal of Law and Society* 126
- Malleson, Kate and Peter H Russell (eds) *Appointing Judges in an Age of Judicial Power: Critical Perspectives from Around the World* (University of Toronto Press, 2006)
- Maroney, Terry A, ‘Angry Judges’ (2012) 65(2) *Vanderbilt Law Review* 1205
- Maroney, Terry A, ‘(What We Talk About When We Talk About) Judicial Temperament’ (2020) 61(6) *Boston College Law Review* 2085
- Maroney Terry A and James J Gross, ‘The Ideal of the Dispassionate Judge: An Emotion Regulation Perspective’ (2014) 6(2) *Emotion Review* 142
- Mason, Anthony, ‘The State of the Judicature’ (1994) 68(2) *Australian Law Journal* 125
- Minow, Martha, ‘Stripped Down Like a Runner or Enriched by Experience: Bias and Impartiality of Judges and Jurors’ (1992) 33(4) *William and Mary Law Review* 1201
- Morison, John, ‘Beyond Merit: The New Challenge for Judicial Appointments’ in Graham Gee and Erika Rackley (eds), *Debating Judicial Appointments in an Age of Diversity* (Routledge, 2017) 223
- Opeskin, Brian, ‘Dismantling the Diversity Deficit: Towards a More Inclusive Australian Judiciary’ in Gabrielle Appleby and Andrew Lynch (eds), *The Judge, the Judiciary, and the Court: Individual, Collegial and Institutional Judicial Dynamics in Australia* (Cambridge University Press, 2021) 83
- Opeskin, Brian and Sharyn Roach Anleu, *Judicial Diversity in Australia: A Roadmap for Data Collection* (AIJA, August 2023)
- O’Sullivan, Kevin, Jill Hunter, Richard Kemp and Prue Vines, ‘Judicial Work and Traumatic Stress: Vilification, Threats, and Secondary Trauma on the Bench’ (2022) 28(4) *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 532
- Rachlinski, Jeffrey J and Andrew J Wistrich, ‘Judging the Judiciary by the Numbers: Empirical Research on Judges’ (2017) 13 *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 203
- Rackley, Erica, ‘A Short History of Judicial Diversity’ (2023) *Current Legal Problems* (advance)
- Roach Anleu, Sharyn and Kathy Mack, ‘Judicial Appointment and the Skills for Judicial Office’ (2005) 15(1) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 37
- Roach Anleu, Sharyn and Kathy Mack, ‘The Work of the Australian Judiciary: Public and Judicial Attitudes’ (2010) 20(1) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 3
- Roach Anleu, Sharyn and Kathy Mack, *Performing Judicial Authority in the Lower Courts* (Palgrave, 2017)
- Roach Anleu, Sharyn and Kathy Mack, *Judging and Emotion: A Socio-Legal Analysis* (Routledge, 2021)
- Russell, Peter H, ‘Judicial Recruitment, Training, and Careers’ in Peter Cane and Herbert M Kritzer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research* (Oxford University Press, 2010) 522

- Russell, Peter H, 'Conclusion' in Kate Malleson and Peter H Russell (eds) *Appointing Judges in an Age of Judicial Power: Critical Perspectives from Around the World* (University of Toronto Press, 2006) 420
- Sackville, Ronald, 'Judicial Appointments: A Discussion Paper' (2005) 14(3) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 117
- Sackville, Ronald, 'The Judicial Appointments Process in Australia: Towards Independence and Accountability' (2007) 16(3) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 125
- Schrever, Carly, Carol Hulbert and Tania Sourdin, 'The Psychological Impact of Judicial Work: Australia's First Empirical Research Measuring Judicial Stress and Wellbeing' (2019) 28(3) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 141
- Schrever, Carly, Carol Hulbert and Tania Sourdin, 'Where Stress Presides: Predictors and Correlates of Stress among Australian Judges and Magistrates' (2022) 29(2) *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law* 290
- Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Parliament of Australia, *Inquiry into Australia's Judicial System and the Role of Judges* (Report, December 2009)
- Shetreet, Shimon, 'Who Will Judge: Reflections on the Process and Standards of Judicial Selection' (1987) 61(12) *Australian Law Journal* 766
- Spigelman, James Jacob, 'Judicial Appointments and Judicial Independence' (2008) 17(3) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 139
- Strengthening Basic Principles of Judicial Conduct*, ESC Res 2006/23, UN ESCOR, 41st plen mtg, Agenda Item 14(c), UN Doc E/RES/2006/23 (27 July 2006) annex ('Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct')
- Szoke, Helen, *Review of Sexual Harassment in Victorian Courts and VCAT* (Report and Recommendations, March 2021)
- Thornton, Margaret, *The Quest for Gender Equality* (ANU Press, 2023) chs 11 ("Otherness" on the Bench) and 15 ('The Mirage of Merit')
- Tyler, Tom R, 'Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation' (2006) 57 *Annual Review of Psychology* 375
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct* (September 2007)
- van Zyl Smit, Jan, *The Appointment, Tenure and Removal of Judges under Commonwealth Principles: A Compendium and Analysis of Best Practice* (Report of Research Undertaken by Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law, 2015)
- Wallace, Anne, Kathy Mack and Sharyn Roach Anleu, 'Caseload Allocation and Special Judicial Skills: Finding the "Right Judge"?' (2012) 4(3) *International Journal for Court Administration* 68
- Wistrich, Andrew J, 'Defining Good Judging' in David Klein and Gregory Mitchell (eds), *The Psychology of Judicial Decision Making* (Oxford University Press, 2010) 249



www.aija.org.au