# Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation 2016 Statewide Demographic Report

Government Code section 12011.5, subdivision (n), requires that on or before March 1, the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation (JNE) collect and release statewide demographic data provided by the judicial applicants reviewed and the statewide summary of the recommendations of the JNE Commission by ethnicity, race, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, areas of legal practice and employment, disability, and veteran status. The tables in this report cover demographic information provided by applicants and on JNE's recommendations completed as required for the 2016 calendar year.

In 2016, JNE evaluated 191 applicants for judicial appointment. The total number of ratings in the tables may exceed the number of applicants because of separate evaluations of those applicants seeking appointment in more than one county.

#### **Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation**

180 Howard Street San Francisco CA 94105 Jody Nunez, Chair

Francisco Gomez, Office of the Executive Director <a href="mailto:francisco.gomez@calbar.ca.gov">francisco.gomez@calbar.ca.gov</a>

# Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation Total Evaluations for Calendar Year 2016

#### **Total Number of Candidate Evaluations: Gender and Rating**

			Female		*Unknown		Total	
Rating	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
EWQ	17	9%	13	7%	0	0	30	16%
WQ Male	49	26%	30	16%	1	1%	80	42%
Q	41	21%	23	12%	1	1%	65	34%
NQ	5	3%	3	2%	0	0	8	4%
Withdrawn	2	1%	6	3%	0	0	8	4%
Elected	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	114	60%	75	39%	2	1%	191	100%

Note: All Gender and Ethnic Information obtained from candidate application.

Ratings:

**EWQ: Exceptionally Well Qualified** 

WQ: Well Qualified

Q: Qualified NQ: Not Qualified

# **Total Number of Candidate Evaluations: Ethnicity and Rating**

			WQ		Q		NQ		Withdrav	vn <sup>*</sup>	Total	
Ethnicity	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Asian	7	4%	7	4%	3	2%	4	2%	0	0	21	11%
Black or African American	0	0%	4	2%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0	6	3%
Hispanic or Latino	3	2%	11	6%	7	4%	0	0	1	1%	22	12%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	2	1%	1	1%	0	0	0	0	3	2%
White	19	10%	52	27%	50	26%	3	2%	6	3%	130	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some Other Race	0	0	1	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
More Than One Race	1	1%	1	1%	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2%
Unknown	0	0	2	1%	3	2%	0	0	0	0	5	3%
Total	30	16%	80	42%	65	34%	8	4%	8	4%	191	100%

<sup>\*</sup> Governor's Office withdrew candidate prior to evaluation

### **Evaluated Candidates' Areas of Legal Practice/Employment**

		WQ	Q	NQ	Withdrawn <sup>†</sup>	Tota	ıl
Legal Practice/Employment	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Percentage	Number
Administrative	13	15	31	2	2	8	50
Civil Law	15	28	18	5	3	14	82
Legislative	5	6	4	1	2	3	82
House/Staff Counsel	6	4	8	1	1	3	20
Juvenile/Family/Probate	11	26	28	5	3	12	73
EWMnal	14	37	30	5	3	15	89
Litigation (Trial/Appellate)	17	40	38	5	3	17	103
Corporate/Transactional	7	8	21	1	3	7	40
Other Legal Practice	21	53	44	6	4	21	128
Total	109	217	222	31	24	100	603

Note: Candidates are allowed to mark multiple areas of legal practice on the judicial application. All data is taken from judicial application. A candidate's rating is reflected in each legal practice area marked.

<sup>†</sup> Governor's office withdrew candidate prior to evaluation

## **Evaluated Candidates' Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity**

Note: All sexual orientation and gender identity, veteran and disability data obtained from candidate application.

Female Candidates<sup>‡</sup>- Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity

Rating	Heterosexual	Lesbian	Bisexual	Transgender	Decline to Respond§
EWQ	9	1			1
WQ	24	3			4
Q	19	1			2
NQ	3				0
Total	55	6			7

Male Candidates§ - Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity

Rating	Heterosexual	Gay	Bisexual	Transgender	Decline to Respond§
EWQ	24	0			1
WQ	26	3			15
Q	35	0			3
NQ	5	0			
Total	90	3			19

 $<sup>^\</sup>S$  Total of -68 Male Candidates Rated  $^\S$   $_{10}$  % declined to reveal sexual orientation

Candidates - Veteran Status

Rating	Veteran	Non- Veteran	Decline to Respond
Exceptionally Well Qualified	2	21	5
Well Qualified	3	55	18
Qualified	1	46	12
Not Qualified	0	8	1
Total	6	130	36

# Total of 172 Candidates Rated 21% declined to reveal veteran status

Candidates - Disability Status

Rating	Disability	No Disability	Decline to Respond
Exceptionally Well Qualified	0	23	3
Well Qualified	1	56	18
0	0	46	7
Not Qualified	0	6	1
Total	1	131	29

**Total of 161 Candidates Rated** 

18 % declined to reveal disability status