



# The State Bar *of California*

## **Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation 2020 Statewide Demographics Report**

**Report in Compliance with Government Code  
Section 12011.5 (n)(B)**

**March 1, 2021**

## **Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation 2020 Statewide Demographics Report**

Government Code section 12011.5 (n)(B) requires that on or before March 1, the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation (JNE) collect and release aggregate, statewide data on the following: (1) demographics of the judicial candidates reviewed relative to race/ethnicity, disability, veteran status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, and areas of legal practice and employment; and (2) a summary of JNE Commission recommendations by the same categories.

Consistent with statutory intent, the 2020 Statewide Demographics Report includes data only for the 143 candidates whose qualifications for judicial office were reviewed in the 2020 calendar year.

Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation  
The State Bar of California  
180 Howard Street  
San Francisco CA 94105  
Aminder Singh, Chair

Sarah Cohen, Mission Advancement & Accountability Division  
[sarah.cohen@calbar.ca.gov](mailto:sarah.cohen@calbar.ca.gov)

**Issued March 1, 2021**  
(Updated March 3, 2021)

# Gender

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female	19	48.7	25	41.0	15	44.1	4	44.4	63	44.1
Male	19	48.7	34	55.7	19	55.9	5	55.6	77	53.8
Unknown	1	2.6	2	3.3	0	-	0	-	3	2.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100.0</b>

# Ethnicity/Race

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Asian	10	25.6	9	14.8	3	8.8	2	22.2	24	16.8
Black or African American	5	12.8	12	19.7	5	14.7	1	11.1	23	16.1
Hispanic or Latino	8	20.5	8	13.1	3	8.8	1	11.1	20	14.0
Some Other Race	1	2.6	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	0.7
White	12	30.8	26	42.6	21	61.8	4	44.4	63	44.1
Unknown	3	7.7	6	9.8	2	5.9	1	11.1	12	8.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100.0</b>

# Areas of Legal Practice and Employment

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Administrative	15	9.1	28	10.6	14	10.9	3	6.8	60	10.0
Civil Law	30	18.3	47	17.9	21	16.4	8	18.2	106	17.7
Legislative	11	6.7	11	4.2	6	4.7	3	6.8	31	5.2
House/Staff Counsel	8	4.9	13	4.9	2	1.6	3	6.8	26	4.3
Juvenile/Family/Probate	21	12.8	31	11.8	19	14.8	6	13.6	77	12.9
Criminal	30	18.3	42	16.0	22	17.2	6	13.6	100	16.7
Litigation (Trial/Appellate)	28	17.1	50	19.0	26	20.3	7	15.9	111	18.5
Corporate/Transactional	10	6.1	20	7.6	10	7.8	5	11.4	45	7.5
Other Legal Practice	11	6.7	21	8.0	8	6.3	3	6.8	43	7.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: The totals exceed the number of applicants because candidates are allowed to mark multiple areas of legal practice and employment on the Judicial Appointment Application. A candidate's rating is reflected in each legal practice and employment area marked.

## Female Candidates - Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Heterosexual	19	100.0	23	92.0	12	80.0	3	75.0	57	90.5
Lesbian	0	-	2	8.0	3	20.0	0	-	5	7.9
Bisexual	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	25.0	1	1.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## Male Candidates - Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Heterosexual	17	89.5	30	88.2	19	100.0	5	100.0	71	92.2
Gay	2	10.5	2	5.9	0	-	0	-	4	5.2
Unknown	0	-	2	5.9	0	-	0	-	2	2.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: Three candidates did not disclose their gender, as reflected on the gender table. Therefore, data concerning their sexual orientation/gender identity are not included in the above tables. Of the three, one identifies as lesbian and the other two as unknown.

## Veteran Status

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Veteran	1	2.6	3	4.9	2	5.9	0	-	6	4.2
Non-Veteran	38	97.4	58	95.1	32	94.1	9	100.0	137	95.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## Disability Status

	Exceptionally Well		Well Qualified		Qualified		Not Qualified		Total	
	Qualified									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Disability	0	-	0	-	1	2.9	0	-	1	0.7
No Disability	39	100.0	61	100.0	33	97.1	9	100.0	142	99.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100.0</b>