

	2022 APPLICANT & APPOINTEE DATA				CUMULATIVE APPLICANT & APPOINTEE DATA (2019-2022)				CA State Bar Membership (2019)	Sitting Judges and Justices (2022)
	Applicants		Appointees		Applicants		Appointees			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%
<b>GENDER</b>										
<b>Female</b>	162	57.4%	63	52.9%	653	47.9%	146	50.7%	42%	39.9%
<b>ETHNICITY</b>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.1%	0	0%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>Asian</b>	40	14.2%	15	12.6%	186	13.6%	46	16%	13%	9.3%
<b>Black or African American</b>	34	12.1%	20	16.8%	157	11.5%	50	17.4%	4%	8.6%
<b>Hispanic</b>	45	16%	35	29.4%	195	14.3%	69	24%	7%	12.5%
<b>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</b>	3	1.1%	1	0.8%	10	0.7%	4	1.4%	0.3%	0.4%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	19	6.7%	1	0.8%	92	6.7%	9	3.1%	8.5%	7.4%
<b>White or Caucasian</b>	141	50%	47	39.5%	722	52.9%	110	38.2%	68%	61.4%
<b>GENDER IDENTITY/SEXUAL ORIENTATION</b>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%
<b>LGBT</b>	34	12.1%	10	8.4%	110	8.1%	24	8.3%	7%	4.7%
<b>VETERAN STATUS</b>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%
<b>Veteran</b>	11	3.9%	3	2.5%	49	3.6%	9	3.1%	–	6.2%
<b>DISABILITY STATUS</b>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%
<b>Person w/disability</b>	16	5.7%	3	2.5%	50	3.7%	4	1.4%	5%	2.3%

\*Judicial Branch demographic data: In response to the expansion of the mandate for the collection of demographic information from new judges and justices, the sitting judges and justices data collected by the Judicial Council of California on veteran and disability status include responses from those new to the bench in calendar years 2014 through 2022, as well as experienced judges and justices that chose to update their demographic information during the same period.

In addition, the gender identity and sexual orientation data collected for sitting judges and justices include responses from those new to the bench in calendar years 2012 through 2022, as well as experienced judges and justices that chose to update their demographic information during this same period. Thus, the data provided for these categories reflect only a subset of all sitting judges and therefore may not be reflective of the demographics of the entire judiciary.