

Access and Fairness in California Law Schools

A REPORT ON THE FOCUS GROUP
PROJECT OF THE
JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA'S
ACCESS AND FAIRNESS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND
THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA'S
OFFICE OF LEGAL SERVICES,
ACCESS & FAIRNESS PROGRAMS



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ACCESS AND FAIRNESS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Access and Fairness in California Law Schools

A REPORT ON THE FOCUS GROUP PROJECT OF THE
JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA'S
ACCESS AND FAIRNESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AND THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA'S
OFFICE OF LEGAL SERVICES, ACCESS & FAIRNESS PROGRAMS,
CENTER FOR ACCESS & FAIRNESS

FEBRUARY 2008



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ACCESS AND FAIRNESS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Access and Fairness Advisory Committee
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

Copyright © 2008 by Judicial Council of California/Administrative Office of the Courts.
All rights reserved.

Except as permitted under the Copyright Act of 1976 and as otherwise expressly provided herein, no part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic, online, or mechanical, including the use of information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the copyright holder. Permission is hereby granted to nonprofit institutions to reproduce and distribute this publication for educational purposes if the copies credit the copyright holder.

Judicial Council of California

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. George J. Abdallah, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Joaquin

Mr. Raymond G. Aragon
Attorney at Law

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the California Supreme
Court

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Attorney at Law
Law Offices of Anthony Capozzi

Hon. Ellen M. Corbett
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Peter Paul Espinoza
Assistant Supervising Judge of the
Superior Court of California, County of
Los Angeles

Hon. Terry B. Friedman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Mr. Thomas V. Girardi
Attorney at Law
Girardi & Keese

Hon. Brad R. Hill
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Fifth Appellate District

Hon. Richard D. Huffman
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Fourth Appellate District, Division One

Hon. Jamie A. Jacobs-May
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior
Court of California, County of Santa Clara

Hon. Dave Jones
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas M. Maddock
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Charles W. McCoy, Jr.
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior
Court of California, County of Los
Angeles

Hon. Barbara J. Miller
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Eileen C. Moore
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Fourth Appellate District, Division Three

Hon. Dennis E. Murray
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of
California, County of Tehama

Ms. Barbara J. Parker
Chief Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney

Hon. James Michael Welch
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Advisory Members

Hon. Ronald E. Albers
Commissioner of the Superior Court of
California, County of San Francisco

Ms. Deena Fawcett
Clerk/Administrator
Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Hon. Ira R. Kaufman
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of
California, County of Plumas

Mr. Michael D. Planet
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of
Ventura

Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San
Diego

Hon. Nancy Wieben Stock
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of
California, County of Orange

Ms. Sharol Strickland
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of
Butte

Administrative Office of the Courts

Mr. William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of the Judicial Council

Access and Fairness Advisory Committee

Hon. James R. Lambden, Chair

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. Steven K. Austin

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Gordon S. Baranco

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Dr. Bryan Borys, Ph.D.

Special Assistant to the Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Los
Angeles

Professor Todd Brower

Western State University College of Law

Hon. Manuel J. Covarrubias

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Ventura

Hon. My-Le Jacqueline Duong

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Barry P. Goode

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Catherine Lyons

Commissioner of the Superior Court of
California, County of San Francisco

Ms. Sandra McBrayer

Chief Executive Officer
The Children's Initiative

Ms. Sheila Conlon Mentkowski

Chief, Client Assistance Program (CAP)
Department of Rehabilitation

Hon. Franz E. Miller

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. William J. Murray, Jr.

Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior
Court of California, County of San
Joaquin

Ms. Raquelle Myers

Staff Attorney
National Indian Justice Center

Mr. Gordon (Sam) Overton

Deputy Attorney General
California Department of Justice
Deputy Attorney General

Hon. John M. Pacheco

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Dean Elizabeth Rindskopf Parker

University of the Pacific
McGeorge School of Law

Ms. Tina L. Rasnow

Attorney and Coordinator
Self-Help Legal Access Center
Superior Court of California,
County of Ventura

Hon. Maria P. Rivera

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division Four

Hon. Luis A. Rodriguez

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Zaven V. Sinanian
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Diana Becton Smith
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Julie M. Tang
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Dr. Dorothy M. Tucker
Consulting Organizational Psychologist

Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of El
Dorado

Ms. Carole Wagner-Vallianos
Attorney at Law
Law Offices of Carole Wagner-Vallianos

Hon. Mary Lou Villar
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Allen Joseph Webster, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Rosalyn S. Zakheim
Senior Judicial Attorney
Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,
Division Eight

Hon. Daniel Zeke Zeidler
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Laurie D. Zelon
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Second Appellate District, Division Seven

AOC Lead Committee Staff

Ms. Donna Clay-Conti, Lead Staff
Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel

AOC Staff to the Committee

Mr. Clifford Alumno
Court Services Analyst
Office of the General Counsel

Ms. Geraldine Dungo
Administrative Coordinator
Office of the General Counsel

Ms. Linda McCulloh
Attorney
Education Division/Center for Judicial
Education and Research

**Access and Fairness Advisory Committee
Gender Fairness Subcommittee
Working Group on Access and Fairness in California Law Schools**

Hon. Steven K. Austin

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Steven A. Brick

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Manuel J. Covarrubias

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Ventura

Hon. John L. Davidson

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Hon. Margaret Johnson

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Ken Kawaichi (Ret.)

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Franz E. Miller

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Winifred Young Smith

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Dean Maryann Jones

Western States University School of Law

Associate Dean Rodney Fong

Golden Gate University School of Law

Ms. Raquelle Myers

Staff Attorney
National Indian Justice Center

Mr. Gordon (Sam) Overton

Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
State of California

Ms. Patricia Lee

State Bar of California,
Office of Legal Services,
Access & Fairness Programs,
Center for Access & Fairness

AOC Staff to the Working Group

Ms. Donna P. Clay-Conti

Lead Staff
Access and Fairness Advisory Committee,
Administrative Office of the Courts

Mr. Clifford Alumno

Staff
Access and Fairness Advisory Committee,
Administrative Office of the Courts

Mr. Michael Roosevelt

Senior Court Services Analyst
Center for Families, Children, & the Courts,
Administrative Office of the Courts

Contents

Introduction.....	1
<i>Project Background.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Overview of Findings.....</i>	<i>6</i>
Integrating Fairness Issues Into Curricula	6
Grievance Procedures on Law School Campuses.....	7
Physical Access to Facilities and Accommodations for Students With Disabilities	8
Career Services	9
Law School Environment	10
Faculty Hiring and Retention.....	11
Methodology of the Focus Group Project.....	12
Discussion.....	13
<i>Demographics of California Law Schools.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Integration of Fairness Issues in Law School Curricula.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Courses.....	15
Classroom Discussion.....	16
<i>Grievance Process</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Physical Access to Facilities and Accommodations for Students With Disabilities.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Career Services.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Law School Environment.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Faculty Hiring and Retention: Effect on Student Learning.....</i>	<i>23</i>
Law School Council’s Review and Comments on the Report.....	25
<i>Curriculum Reform and the Realities of Law Practice.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>School and Classroom Environment.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Diversity in the Profession and the Cost of a Legal Education.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>The Law School Council’s Additional Recommendations.....</i>	<i>27</i>
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	28
<i>Conclusions.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Recommendations.....</i>	<i>29</i>
Appendix.....	32
<i>Appendix A: Questions Posed to Focus Group Participants.....</i>	<i>33</i>
Questions Posed to Dean/Administrator Participants	34
Questions Posed to Faculty Participants	38
Questions Posed to Student Participants.....	42
<i>Appendix B: Participating Law Schools.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Appendix C: Demographic Charts Of ABA-Approved California Law Schools</i>	<i>46</i>
Faculty and Administrators.....	47
J.D. Enrollment	50

Introduction

The focus group project that is the subject of this report was a joint effort by the Judicial Council of California's Access and Fairness Advisory Committee and the State Bar of California's Office of Legal Services, Access & Fairness Programs, Center for Access & Fairness, conducted in cooperation with the deans of 17 California law schools approved by the American Bar Association (ABA). The project follows up on recommendations made to the Judicial Council in 1996 to address gender bias and other fairness issues in law schools as part of the council's ongoing effort to improve and enhance the fair administration of justice in California. The Law School Council previewed a draft of this report and provided feedback and recommendations, which are reflected in the report and the recommendations to the Judicial Council. This report is being submitted to the Judicial Council with the recommendations that it accept the report and direct further action as appropriate.

Project Background

Recognizing that access and fairness are crucial elements of a fair and impartial justice system and a free society, the council has focused on the problems that underrepresented groups face in the court system. The council's Access and Fairness Advisory Committee, and its predecessor committees, commissioned studies in the areas of gender bias, racial and ethnic bias, disability access, and sexual orientation fairness in the California courts.¹ These studies were conducted by researchers and consultants using various methodologies, including telephone and written surveys, public hearings, individual interviews, and focus groups composed of various justice system constituencies, including judicial officers, students, professors, and deans of California law schools.

One study was conducted by the council's former Advisory Committee on Gender Bias in the Courts, which was appointed by Chief Justice Malcolm Lucas in 1987 and 1988. That committee was the precursor to the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee, which was established by the council in 1994. The Gender Bias Committee was charged in 1987 with conducting a

¹ *Achieving Equal Justice for Women and Men in the California Courts*, Final Report of the Judicial Council Advisory Committee on Gender Bias in the Courts (1996), www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/access/documents/f-report.pdf.

Final Report of the California Judicial Council Advisory Committee on Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Courts (1997), www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/rebias.pdf.

Public Hearings Report: Access for Persons With Disabilities, Final Report of the Judicial Council of California Standing Advisory Committee on Access and Fairness, Access for Persons With Disabilities Subcommittee (1997), www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/access/documents/dis_hear.pdf.

Access to the California State Courts: A Survey of Court Users, Attorneys, and Court Personnel, Final Report of the Judicial Council of California Standing Advisory Committee on Access and Fairness, Access for Persons With Disabilities Subcommittee (1997), www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/access/documents/dis_surv.pdf.

Sexual Orientation Fairness in the California Courts, Final Report of the Sexual Orientation Fairness Subcommittee of the Judicial Council's Access and Fairness Advisory Committee (January 2001), www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/access/documents/report.pdf.

comprehensive review of gender bias issues, consistent with the scope of the council's strategic plans,² with special focus on the following topics:

- Judicial branch employment practices;
- Gender bias within the judiciary;
- Selection of court-appointed counsel;
- Jury instructions;
- Domestic violence;
- Custody;
- Child support;
- Economic consequences of dissolution; and
- Family law education and assignment procedures.

As part of that charge, the council further authorized the Gender Bias Committee to:

- Consult with other professionals in the justice system;
- Conduct public hearings, regional meetings, and surveys;
- Collect statistical information; and
- Perform any other tasks consistent with the council's authority and the committee's charge.

Accordingly, the Gender Bias Committee studied these areas and, in recognition of other biases in our society and the changing demographics of California, also identified the interaction between gender, race, and ethnic bias as an additional focus of its inquiry.

Why should the council, the judicial branch, and the State Bar be concerned with the curriculum and the environment of California's law schools? The advisory committee's research resulted in findings and recommendations that were published in a 1996 report to the council, *Achieving Equal Justice for Women and Men in the California Courts*. The report noted, "As men and women train in law schools and schools for legal technicians, they are shaped by role models offered to them and by the thinking reflected in the course offerings and instruction they receive."³ Law school graduates are our future lawyers and judges. The council's goal of fair administration of justice in all of its courts depends on the excellent work of these professionals. The council, therefore, should be interested in, and prepared to collaborate with, the State Bar, law school deans, faculty, and students to prepare future lawyers and judges to oversee cases involving increasingly diverse court users and members of the legal profession. The reason is

² The council adopted its first strategic plan in 1992, which included objectives designed to promote access, fairness, and diversity in the courts. Its 1995 strategic plan identified as primary goals, "the need to improve access, fairness, and diversity in the judicial branch" and "to identify and eliminate bias in the courts" as significant policy directions. *Leading Justice Into the Future*, the Judicial Council of California Long-Range Strategic Plan, Administrative Office of the Courts/Advisory Committee Action Plan (March 1995), pp. 11 and 25.

³ *Achieving Equal Justice for Women and Men in the California Courts*, (1996) Ch.8, Court Administration, part D, at p. 388.

also expressed in a passage from *Moving Mountains: California's Latest Quake in the Legal World*, written by law students and Professor Diane L. Abraham, University of California at Berkeley, Boalt Hall School of Law,⁴ which states:

The judicial branch is obligated under the California Constitution to treat all people fairly and ensure equal access to the courts. Equal access to justice, however, is at risk for compromise with a bar comprised of attorneys who do not responsibly address—or know how to address—issues of diversity and bias. The admission to legal practice in any state should require more than knowledge of substantive law; it must demand competency defined by the racial and cultural diversity of 21st century America. These are the attorneys from whom the Governor selects the courts' judicial officers, who are under just as great or more of an obligation to ensure that litigants and other court users appearing before them are treated with respect and fairness and that they have equal access to the courts.

When the 1996 report was issued, it was clear that employment practices in California law schools and the lack of tenured female professors were high-profile issues that garnered law schools substantial publicity in the legal community. These findings generated the following recommendation, which had not been addressed before, from the Gender Bias Committee:

RECOMMENDATION 9

Due to the primary importance of educating all members of the profession on the nature and effects of gender bias in the legal system, [the committee] request[s] the Judicial Council to transmit to and urge consideration by the deans of law schools and schools training legal technicians, the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the schools develop written policies and other programs that will:

- (a) Eliminate gender bias from classroom interactions, casebooks, and course materials;
- (b) Eliminate gender bias and encourage diversity in the hiring, promotion, and tenure of faculty;
- (c) Include gender and other fairness as an integral part of all professional responsibility courses;

⁴ See, <http://www.abanet.org/minorities/publications/g9/v11n1/mountains.html>.

- (d) Include an analysis of the way in which gender bias can taint expert testimony, cross-examination, interpersonal conduct between attorneys and between attorneys and judges, jury selection, and juror use;
- (e) Provide grievance procedures and discipline for sexual harassment by students, faculty, or employees; and
- (f) Eliminate gender bias in on-campus recruiting.

Further, the Gender Bias Committee recommended that the council transmit its recommendations to, and urge consideration of them by, the State Bar, the Committee of Bar Examiners, and law schools, as appropriate. It further urged that representatives of the State Bar and the Committee of Bar Examiners meet with law school deans on these subjects. The council adopted these recommendations,⁵ which were subsequently transmitted to the State Bar.

The 1996 report's finding that is relevant to this focus group project is the following:

[G]ender bias is evident in the employment practices, the curricula, and teaching methods of many California law schools. . . . Female professors have been denied tenure under circumstances that bespeak gender bias. Casebooks continue to use stereotypical females, teachers continue to discount female experience, and gender bias itself continues to be ignored as a subject to be studied for its impact on substantive law and trial practice.⁶

An important conclusion from the 1996 report and follow up focus groups on this issue in 2000 was that promoting and institutionalizing the goals of access and fairness in the justice system and the legal profession must begin at the law school level, at the latest, if those concepts are to be instilled in the lawyers and jurists who serve the public. Thus, in 2002, the council, through the Rules and Projects Committee, approved the advisory committee to examine the scope and effectiveness of gender fairness training in California's law schools. The Gender Fairness Subcommittee of the advisory committee undertook this task. The subcommittee's goals were to determine how the judiciary and the State Bar might assist and encourage law schools to:

1. Ensure that their legal curricula and practicum, as well as the law school environment, instill in students the ability to recognize and effectively handle gender fairness, equity, and cultural competency issues in the context of substantive legal representation;

⁵ Recommendations also were transmitted to other entities, including the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the California Youth Authority, California district attorneys, public defenders, the California Judges Association, and local probation departments.

⁶ *Id.*, at pp. 388–395.

2. Actively promote students' understanding of the importance of treating fellow students, future clients, and others in the profession with dignity and respect;
3. Explore and implement ways to incorporate gender fairness and other fairness issues into substantive coursework, in addition to any stand-alone courses that schools already offer; and
4. Promote all types of diversity and inclusion in the law school environment.

Between 2003 and 2006, the advisory committee, the subcommittee, and the State Bar (collectively referred to as the project team) collaborated on this project to gather anecdotal information regarding perceptions of gender fairness issues in the law school curriculum and environment using focus groups of deans,⁷ administrators,⁸ faculty, and students from 17 California ABA-approved law schools. While creating procedures for the focus groups, the project team realized it would be efficient to also examine other access and fairness issues as part of the process. Those included racial and ethnic fairness, access for persons with disabilities, and sexual orientation issues.

This report contains the results of those focus group sessions and notes a few articles and studies that examine how law schools can more effectively prepare students to provide legal services to increasingly diverse clients. The report concludes that California law schools have begun to recognize the need to include issues of access to justice, fairness in legal decisionmaking, and diversity as integral elements of the law school curriculum and learning environment and that schools may wish to consider how they can better incorporate these values through the legal education they provide.

This report is a snapshot of the perspectives of students, faculty, administrators, and deans concerning their schools' approaches to fairness issues at the time the focus groups were held. The project team recognizes that since that time, changes at most or all of the participating schools have undoubtedly occurred. During the last decade or so, many law schools have made extraordinary efforts to expand and improve curricular offerings, diversify their faculties and student populations, and expose students to the variety of potential legal careers. Thus, this report is intended to assist law schools by sharing information garnered through the focus group project, so that schools can consider the expressed views of their own constituencies. This may help law schools ensure that their students are prepared not only to pass the bar examination, but also to provide quality and compassionate legal services to their clients, whether individuals or institutions. The report is not intended to criticize or emphasize what can be viewed as shortcomings in today's California law schools. It is meant to provide law schools with the candid observations of their students, faculty, and administrators. The project team believes that

⁷ Participating deans include, for example, associate deans of student affairs and student services, academic deans, and deans of the schools.

⁸ Participating administrators include, for example, directors of outreach and assistants to the dean of the school.

student, faculty, and administrator observations, opinions, and comments about experiences at their respective institutions can be useful as law schools continue to address these challenges.

This endeavor required the willingness of law school deans, faculty, administrators, and students to self-reflect and explore their respective schools' approaches to gender and other fairness issues. The project team applauds and thanks those participants who were willing to engage in this process.

This report must point out that the student and faculty participants in this inquiry were primarily self-selected. To invite student participation, the deans and administrators of the participating schools distributed and posted flyers announcing the focus groups sessions. At some schools, flyers also were distributed to affinity group organizations. Deans invited faculty and administrators to attend. Some deans requested participation by specific students, student groups, faculty, or staff. At the suggestion of almost all participating deans, the focus group sessions were held on Fridays, recognizing the likelihood that attendance might be higher because of less demanding class schedules on those days. Therefore, the level of participation depended on a number of factors, such as the level of student and faculty interest in fairness issues at their school, visibility of the announcements about the sessions, and the availability of prospective participants.⁹ Accordingly, the opinions and observations referenced in this report do not necessarily reflect the perspective of the schools' broader law school populations. However, the consistency of the comments by each of the five focus groups was significant.

The focus group covered the following topics: (1) integration of fairness issues in the substantive curriculum,¹⁰ (2) the grievance process for students, (3) law school accommodations for students with disabilities, (4) career services, (5) the law school environment, and (6) minority faculty hiring and retention.

Overview of Findings

What follows is a summary of the project team's findings, divided by subject areas.

Integrating Fairness Issues Into Curricula

One of the primary areas of interest to the project team was to what extent the law schools and their curricula integrate fairness, bias, and discrimination concepts into core, bar-tested courses, as opposed to entrusting these concepts to stand-alone curricula.

Questions posed to participants concerning law school curriculum covered:

- Student interests in legal issues relevant to and courses dealing with race, gender, sexual orientation, or disabilities;

⁹ See appendix B, which reflects the number of participants at each focus group location and appendix C, which charts the 2006 population data for each participating school.

¹⁰ "Substantive curriculum" as referenced in this report refers to core or bar-tested subjects such as criminal law, criminal procedure, civil procedure, real property, community property, torts, and wills and trusts.

- The extent to which these issues are covered in the schools’ substantive courses;
- Students’ familiarity with major antidiscrimination and civil rights legislation;
- Classroom discussion of fairness in the context of the substantive curriculum; and
- Choice of casebooks that acknowledge or fail to acknowledge race, gender, sexual orientation, and disability issues where appropriate.

California law schools continue to offer stand-alone courses focusing on issues such as women and the law and critical race theory. These courses became part of most law school course offerings in the 1980s. However, students who participated in the focus groups expressed the view that their schools should increase course offerings in these areas, given the level of student interest. Faculty participants remarked that although these classes are typically fully enrolled, they were offered only periodically at some schools. Students also noted that fairness issues are generally not incorporated into bar-tested courses. Accordingly, some student participants, especially women and students of color, expressed the opinion that important substantive and legal practice issues were not addressed in the required coursework.

Most faculty participants, on the other hand, appeared to strongly adhere to the notion that “academic freedom” permitted them to be the sole decision makers regarding course content when curriculum was examined. Most agreed that their colleagues are reluctant to change a curriculum they have taught for years and are resistant to suggestions to integrate fairness concepts into their existing curricula. Facilitating classroom discussion of provocative or sensitive issues, such as race, gender, or cultural differences, was also an area that most participating faculty agreed was challenging. This view was confirmed by many student participants.

Most participating deans commented that they lack control or influence over curriculum content and suggested that unless the students demand it, curriculum changes will be slow to occur.

Grievance Procedures on Law School Campuses

Because one of the recommendations of the 1996 report related to how schools handle complaints of harassment and bias,¹¹ the project team thought it was important to learn whether law schools have effective grievance procedures for students to report concerns about biased or discriminatory conduct by faculty or others at the schools.

Questions posed to participants concerning grievance procedures covered:

- Whether schools had in place a mechanism for students to raise concerns regarding actual or perceived bias and inappropriate behavior based on gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability; and

¹¹ *Achieving Equal Justice, supra*, at footnote 1, p. 389, Recommendation 9(e) which states “[law schools should] provide grievance procedures and discipline for sexual harassment by students, faculty or employees.”

- The extent to which students were aware of the mechanism and felt they could access it without retaliation.

All participating schools have sexual harassment policies¹² in place. The focus group discussions suggested that law schools should ensure that they have effective and transparent anti-bias or anti-discriminatory policies and procedures as well. The student discussions suggested that students needed more education about their schools' grievance processes because most were unaware of any formal procedures for lodging complaints. They noted their reliance on commonsense solutions, such as complaining to a faculty member or an administrator they felt they could trust. Some students indicated reluctance to report biased behavior by their professors, administrators, or fellow students. Thus, a school's challenge in addressing any problem could be attributable, in large part, to students' lack of awareness of appropriate procedures and the school's need to communicate its policies effectively. While most deans and administrators agreed that there were few problems of this nature on their campuses, they acknowledged the lack of formal anti-bias or anti-discriminatory policies and procedures for students to access. They attributed the absence of such policies to the fact that unlike campus policies against sexual harassment, written anti-bias policies are not required by statute.

Physical Access to Facilities and Accommodations for Students With Disabilities

Student participants observed that individuals with physical disabilities do not compose a significant percentage of any school's student population. Participants in the focus groups did, however, include students with disabilities, both observable and hidden. These student participants expressed the view that they are usually the smallest law school minority with the fewest advocates.

Questions posed to participants concerning physical access and accommodations for individuals with disabilities covered:

- The extent to which the law school facilities were accessible to persons with disabilities;
- Whether formal procedures were in place for persons requesting accommodations; and
- The attitudes of faculty, staff, and students regarding students needing or receiving disability accommodations.

Students with physical disabilities reported mixed experiences. Some institutions have updated their physical facilities to accommodate the needs of individuals with mobility challenges. Other schools need to improve physical access to their facilities. Of the institutions that need to improve physical access to their facilities, the barriers described by the focus group participants ranged from limited seating or access to seating in lecture rooms to inability to access lecture

¹² Education Code section 231.5, enacted in 1992, requires that all educational institutions establish written sexual harassment policies.

halls, libraries, and faculty offices without waiting for assistance from an able-bodied person. The student participants with observable disabilities reported that other students were respectful and that they generally did not experience harassment or offensive behavior from other students.

Law school administrators described varying processes for those requesting physical accommodations. Procedures ranged from comprehensive policies and procedures at one school to procedures that addressed needs on a case-by-case basis at others. Some faculty indicated that the role of an Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) coordinator was not yet viewed as significant, with inexperienced faculty holding those positions. Based on these responses, the advisory committee suggests schools might also consider institutionalizing procedures designed to accommodate these students, if they have not already done so.

By contrast, students with hidden disabilities, primarily learning disabilities, described more unpleasant experiences in law school, though few stated that they were not accommodated. Almost universally, these students indicated that both faculty and peers regarded them suspiciously if they requested extra time to write papers and exams, even when their condition was medically verified. Some students reported receiving offensive e-mail, which they attributed to fellow students. These students stated that their respective schools should make more effort to dispel tensions about the issue.

Career Services

Career services staff provide support for legal professionals at different stages in their careers. On-campus career services provide counseling, assistance with resumé writing, individual evaluation and assessment, and job placement services. They invite potential employers to meet and talk with students during career or placement fairs. When law school career offices operate well, students are exposed to a range of opportunities.

Because the focus group participants responded to questions focused primarily on career services, this section focuses on the participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of law school career services in providing information on a broad range of career opportunities for students.

Questions posed to participants concerning career services covered:

- The level of student interest in working in underserved communities,
- The extent to which students are encouraged to enter certain legal careers based on academic performance, ethnic, racial identity, or gender, if at all; and
- The extent to which career services provide guidance to students regarding work/life balance issues.

Students reported that the enormous debt loads they carry when they leave law school virtually preclude careers in the public sector. Faculty also agreed with this perspective. However, some also observed that career services offices discouraged students from pursuing these jobs and tended to steer students to large law firms. Dean participants observed that students' career

choices after law school are influenced by debt load more than by the lack of desire to pursue non-law-firm and noncorporate jobs.¹³

Some students reported that their peers ridiculed them if they expressed interest in public interest law. Students of color reported that even though career services staff are aware that private firms are challenged with retaining lawyers of color, they promote law firm employment. These students expressed the view that counseling for students of color regarding the law firm experience should be implemented. Schools might also consider facilitating student mentoring by practicing lawyers to increase student awareness of different types of legal practice.

Law School Environment

Some students attending law school do not merely attend classes each day and return home or to their dormitories. Students often seek camaraderie, support, and social and academic stimulation from their peers and faculty. Some students participate as members of their school's law review editorial staff; others join affinity group organizations, seek informal study groups for academic support, or work while attending school. Membership in clubs, groups, or organizations also can contribute to positive law school experiences for students. Moreover, interactions among students or between students and faculty can substantially affect the overall law school environment and the experience of individual students.

Questions posed to participants concerning the law school environment covered:

- Incidents of bias involving students, faculty, and staff and how the incidents were handled or resolved;
- Their opinion regarding whether law students value diversity in their legal education and in the law school environment;
- The extent to which minority; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students and organizations for disabled students are supported by the institution; and
- Whether and the extent to which minority students feel included or marginalized in the classroom or at school, in general.

Female students and students of color at many of the participating law schools reported incidents of bias and harassment in their student-to-student interaction. Students at several institutions spoke of feeling intimidated by the school administration when they reported these incidents. They expressed reluctance to discuss bias and diversity issues, even among themselves. Others hesitated to raise these issues in class for fear of ridicule and marginalization by their peers. Some noted that as students of color, classmates expected them to speak for their entire race or ethnic group when issues of bias arose in the classroom.

¹³ Since these focus groups were held, several law schools have established debt forgiveness programs for their students who work for a specified time period in public interest law.

Administrators who participated in the focus groups expressed uncertainty and some discomfort in dealing with biased or offensive behavior on the part of students or faculty. Most admitted that with respect to student-to-student interactions, the tendency is to ignore the issues and to allow the students to work them out among themselves. Several administrators indicated that complaints against professors, on the other hand, were discussed with the students. Most participating administrators concurred that if the student did not file a *formal* complaint, the school did little to address it.

Faculty Hiring and Retention

Having little diversity among faculty affects institutions' ability to attract diverse faculty and students and the quality of student education and preparation for real-world practice.¹⁴ The quality and depth of a lawyer's educational experience directly affects his or her ability to provide quality legal representation and, for some, to become competent and knowledgeable judicial officers.¹⁵

Questions posed to participants concerning minority faculty hiring and retention included:

- The extent to which women and faculty of color are achieving tenure;
- Whether they could identify any obstacles to achieving tenure for women and faculty of color;
- The challenges of recruiting faculty of color; and
- The extent to which faculty are encouraged to pursue scholarly interests outside of traditional theoretical discourses.

While all participants voiced a commitment to the hiring, retention, and promotion of female professors and professors of color, the faculties at most participant law schools remain, for the most part, predominantly white.¹⁶ Female professors and faculty of color reportedly face obstacles such as tokenism, isolation, and differing scholastic or performance standards not experienced by their white male colleagues. Achieving a critical mass of faculty of color continues to elude most law schools that participated in the focus groups.

While most faculty recruitment occurs through the Association of American Law Schools (AALS), some dean participants suggested that schools should think outside the box and search for candidates using nontraditional recruiting methods.

An often-cited obstacle to tenure for law professors of color discussed by the participants is the perceived lack of scholarly writings. According to several participants, junior faculty members at

¹⁴ See generally, Jon C. Dubin, *Faculty Diversity as Clinical Legal Imperative*, 51 *Hastings L. Journal* 445, 453–472 (2000).

¹⁵ See *The Statement of Skills and Values, Education Continuum Report of the Task Force on Law Schools and the Profession: Narrowing the Gap*, ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar (1992).

¹⁶ See demographic charts for participant law schools in appendix C.

their schools have been advised to avoid writing or researching topics of gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other fairness issues until after they achieve tenure.

Methodology of the Focus Group Project

Project team members facilitated focus groups at 5 law schools throughout the state and heard from faculty, student, and administrative representatives from 17 of California's 19 ABA-approved law schools as follows:

- University of California at Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall);
- University of California at Davis School of Law (King Hall);
- University of California, Hastings College of the Law;
- University of California at Los Angeles School of Law;
- California Western School of Law;
- Golden Gate University School of Law;
- Thomas Jefferson School of Law;
- Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University;
- University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law;
- University of San Diego Law School;
- Southwestern University School of Law;
- Stanford University School of Law;
- Santa Clara University School of Law;
- University of Southern California, Gould School of Law;
- University of San Francisco School of Law;
- Western State University -College of Law; and
- Whittier Law School.¹⁷

Prior to each focus group, the subcommittee sent letters to the deans of all of the ABA-approved California law schools, inviting their schools' participation in the focus groups and enlisting their assistance in recruiting participants.¹⁸ Non-ABA and California unaccredited schools were not included in the focus groups because the project team wanted (1) to maximize attendance by inviting schools with larger student populations and (2) to protect the anonymity of the students and faculty from the smaller schools. Deans were asked to publicize the event to students, faculty, and administrators. Follow-up letters were sent, and members of the subcommittee contacted administrators and faculty at each institution to confirm the school's participation. The advisory committee acknowledges that the results obtained reflect the perceptions of the students and faculty who self-selected to attend the focus groups or, in the case of UC Davis, to respond to the online survey (see appendix B). Those participants may have had more interest in issues of

¹⁷ See appendix B.

¹⁸ Chapman University School of Law and Pepperdine University School of Law were invited but were unable to participate.

access and fairness than students who chose not to attend and who may have had differing views of their law school experience. Notably, not all participants shared similar views on each topic.

Representatives from two or more local law schools attended each focus group session. Participants were divided into three groups: students, faculty, and deans/administrators. Focus group sessions were held on Fridays, when classes would not substantially interfere with participation. However, the overall participation level of faculty was significantly less than for the other two discussion groups. The focus groups met for four hours. Student participants in all locations totaled 169; faculty totaled 37, and dean/administrator totaled 82.

Members of the project team, assisted by staff from the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER), served as facilitators. An effort was made to use as many of the same facilitators as possible in all of the focus groups to ensure continuity and consistency in approach and questioning. Sessions began with a welcome from the hosting law school dean and a cochair of the Gender Fairness Subcommittee, who explained the project and introduced the facilitators.

With CJER's assistance, a series of questions was developed for each of the three categories of participants.¹⁹ The recommendation from the 1996 report provided the general categories of inquiry. All groups were asked the same series of questions that were prepared for that group to ensure that the same topics were addressed.

After the in-person group sessions concluded, the dean of UC Davis School of Law requested that her school be able to provide additional input. The project team then created an online survey consisting of the questions in appendix A. Fifty-one students, 3 faculty, and 36 deans/administrators from UC Davis completed the online survey.

Discussion

Demographics of California Law Schools

California's law schools vary considerably in their percentage of minority students. According to the 2006 *ABA/LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools*, the percentage of students of color ranges from a low of 17.2 percent to a high of 41.7 percent.²⁰

Faculty and administrator diversity also varies considerably from school to school. However, overall faculty diversity is substantially lower than that of the student population at each of the participating institutions.²¹ At the time the ABA survey was compiled, one school with 62 full-

¹⁹ See appendix A for a complete list of the questions.

²⁰ See the 2006 edition, published by the Law School Admission Council (LSAC) and the American Bar Association.

²¹ The *ABA/LSAC Official Guide*, which provides, among other things, demographic information on all ABA-approved law schools, did not identify the number of faculty who are tenured or hold the rank of full professor.

time faculty had 14 full-time minority faculty—the largest ratio of minority faculty for all California law schools. The schools with the fewest full-time faculty of color (2) had totals of 23 and 24 full-time faculty.

Focus group participants, across the board, agreed that achieving and retaining a diverse law school faculty is one of greatest challenges with which schools continue to struggle. Dean participants often mentioned faculty burnout as a reason for their school's inability to retain women and faculty of color. This seems to be an obstacle even 10 years after a similar observation was made in a 1996 Association of American Law Schools (AALS) newsletter:

The other retention problem created by too few minority faculty members is their popularity with law school, university, and community committees, boards, and other service groups. Although these groups' efforts to achieve diverse representation are commendable, they necessarily repeatedly call on the same minority faculty members because the pool is so small. Minority professors also often become official or unofficial advisers for the school's minority students and organizations. Many minority faculty are reluctant to decline because they have a strong commitment to help achieve diversity, provide community service, and help minority students cope with an environment that may be hostile and isolating. The resulting overload and stress, however, have caused minority professors to leave the professoriate. Deans must actively protect minority professors from excessive service demands, particularly because such activities often are granted little weight in performance reviews.

Integration of Fairness Issues in Law School Curricula

Over the years, law school education and curricula have expanded to include topics that would not have been part of legal education two or three decades ago. Today, courses on discrimination and employment law, sexual orientation, gender, race and racism, and disabilities are taken for granted by law students. One author observes that at least three events helped reshape legal education: new law, social change, and increased student diversity. Arguably, the most influential of the three events was the social change and unrest that occurred in the middle of the last century.²²

While law schools offer fairness courses, they are primarily offered as electives and do not attract a representative cross-section of law school students. To gain exposure to issues of race, gender, class, disabilities, and similar topics, motivated students must seek them out or enroll in law clinics that provide opportunities for students to learn through experience. Many respondents stated that by relegating these topics to what they described as the margins of law school

²² See Mark Kurlansky, *1968: The Year That Rocked the World*. His article states that much of what is offered today as a part of law school education resulted from changes in the law, demands of law students and faculty, and social movements of the 1960's and 1970's.

education, graduates are unprepared to work with clients that are increasingly multiracial and ethnically and linguistically diverse. By not requiring these courses, students may be receiving the message that these topics are of minimal importance.

Okianer Dark's 1996 article in the *Willamette Law Review*²³ illuminates two important points on the value of diversity in law schools and in the law school classroom:

Those discussions belong in law schools and, at the very least, in law school classrooms. Diversity issues affect and shape legal doctrine, application of the law, and judicial and administrative processes. Consequently, students who will practice law into the next century need to be conversant with and understand the nuanced ways in which these issues affect what they will do as lawyers.

Too often, teachers will avoid these important discussions because they feel that one needs to have a range of special tools and skills to effectively handle a discussion about diversity. I believe that the most critical skills that teachers need are related to what is referred to as "good teaching"—the ability to listen, to demonstrate respect for the student, to model professionalism in the level of preparation and treatment of the material, and to not take yourself so seriously. But most importantly, the teacher must be willing to engage in some risk taking to enhance and enrich the students' learning experience.

Courses

The students' curricula include required courses for graduation and electives. Required courses are typically limited to subjects tested on the bar examination and certain research and writing courses. Classes such as Poverty and the Law, Women in the Law, Gender in the Law, Critical Race Theory, and Asian-American Lawyering are listed as electives. However, in general these classes are not offered regularly. When they are offered, most participants reported that the courses were full and had waiting lists. In addition to the for-credit courses, one school's first-year students have the option to attend meetings on critical race studies to discuss issues of race and classroom dynamics.

The American Bar Association conducted a three-year study of changes, innovations, and trends in law school curricula, which resulted in a report published in 2002 titled *A Survey of Law School Curricula*.²⁴ The study surveyed 152 law schools and yielded a response rate of 96.7 percent. The goal of the study was, among other things, to examine changes, innovation, and trends in legal education. Two of its findings are relevant to this report. First, there is no

²³ Okianer Christian Dark, *Incorporating Issues of Race, Gender, Class, Sexual Orientation, and Disability Into Law School Teaching*, 32 *Willamette L. Rev.* 541, 542–543 (1996).

²⁴ The report was prepared by the Curriculum Committee of the American Bar Association Section of Legal Education and Admissions.

statistical evidence suggesting that the “bar factor” drives curricular decisionmaking or graduation requirements. This is contrary to the anecdotal comments from dean/administrator participants in the focus groups. Second, skills and simulation course opportunities for students have increased in the past decade. Twenty-nine percent of law school respondents in the study required some form of clinical skills or a simulation course for graduation. The focus group participants supported this development.

Classroom Discussion

Most schools require professors to cover specific subject areas and topics in their classes. However, law professors are not required to raise issues of access and fairness as they relate to course content. Academic freedom allows the professor to approach and discuss the required topics in any manner they choose.

Students reported that the professors who do incorporate issues of diversity and encourage ensuing discussions vary by race, gender, and sexual orientation. Professors who have researched and written on these topics are more likely to raise the issues in class. Some professors introduce diversity issues through supplemental reading, such as law review articles and newspaper clippings. Students noted that professors who are open to one form of diversity maybe not be open to other forms. For example, a professor open to discussing sexual orientation issues may not be as open to discussions of racial issues.

Further, course content often drives discussions about diversity. Students pointed to Family Law and Wills and Trusts as courses that included more discussions on diversity. At least one school’s legal writing course incorporates diversity issues, including children’s rights, into their writing assignments. Students expressed some disappointment that in courses where many of the litigants in case studies were minorities, such as in Criminal Law and Constitutional Law, this factor did not typically lead to discussions of diversity. One student pointed out that even the concept of “the reasonable person” addressed in core torts classes did not necessarily generate a discussion on diversity, leaving some students to conclude that the reasonable white male was the only valid standard.

Many students expressed a desire for more straightforward classroom discussions about fairness issues within the context of the subject area. There was a suggestion that some faculty members should be more comfortable with these issues and might benefit from training in handling these topics. Students reported that many professors omitted diversity issues because of time limitations and the need to cover all the topics required by the curriculum. Professors also have limited time to cover issues tested on the bar examination. Moreover, some professors follow the casebook very closely. Thus, if diversity issues were not addressed in case studies, they were not generally the subject of classroom discussion. One student noted that if cases in the text raised racial issues, some professors excluded those cases from the syllabus.

Another student reported that some professors feared being labeled as not “politically correct.” Another noted that professors seemed afraid of “going out on a limb.” They expressed

disappointment that professors sometimes cut off the discussions, limited the exchanges between students, summarily dismissed students' comments, or worse, demeaned the student who raised issues of bias or fairness. One student reported that when issues of race, class, gender, or disability surfaced, the professor or the students joked about them.

Many students expected the professors to control classroom discussions and create a safe and respectful environment for open discussions. Some students who spoke up in class said they felt attacked by other students either during or after class. These students felt professors would allow the discussions to get out of hand, making it uncomfortable for future discussions. As a result, many students simply abandoned efforts to engage in dialogue on these issues.

A dearth of discussion of fairness and equity issues can lead some students to believe that issues of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity are not relevant to the profession or that law should be taught in a vacuum. "It's like saying, 'Racism is the responsibility of people of color and . . . sexism is the responsibility of women,'" commented one student. Other students said they were disheartened or felt isolated, believing that they were the only students in the class with their views. At one of the law schools, several first-year students stated that they were very disappointed with their classes. One lamented, "To me, that's the saddest thing about law school because that's where we have an opportunity to engage in these issues before . . . we go out and practice." A classmate added, "And if we're not getting the whole picture when we're being taught the law, we're not going to apply it when we get done with law school."

Participants noted that sometimes classmates were the source of frustration for students of color and other students sensitive to fairness issues in the justice system. Some students observed that when professors did initiate dialogue, not all students were engaged and some complained about the time devoted to this part of the discussion. They wanted "black letter law" and were interested only in issues that were likely to be tested on final examinations or the bar exam. Participants also commented that classmates openly expressed that classroom discussion of these topics was either a waste of time, was irrelevant, or made them uncomfortable, or that they did not understand the relevance of diversity to the profession.

For some students, the lack of a critical mass of students from diverse backgrounds made speaking in class more arduous. Students of color remarked about the burden of feeling as if they were the spokesperson for their race. This phenomenon is not exclusive to law schools.²⁵ Also, professors would readily choose the student who "looked like" a person from a diversity group anytime the minority viewpoint was solicited. One student commented, "There's a difference between volunteering your experience and being put on the spot because you're the one person in the room who looks like that." In seminars, these issues were magnified because of the lack of a critical mass.

²⁵ See Michael Thompson and Kathy Schultz, *The Psychological Experiences of Students of Color*, National Association of Independent Schools (2007).

Several students suggested diversity or sensitivity training for professors. In addition to diversity training, students suggested including diversity, civil rights, or fairness issues on the bar exam to force professors to include the topics in class. Such topics could include “statutes that affect discrimination, disability access, fairness, sexual orientation, and racial discrimination in the workplace.” Another student suggested including these topics in the mandatory Professional Responsibility class. Finally, one student suggested that there should be a course on “diversity training in the professional law office.” Most students, however, opted to include the topics within core classes. Another suggestion focused on an accreditation requirement that law schools include diversity and fairness issues in the core curriculum.

Students on one campus reported that a large number of students are exposed to fairness and diversity topics in courses on civil rights. According to another, diversity and fairness course offerings are not well-enrolled, either as stand-alone courses or those where concepts are integrated into the legal education curriculum. Participants at another school that offers stand-alone courses on access and fairness issues indicated that those courses attract a good cross-section of students. Their school’s fairness courses and related clinics are fully subscribed and expose students to fairness issues in practical ways. Some deans also acknowledged that at their schools, most students do not take these courses and those who do are already interested in the topic.

Comments concerning course offerings included the lack of a structured approach to curriculum development and content. It was described as a “hit or miss” approach by one participant. Faculty, that participant complained, inconsistently incorporate fairness topics into core courses. At one university, these topics are incorporated into courses but to such a degree that it may, according to one respondent, trivialize their importance. Students agreed that these courses add value to legal education and should be required early in the education of future lawyers and not simply as electives. Moreover, they argue for a multidisciplinary approach that integrates the topic into substantive courses, so all students are exposed in the course of their legal education. Integrating fairness topics does not diminish their importance but ensures that these topics are seen as “need to know,” rather than “nice to know.”

One faculty member at a Northern California law school noted a variety of courses into which fairness issues can be incorporated, such as Constitutional Law, Religion, Torts, Environmental Justice, Native American Law, Sex Discrimination, Disability Rights, Civil Rights, and Immigration Law and Procedure. This professor commented that “the biggest obstacle is presenting a balanced perspective between liberal and less liberal views, so as not to alienate students whose political views differ from the majority. That is part of ‘fairness,’ really.”

The administrators explained, almost unanimously, that the deans were concerned about faculty “academic freedom” and were universally reluctant to attempt to require faculty to incorporate fairness issues into any of their courses. Deans repeatedly expressed reluctance to discuss course content with faculty. They perceived that most faculty resist being told what to include in their curricula and that faculty do not believe the inclusion of fairness topics in their courses is their

responsibility. One participant felt any effort to change the status quo in this area must be student-driven in order for deans to force the issue with faculty. Another explanation for this seeming resistance is that often professors are uncomfortable with or do not know how to address issues of race, gender, and other differences in their classrooms.

Participants also offered solutions. Some suggested that law schools, in general, not compartmentalize fairness topics into stand-alone courses but that fairness concepts should be integrated throughout the law school environment. Some participants suggested faculty retreats as a more preferable forum for discussion of classroom environment and fairness issues. Deans indicated that faculty would be receptive to training on classroom facilitation of discussion of fairness issues or other more provocative (hot topic) classroom dialogue. Another suggestion echoed that of the students, that is, if the bar examination devoted attention to major civil rights and other antidiscrimination legislation (such as the Americans With Disabilities Act), students would be conversant with them.

Grievance Process

Deans and administrators said their law schools have grievance procedures and at least one person designated to hear and investigate complaints. Most complaints are student-to-student complaints, and some are student complaints against faculty. According to administrators at most participating schools, students receive a brochure or can visit a Web site to learn about the grievance process or procedures. A range of formalities exists at the schools with respect to these procedures. While some schools may have a policy prohibiting biased behavior, they admittedly have no formal process for addressing such behavior (with the exception of sexual harassment) should a complaint arise.

According to some school administrators, discussion of antiharassment policies or grievance procedures is included in their orientation programs, but most do very little to publicize the policies or procedures to the students or to insure that students have a basic awareness of the process. Others stated that little or no discussion of those policies takes place during student orientation. According to participants, schools seldom address student-to-student behavior and students are left to manage these problems with no guidance. According to one administrator, a student complaint never reaches the dean even when a student reports a problem to a school administrator.

An administrator at one focus group stated, "I don't think we do anywhere near enough to empower students and staff to feel comfortable enough to make complaints." Another stated that students really don't know where to go to make complaints. One administrator admitted that she would not feel comfortable taking a complaint of bias to the dean of the school. Some deans and administrators reported hearing only minor complaints, while others indicated they knew of more serious complaints of harassment or bias. One administrator reported receiving a number of complaints from students regarding biased behavior on the part of professors and students in the classroom, while two administrators explained that their students expressed fear of retribution from professors if they complained about the professors' behavior. A participant in the

dean/administrator group reported that their administration is aware that students engage in offensive behavior but does not intervene because the administrators are not trained to deal with it. Another participant stated, “The problem is that the institution is putting the responsibility for change and addressing these issues on the student, when we should be creating an environment for them where they’re safe.”

Few students, on the other hand, reported having any knowledge of these procedures, and further, that they would tend not to use them because of fear of reprisal. A number of students expressed a lack of confidence in the procedures. Some indicate that they would feel comfortable going to the designated person and making a complaint; others would not use the grievance procedures. Those in the latter group did not trust the process or did not want to “rock the boat.”

Physical Access to Facilities and Accommodations for Students With Disabilities

Six of the 17 participating schools indicated that they provide resources for students with mental or physical disabilities. One administrator reported that her school has an institutionalized process and procedure for students who need disability accommodations. Others indicated that they address such needs case by case. Campuses are accessible for the most part. However, older buildings on those campuses are least accessible for students with physical disabilities. Most participants reported that their school made substantial physical improvements in their facilities to increase access for persons with disabilities. However, one student complained that even newer buildings on her campus were not ADA compliant. In response to a complaint from a school administrator regarding the inaccessibility of classroom seating, an administrator indicated that a colleague stated that the ADA did not apply to the school because it is a private institution. All participants agreed that while schools provide resources for persons with disabilities, their schools can do a better job of providing information about available services to students with special needs and educating its administrators about statutory requirements regarding accommodations for persons with disabilities.

According to participating students with physical disabilities, most of their law school classrooms use the standard tiered, fixed, amphitheater seating, which creates enormous access problems. Wheelchair seating is usually provided in either the front or back row, on the same level as the door. No preference in seating is provided for the students who use wheelchairs. Even students who can negotiate the steps struggle with the seating arrangements. Two students remarked that the classroom configuration posed physical barriers for them because of the close proximity of the stationary chairs and desks.

Students with invisible disabilities face obstacles as well. A number of participants reported an increase in the number of students with learning disabilities, which has become a major issue for many students and faculty. Law schools are encountering increasing numbers of students with learning disabilities and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), as well as attention deficit disorder (ADD). Some of these students are diagnosed while in law school.

Participants reported that among students without disabilities, there is some sentiment that students with learning disabilities are given preferential treatment because they are sometimes provided with class note-takers and allowed more time to complete exams. These students also complain to faculty and deans about the perceived preferential treatment. Students with these disabilities are generally viewed with some animosity and skepticism by other students. According to dean/administrator participants, faculty members at their institutions were also skeptical of students with learning disabilities who received additional time on examinations. This group agreed that students often stigmatized their peers who have these types of disabilities.

One school's administrators complained about the Committee of Bar Examiners' denial of accommodations for one student. Another participant did not feel that students with disabilities needed much assistance. He stated, "By the time students get to law school, they are savvy about what to do."

Another dean/administrator remarked that the school's ADA compliance budget is not proactive but reacts when a student presents an accommodation request. Others in the group agreed with that assessment of the general approach to accessibility issues at their schools. Participating schools might consider educational programs for students, faculty, and staff regarding disability issues to foster more sensitivity to students with all types of disabilities. Additional training also should be considered for those designated as ADA coordinators to ensure a working knowledge of the ADA requirements for addressing requests for accommodations.

Career Services

Many students leave law school with jobs as associates in medium or large firms. Focus group participants indicated that successful placement of graduates is a barometer of the success of law school education their institutions provide. Some students criticized campus career placement staff for the disproportionate placement of graduates with medium to large private firms, preferring them to public interest or public sector employment. However, most participants recognized that the placement of students following graduation is complex and not the sole responsibility of the schools' professional staff. Among the reasons students select larger firms is to repay student loans, prestige, and the emphasis their professors place on law firm employment. With regard to public sector employment, students reported that few public law interest firms are invited to participate in career fairs or to interview third-year students. Students indicated that they were not advised of the various loan forgiveness programs provided by some public interest programs.

One legal writer posits two views about law students' career interests before and near the end of their legal education:

It is likely that law students initially want to go into public interest law because they think it would be an interesting and rewarding career path that provides the additional benefit of assisting the community. Such ambitions are invariably going to falter if students are presented with other interesting and rewarding

career paths. When interesting and rewarding career paths are combined with unbelievable temptation in the form of salary and perks, only an indefatigable desire to serve the public good is likely to survive. . . .²⁶

After a law school experience where some students feel they “have been treated as incompetents, terrorized daily, excluded from privilege, had their valued beliefs ridiculed, and in general felt their sense of self-worth thoroughly demeaned,” they are flattered and cajoled, wined and dined, and keenly sought after [by law firms who go to elite law schools to recruit new associates].²⁷

The focus groups yielded a number of observations from deans and administrators about students’ experiences with career placement and access to information about legal careers. One dean stated that minority students are expected to practice public interest law and that some professors at their school expressed shock if students of color indicate interests in technology or corporate law. This group remarked that these students also feel peer pressure to practice criminal or public interest law. One administrator remarked that minority students lacked role models for business law and other non-public-interest careers. Another commented that often the career services staff fail to provide appropriate counseling to minority students about postgraduation employment possibilities. One career services administrator stated that she reminds students of their interest in public interest law when they began law school and points out that sometimes large firms do not encourage associates’ interest in pro bono work. Her solution was for law schools to recognize and act on the need for more role models in the administrative structure for students of color. One participant had hired a job coach for students of color to assist them in a career search.

A participating administrator stated, “Alums and deans are not going to be happy about a graduate who is doing poverty law in a rural area and making \$32,000 a year. They are more interested in who went to the big firms and who makes the highest salaries.” Another commented that some interviewers continue to ask inappropriate questions that may reflect gender bias, for example, when they inquire about marriage plans and family issues. However, administrators reported that, based on conversations with students, more male students are beginning to affirmatively question employers’ views of quality of life issues during interviews.

Students across the board indicated that their schools could more adequately address work-life balance issues. One indicated that, to the extent these issues are addressed, they are addressed through student-initiated forums, lunch hour sessions, and evening presentations. Another student complained that the emphasis appears to be on work-life balance issues for women when “all law students [should] be provided with information for balancing personal and professional lives.” A minority of students disagreed, one stating that professors dialogued with students

²⁶ Kirsten Edwards, *Found! The Lost Lawyer*, October 2001, 70 *Fordham L. Rev.* 37, 46–47.

²⁷ *Id.*, at 49.

about this issue and another saying that work-life balance is an issue for law firms, not law schools.

Law School Environment

Generally, participants from most law schools reported the lack of a comprehensive approach to handling incidents of offensive or biased behavior in the classroom or at the law school in general.

One administrator described an incident regarding a racially offensive e-mail message sent by a student to the entire school. Another administrator discussed a similar incident at her school involving a student-to-student e-mail involving racially offensive remarks. The school reportedly did nothing to address it and merely waited for the students to lose interest in the matter. At another focus group session, deans reported that the students handle offensive behavior “by the seat of their pants” and that the school provides no training for them.

There was also a consensus expressed among most administrators that students and faculty alike expected students of color to speak on behalf of their entire race or ethnic group and that this imposed an unfair burden on those students. However, the administrators reportedly did not address the issue with their faculty. In the view of the participants, without a critical mass of students of color, those students do not believe they can express their opinions free of ridicule in their classes.

Dean/administrator participants discussed the types of resources their schools provide for on-campus student organizations. Participants from one school indicated that the law school student organizations had access to minimal financial support from the school and that access to funding was on a first-come, first-served basis. Access to faculty advisors for these groups depended on the faculty’s interest and availability. Dean participants expressed the view that law student organizations, for the most part, enriched the students’ experience.

Faculty Hiring and Retention: Effect on Student Learning

While all of the participants voiced a commitment to hiring, retaining, and promoting minority law professors, the faculties at most participant law schools remain overwhelmingly white. Statistics illustrate that white female faculty fare better than faculty of color in terms of employment, although retention remains an issue for them as well. According to 2006 ABA statistics of the participating law schools, the percentage of full-time faculty of color ranged from 5.0 percent to 24.5 percent. The percentage of full-time female faculty ranged from 7.6 percent to 31.6 percent for either the fall or spring semesters.

According to the dean/administrator participants, minority faculty face burdens not experienced by most white faculty members, such as serving on multiple university and law school committees, participating on community boards, advising students of color, and mentoring students from similar diversity groups. Also, the lack of a critical mass of diverse professors

often results in isolation and alienation.²⁸ As a result, retention continues to be a challenge at most law schools participating in the focus groups.

Students expressed strong concern about the lack of diversity among tenured faculty. It appeared that a high percentage of the professors from diverse backgrounds were not tenured or tenure-track but taught in clinical programs or legal writing courses. Some schools made a conscious effort to have at least one female and one minority professor in each first-year section. While several schools have female deans or deans of color, the concern about the ability to increase the numbers of full-time, tenured professors of color remains undiminished since the issue came to the forefront for many law schools in the early 1980s. Student and dean/administrator participants' comments echoed those in a law student article published 1999 where the student observed that definitions of academic scholarship are often cross-cultural, and that any standard would be one developed for the majority. "There are a lot of minority scholars who are writing in very innovative fields. If a faculty member is an expert on activism in the 1950s, how can they accurately judge activist scholarship in 1999?" Students felt they would benefit from a larger "minority faculty community." Dean/administrator participants expressed similar sentiments.

All deans and administrators indicated that their schools were experiencing a disproportionate loss of female faculty. They indicated that faculty members are expected to engage in traditional doctrinal scholastic endeavors until they receive tenure. For example, some of the deans indicated that, at their schools, junior faculty members were advised to avoid writing about diversity topics or teaching these courses until they achieved tenure. They opined that such an expectation could be a barrier to hiring and retention of female faculty as well as faculty of color. This may also discourage junior professors who perceived that other legal scholars and their peers trivialize these subjects. Many participants also remarked that faculty who engage in scholarship concerning fairness areas are generally viewed with suspicion. One stated, "One woman faculty member was tenured *despite* her gender research" (emphasis added). At a different focus group session, one of the deans indicated that the faculty was split on the issue of granting tenure to a person who wrote on fairness issues. One participant noted the loss of one professor who left the school because of controversy surrounding his scholarship in "nontraditional" areas.

A minority of faculty respondents noted the opposite experience on their campuses. When asked if researching or teaching stand-alone courses on fairness topics might hinder faculty tenure, several professors responded that the situation was the opposite at their schools. One said, "We especially value scholarship in disability rights, civil rights, gender issues, etc."

An article published by the AALS in 1996 on faculty hiring and retention provides one perspective that may be valid for some schools who continue to struggle with retention of faculty of color:

²⁸ These experiences are consistent with the findings of the 2005 report of American Association of Law School's Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Minority Law Teachers.

A minority professor's performance must be evaluated objectively and pursuant to the same standards and procedures as are applied to every other faculty member. To achieve this equality of treatment and to ensure that new faculty understand their responsibilities, a school must develop clearly stated standards and procedures, rather than relying on informal and ambiguous criteria. The standards and procedures should be published and should be given to each faculty member. They should specify the relative weights accorded to teaching, scholarship, and service activities. To eliminate uncertainty about performance, each faculty member should be evaluated annually and should be informed in a candid and constructive manner of the results of the evaluation and of expectations for future performance. . . .

Although the standards should be uniform, they should not exclude nontraditional forms of scholarship. One of the most important reasons for creating a diverse faculty is to provide a variety of perspectives that will enhance knowledge and understanding. Therefore, a faculty should take care not to undervalue the work of a minority professor simply because it explores nontraditional areas or uses nontraditional methods.

Based on participants' comments, law schools should explore ways to institutionalize sustained and appropriate efforts to increase and maintain faculty diversity. They might consider collaborating with legal associations and employers who can assist with these efforts.

Law School Council's Review and Comments on the Report

Before submitting this report to the Judicial Council, the advisory committee chair, cochair of the Gender Fairness Subcommittee, and committee staff attended a November 30, 2007 meeting of the Law School Council (LSC) to solicit its feedback and comments on the draft report. The (LSC) is comprised of representative law school deans, and representatives of the Committee of Bar Examiners (CBE) and the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California. It advises the CBE on matters relating to content and format of the bar examination, issues concerning coordinating curricula, and all aspects of law school education relevant to the bar examination process. It also serves as a two-way channel of information and as a sounding board and source of expertise for the CBE, for proposals from it or from the law schools, and advises on other matters as appropriate.

The 14-member LSC consists of 10 law school deans (elected by their category of school²⁹ and appointed by the Board of Governors), 3 members representing CBE (appointed by the CBE

²⁹ The distribution of law school deans among the categories of law schools is approximately proportional to student enrollment and representation in first-time applicants for the California bar examination. The distribution is: (1)

chair), and 1 member representing the Board of Governors (generally, the chair of the Board Committee on Regulation, Admissions and Discipline Oversight). Five accredited law schools are represented on the LSC, all of whom participated in the focus group sessions that gave rise to this report.

The member deans indicated that they were pleased with the report, particularly the fact that the Judicial Council is expressing interest in the law schools and their curricula. One of the Board of Governors attendees commented that the “judiciary’s voice has an enormous high-profile perspective and is very important.” They commented that the report is a “valuable, sensitizing document” and that highlighting the issues that the focus group participants raised would help law schools prepare the next generation of attorneys to better function in California’s diverse communities. The LSC indicated that it would like to use the report for the deans’ workshop at the American Bar Association’s 2008 midyear meeting and distribute it at the next meeting of the Deans’ Assembly in spring 2008. The LSC’s comments regarding various topics covered by the report were as follows.

Curriculum Reform and the Realities of Law Practice

Deans indicated that the report confirmed most of what they knew about their schools but thought the report would provide leverage with their faculty with respect to curriculum reform and course content. About half of the deans indicated that their schools also participate in the annual Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), a national survey of law students, which, among other things, assesses their opinions of whether law school sensitizes them to “being part of a diverse community.”³⁰ But the schools, according to one dean, do not typically use the survey findings to reevaluate course content and teaching methodologies.

All of the deans welcomed and requested resource assistance from the Judicial Council, if appropriate. They expressed some disappointment at their inability to develop core resources that law schools can access to instruct faculty in classroom facilitation and curriculum development in the areas of fairness and diversity. One dean stated that while curriculum reform is underway, these efforts thus far have not addressed the issues raised in the report.

The deans expressed frustration with the profession’s increased expectations of law school education. They indicated that law firms are demanding that legal education produce “practice-ready” attorneys because firms prefer not to train new attorneys. They also noted that much of the recent discussion regarding curriculum reform in law schools is in response to the 2007 Carnegie report,³¹ which suggests that law schools develop more skills-based, experiential

public, ABA-approved law schools: 2 members, (2) private ABA-approved law schools: 4 members; (3) California accredited law schools, not ABA approved: 2 members; (4) California unaccredited law schools: 1 member; (5) correspondence/distance learning law schools: 1 member.

³⁰ The LSSSE Advisory Board states that the survey “documents dimensions of quality in legal education and provides information about law student participation in effective educational activities that law schools and other organizations can use to improve student learning.” See http://lssse.iub.edu/html/about_lssse.cfm.

³¹ William M. Sullivan, Anne Colby, Judith Welch Wegner, Lloyd Bond, Lee S. Shulman, *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Practice of Law* (2007).

curricula. One dean suggested that legal education should address the realities of legal practice and that in many instances law schools are more diverse than the ultimate practice settings. He stated his belief that law schools provide protective, unrealistic settings for students and that the schools fail to adequately prepare students for legal practice in less supportive environments.

School and Classroom Environment

The deans discussed their perspectives of student-to-student interaction and demeanor at school, a topic about which some focus group students and administrators expressed concern. They were troubled by what they described as the high level of contentiousness among the student population, the students' ideological polarization, and that some students "push the bounds of freedom of speech" in their relationships with other students. Student interaction and demeanor were overarching concerns of the group. One dean suggested that the report could have provided a more in-depth treatment of these issues but acknowledged the limitations of the study.

Diversity in the Profession and the Cost of a Legal Education

The deans expressed particular concern about the bar becoming less diverse than California's population and that the demographics of people being served are not reflected in the bar's membership. One dean referred to this as the "disconnection between the bar and the diverse population." Another dean called it a "crisis in legal education," stating that the cost of a legal education is prohibitive for many prospective applicants from diverse backgrounds and that legal education must be affordable to ameliorate this crisis. Further, responding to the report's recommendation that more law schools consider partnering with other legal entities and associations to implement debt or loan forgiveness programs for students who choose public sector careers (recommendation 3e), most deans agreed that this was *not* the most effective approach, particularly for minority students. They pointed out that these programs do not benefit students who cannot obtain loans or are without the financial resources to consider a legal education. They added that loan forgiveness programs are expensive and currently only two California schools can afford to offer them. The deans also mentioned that although loan forgiveness legislation was passed in California, the programs are not funded and that schools' financial aid programs are shifting from need to merit-based, which also adversely impacts prospective minority law students.

The Law School Council's Additional Recommendations

The LSC members supported the draft reports' proposed recommendations and, in addition, recommended the following:

1. The report should be transmitted to the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC) for its information.
2. The report should be transmitted to the Committee of Bar Examiners and the State Bar Board of Governors to elevate the discussion of the content and format of the bar examination.

3. The report should include a recommendation that encourages all members of the legal profession, not just law schools, to provide scholarships, grants, and other financial assistance to entering law students.

The advisory committee determined that the LSC's recommendations are consistent with the focus group results, and therefore, incorporated them into the report's recommendations, which are set forth on pages 29-31.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section presents the project team's observations and the advisory committee's recommendations.

Conclusions

The focus group dialogue that developed during this project suggests that California law schools should continue to explore ways to meet the needs of all of their students in order to prepare them to be effective legal practitioners. The schools acknowledged the challenges associated with training their students to practice in a diverse, multicultural society. The project team's observations suggest that schools should also develop ways to mainstream issues of diversity, multiculturalism, race, gender, and sexual orientation into substantive law school curricula. If the current focus continues the traditional approach, it may ignore the importance of the ever-changing demographics of California. Diversity of students and faculty remains a sensitive and challenging area where the schools may benefit from partnership with other legal organizations that are focusing their efforts on increasing diversity in the legal profession.

The level of instruction on fairness topics was generally inconsistent, based on responses of participants. The risk of not including this concept in the law school curriculum is that some students will graduate without an appreciation of how race, gender, disability, and sexual orientation issues often relate to law practice in the private and public sectors. At each of the participating law schools, students who were not exposed to fairness issues in the classroom had opportunities to learn about them in law clinics. However, limiting this experience to students who self-select for such clinics leaves most students underexposed to the practical issues of fairness in the justice system. Experiential learning and hands-on experience are effective instructional methods. However, without a legal basis and social context for what students are exposed to in the field and in the classroom, the learning experience for students may be incomplete. Clinical faculty typically provide both a social context and a theoretical basis to help clinical law students appreciate the clients they serve. When student participants compared or spoke of their classroom experiences, many expressed some disappointment with the coursework. They had expected to learn more practical applications of law and legal theory. Since these focus groups were held, law schools have undoubtedly increased the breadth of students' experiential learning. But a focused approach to integration of the reality of legal

practice into substantive and core curricula would ensure that all students benefit from this approach to legal education.

Further, there is an apparent need for faculty to gain expertise in teaching fairness topics and integrating these concepts into substantive curricula. Broadening the faculty education experience in this manner may encounter some resistance, according to law school deans, studies by AALS, and law professors. However, there was an obvious difference in perspectives regarding the reasons these changes are slow to occur. Deans complained of the lack of control over curriculum content because professors resist what some view as interference with their academic freedom. On the other hand, faculty indicated that teaching these topics is not supported by the school administration. They thought that law school administrators place more emphasis on helping students pass the bar and gaining employment in large law firms. Either way, it is clear that the degree to which fairness topics are addressed in the classroom depends on the collaborative efforts of deans and faculty to enhance and broaden their curriculum.

For most law schools, successful placement of graduates is a barometer of the success of law school education. However, the placement of students following graduation is complex and not the sole responsibility of professional staff. The placement of graduates with medium to large firms over public interest law firms was also a criticism of campus career placement staff. One solution schools might consider is to develop or expand debt or loan forgiveness options for students who work in the public sector after graduation. Schools should consider collaborating with public interest legal organizations that support these programs and encourage these organizations to provide financial support for entering law students. They may also determine how to ensure that all students are exposed to a broad spectrum of employment opportunities through their career services offices.

Recommendations

The advisory committee makes the following recommendations to the Judicial Council to encourage enhancement of law school education and the development of effective and compassionate lawyers who directly influence the quality of the California justice system:

1. Request that the Judicial Council transmit this report to the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California for its information and consideration.
2. Request that the Judicial Council urge the Board of Governors and the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California to collaborate, as appropriate, with law school deans regarding how the bar examination might incorporate issues of gender and other types of bias into bar examination questions, as well as other issues of format and content of the examination.
3. Request that the Judicial Council transmit this report to the law school deans and urge them to consider the following strategies:

- (a) Encourage faculty to educate students about the effects of racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, disability, and gender bias within the substantive curriculum, in addition to stand-alone courses that the schools may currently offer;
- (b) Develop effective strategies that institutionalize fairness, diversity, and cultural competency training programs for law school faculty and staff;
- (c) Institute written policies and procedures for students who request disability accommodations; promote awareness of the procedures and documentation needed for requests for accommodations on the bar examination; and develop programs for students, faculty, and administrators that raise awareness of the needs of students with disabilities;
- (d) Enhance the quantity and quality of information provided to students by career services and placement offices about public sector employment opportunities and encourage public interest and government organizations to recruit on law school campuses;
- (e) Explore partnerships with legal organizations, associations, and other interested parties to provide financial support for entering law students with limited resources and to create or expand loan or debt forgiveness programs for law students who choose public sector careers;
- (f) Establish and more widely distribute formal grievance procedures for students that include a process for resolving complaints of bias, harassment, and lack of disability access;
- (g) Provide faculty with access to periodic training that focuses on methods of facilitating student discussion on fairness and access to justice issues as they relate to the substantive curriculum;
- (h) Encourage faculty to develop teaching methods or engage speakers who can integrate the practical aspects of how issues of fairness and bias relate to the reality of legal practice in the substantive areas being taught;
- (i) Provide opportunities for law school faculty to become better informed about the effects of bias on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and disability that might be manifested in the classroom and how to ameliorate their impact on students and the educational environment;

- (j) Develop a broader approach to evaluation of faculty for tenure consideration, including the evaluation of scholastic authorship; to attract and retain a diverse faculty;
 - (k) Collaborate with legal associations and employers to explore more effective approaches to retaining a diverse faculty;
 - (l) Participate with the State Bar's Diversity Pipeline initiative to develop approaches that help attract more students of color to consider law school and legal careers; and
 - (m) Collaborate with the State Bar to evaluate how the bar exam might incorporate issues of gender and other types of bias into bar examination questions.
4. Request that the Judicial Council transmit this report to the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC) for its information.

Appendixes

**Appendix A:
Questions Posed to Focus Group Participants**

Questions Posed to Dean/Administrator Participants

QUESTIONS		NOTES
1.	On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being highest level, describe the level of student interest in legal issues relevant to race, gender, sexual orientation, and/or disabilities.	
2.	This is a two-part question. If you have faculty who teach fairness topics, what is their background (publications, research interest, practice of law)? What research has faculty undertaken?	
3.	List the courses that substantively cover gender, race, sexual orientation, or disability issues. If none or a few, what substantive courses can you identify where fairness issues could be woven into the curriculum? Would some faculty need assistance in doing so? What obstacles would you face if you wanted to introduce these topics into the school's core curriculum?	
4.	Does your school offer fairness training to faculty and students? By "fairness training" we mean education on topics such as gender fairness, racial and ethnic fairness, sexual orientation fairness, disability fairness, age bias, women and the law, critical race theory, or feminism? What about sexual or other harassment prevention?	
5.	Are these topics currently discussed or covered in any way as part of the school's substantive curricula?	
6.	Are your facilities accessible to those who have mobility disabilities?	
7.	Do you have a complaint mechanism in place? Would you feel comfortable in using it when or if faculty and/or students exhibit bias or other inappropriate or offensive behavior based on gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability?	
8.	What experience(s) have you had or have you learned that others have had with bias at your school? Student-student, faculty-faculty, and/or faculty-student? How were the situations handled, if you know?	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
9.	How would you feel about encouraging faculty to include a fairness component in their substantive courses?	
10.	Please explain why you do or don't believe that the presence of minorities and or other underrepresented groups is essential to a law school education?	
11.	Are there subjects for research and publishing that are rated more highly than others for tenure and promotion? If so, please identify the areas of research that are viewed less favorably when considering tenure and promotion.	
12.	Do trial practice or skill practice courses incorporate fairness topics? If they currently do not, what would it take to incorporate these topics?	
13.	What familiarity do students have with discrimination law (title VII, title IX, the ADA, etc.) by the time they graduate?	
14.	Do you know whether students with disabilities experience barriers professionally and academically (i.e., internships)? Please provide one or more examples.	
15.	If a fairness-related course was offered at your school, but the course was under-enrolled for a specific quarter or semester, would it still be offered during that time period? At another time? How would under-enrollment be handled?	
16.	Have any of these courses been oversubscribed and required additional sections?	
17.	Do you think that the professional responsibility course offered at your school would be an appropriate course to incorporate fairness topics? Does it depend on whether the issue is tested on the PRE?	
18.	What percentage of students would you estimate are generally interested in serving the underserved (i.e., low income, minorities, non-English-speaking persons, etc.) during or after law school? Please give examples to support your answer(s).	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
19.	Do you track law school students after graduation to determine or to learn about the type of law that they practice? Do you track after the first year or fifth year?)	
20.	Is there a presumption made on the part of career placement counselors? For example, do you believe students are being steered toward certain legal careers based on academics, ethnic or racial background, or gender? How do you know? Do you think it's important to find out? (<i>Optional</i> : What are the types of law firms that visit your campus?)	
21.	What is the demographic makeup/diversity of faculty/students? Describe the ethnic, linguistic, cultural, gender diversity of your population.	
22.	Do you regularly review textbooks for content that address fairness-related topics or contain potentially offensive material (e.g., examples or hypotheticals that maybe offensive to different groups)?	
23.	Identify the extent to which the traditional textbooks for the core curriculum are supplemented with other course materials.	
24.	Identify institutional barriers to offering courses on fairness issues in the curricula.	
25.	How, if at all, are courses that incorporate the topics under discussion evaluated by students and faculty?	
<i>OPTIONAL (additional questions if time permits)</i>		
26.	Does your school support minority student associations such as gay/lesbian and women's bar associations or student organizations (e.g., with money, inclusion in on-campus events, activities, speakers)? Why or why not?	
27.	Have you ever attended a meeting of a bar association or school minority association such as gay/lesbian and women's bar associations or student organizations?	
28.	Is assistance (e.g., retention programs, tutoring, mentoring) to underrepresented (ethnic minorities, low income) students or students of color provided? If so, please describe. If not, explain.	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
29.	Describe the extent to which your school provides information on balancing professional and personal lives (women/gender).	
30.	How does your institution select its tenure committee?	
31.	Do you have formal faculty-faculty or student-student mentoring programs? If so, please give details.	
32.	What is the demographic makeup/diversity of faculty/students? Describe the ethnic, linguistic, cultural, gender diversity of your population.	
33.	What is the process for students to request accommodations? How are these issues addressed? Does your school have a “point person” responsible for handling these issues? Do you feel your faculty has enough information to address these issues? Do you think your faculty needs training in these issues?	

Questions Posed to Faculty Participants

QUESTIONS		NOTES
1.	On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being highest level, describe the level of student interest in legal issues relevant to race, gender, sexual orientation, and/or disabilities.	
2.	List the courses that substantively cover gender, race, sexual orientation, or disability issues. If none or a few, what substantive courses can you identify where fairness issues could be woven into the curriculum? Would some faculty need assistance in doing so? What obstacles would you face if you wanted to introduce these topics into the school's core curriculum?	
3.	Does your school offer fairness training to faculty and students? By "fairness training" we mean education on topics such as gender fairness, racial and ethnic fairness, sexual orientation fairness, disability fairness, age bias, women and the law, critical race theory, or feminism? What about sexual or other harassment prevention?	
4.	Are these topics currently discussed or covered in any way as part of the school's substantive curricula?	
5.	Are your facilities accessible to those who have mobility disabilities?	
6.	Do you have a complaint mechanism in place? Would you feel comfortable in using it when or if faculty and/or students exhibit bias or other inappropriate or offensive behavior based on gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability?	
7.	What experience(s) have you had or have you learned that others have had with bias at your school? Student-student, faculty-faculty, and/or faculty-student? How were the situations handled, if you know?	
8.	Do you believe you have the training and experience to teach fairness topics?	
9.	Do you think researching and/or teaching stand-alone fairness topics might hinder faculty tenure?	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
10.	As experienced faculty, are there subjects for research and publishing that are rated more highly than others for tenure and promotion? If so, please identify the areas of research that are viewed less favorably when considering tenure and promotion.	
11.	How would you feel about encouraging faculty to include a fairness component in their substantive courses?	
12.	Please explain why you do or don't believe that the presence of minorities and or other underrepresented groups is essential to a law school education?	
13.	Do trial practice or skill practice courses incorporate fairness topics? If they currently do not, what would it take to incorporate these topics?	
14.	What familiarity do students have with discrimination law (title VII, title IX, the ADA, etc.) by the time they graduate?	
15.	Do you know whether students with disabilities experience barriers professionally and academically (i.e., internships)? Please provide one or more examples.	
16.	If a fairness-related course was offered at your school, but the course was under-enrolled for a specific quarter or semester, would it still be offered during that time period? At another time? How would under-enrollment be handled?	
17.	Have any of these courses been oversubscribed and required additional sections?	
18.	What fairness topics, if any, are included in the professional responsibility course offered at your school? Does it depend on whether the issue is tested on the PRE?	
19.	What percentage of students would you estimate are generally interested in serving the underserved (i.e., low income, minorities, non-English-speaking persons, etc.) during or after law school? Please give examples to support your answer(s).	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
20.	Is there a presumption made on the part of career placement counselors? For example, do you believe students are being steered toward certain legal careers based on academics, ethnic, or racial background, or gender? How do you know? Do you think it's important to find out?	
21.	What is the demographic makeup/diversity of faculty/students? Describe the ethnic, linguistic, cultural, gender diversity of your population.	
22.	Do you believe that the diversity of the student population at your school is reflective or representative of the people that they will serve?	
23.	In your view, are entering students sufficiently knowledgeable about fairness topics? What are the indicators of adequate or inadequate knowledge? For example, are students raising questions or addressing fairness issues in papers or during class discussions?	
24.	Are such courses required for graduation? Do they have to be completed in the first or second year?	
25.	Do you regularly review textbooks for content that address fairness-related topics or contain potentially offensive material, e.g., examples or hypotheticals that maybe offensive to different groups?	
26.	Identify the extent to which the traditional textbooks for the core curriculum are supplemented with other course materials.	
27.	For those of you who are experienced in teaching fairness issues, please describe your positive and negative experiences with teaching or designing such courses? Identify institutional barriers to offering such courses in the curricula.	
28.	How, if at all, are courses that incorporate the topics under discussion evaluated by students and faculty?	
29.	Does your school support minority student associations such as gay/lesbian and women's bar associations or student organizations (e.g., with money, inclusion in on-campus events, activities, speakers)? Why or why not? Are there faculty advisors for any of these specialty bars?	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
30.	Have you ever attended a meeting of a bar association or school minority association such as gay/lesbian and women's bar associations or student organizations?	
31.	Is assistance (i.e., retention programs, tutoring, mentoring) to underrepresented students or students of color provided? If so, please describe. If not, explain.	
32.	Describe the extent to which your school provides information on balancing professional and personal lives (women/gender).	
33.	How does your institution select its tenure committee?	
34.	Do you have formal faculty-faculty or student-student mentoring programs? If so, please give details.	
35.	What is the process for students to request accommodations? Do you feel that the faculty has a responsibility to ensure that students with disabilities are aware of this process? Does your school have a "point person" responsible for handling these issues? Do you feel you have enough information to address these issues? Do you think you need training in these issues?	

Questions Posed to Student Participants

QUESTIONS		NOTES
1.	On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being highest level, describe the level of student interest in legal issues relevant to race, gender, sexual orientation, and/or disabilities.	
2.	Are your facilities accessible to those who have mobility disabilities?	
3.	Do you know of a complaint mechanism that is in place? Would you feel comfortable in using it when or if faculty and/or other students exhibit bias or other inappropriate or offensive behavior based on gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability?	
4.	What experience(s) have you had or have you learned that others have had with bias at your school? Student-student, faculty-faculty, and/or faculty-student? How were the situations handled, if you know?	
5.	Do trial practice or skill practice courses incorporate fairness topics? If they currently do not, what would it take to incorporate these topics?	
6.	What percentage of your fellow students would you estimate are generally interested in serving the underserved (i.e., low income, minorities, non-English-speaking persons, etc.) during or after law school? Please give examples to support your answer(s).	
7.	Do you know whether students with disabilities experience barriers professionally and academically (i.e., internships)? Please provide one or more examples.	
8.	Do you think the professional responsibility course offered at your school would be an appropriate course to incorporate fairness topics? Does it depend on whether the issue is tested on the PRE?	
9.	Is there a presumption made on the part of career placement counselors? For example, do you believe students are being steered toward certain legal careers based on academics, ethnic, or racial background, or gender? How do you know?	

QUESTIONS		NOTES
10.	Do you believe that the diversity of the student population at your school is reflective or representative of the people that they will serve?	
11.	Does your school support minority student associations such as gay/lesbian and women's bar associations or student organizations (e.g., with money, inclusion in on-campus events, activities, speakers)? Why or why not?	
12.	Have you ever attended a meeting of a bar association or school minority association such as gay/lesbian and women's bar associations or student organizations? If not, why not?	
13.	Is assistance (i.e., retention programs, tutoring, mentoring) to underrepresented students or students of color provided? If so, please describe. If not, explain.	
14.	Describe the extent to which your school provides information on balancing professional and personal lives (women/gender).	
15.	List the courses that substantively cover gender, race, sexual orientation, or disability issues. If none or a few, what substantive courses can you identify where fairness issues could be woven into the curriculum? What would prevent you from taking a stand-alone fairness course?	
16.	Does your school offer courses such as women and the law, critical race theory, and/or feminism?	
17.	Please explain why you do or don't believe that the presence of minorities and or other underrepresented groups is essential to a law school education?	
18.	What familiarity do you have with discrimination law (title VII, title IX, the ADA, etc.)?	
19.	Do you have a formal student-student mentoring program? If so, please give details.	
20.	Are you aware of the process for students to request accommodations? Do you think providing accommodations levels the playing field or is it an unfair advantage?	

Participating Law Schools by Location³²	No. of Students	No. of Faculty	No. of Deans and Administrators
University of San Diego Law School (held on April 4, 2003) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Western (855) • Thomas Jefferson (803) • University of San Diego (571) • Western State University (489) • Whittier (871) 	26	10	15
UC Hastings College of the Law (held on October 17, 2003) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golden Gate University (851) • John F. Kennedy³³ • Santa Clara University (955) • UC Berkeley, Boalt Hall (874) • UC Davis, King Hall (571) • UC Hastings (1,255) • University of the Pacific, McGeorge (1,042) • University of San Francisco (729) 	51	8	11
UCLA (held on October 29, 2004) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UCLA (970) • University of Southern California (628) 	10	8	2
Loyola, Los Angeles (held on April 2, 2004) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loyola, Los Angeles (1,319) • Southwestern University (931) 	16	5	13
Stanford University (held on February 4, 2005) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stanford University (527) • Santa Clara University (955)³⁴ 	15	3	5
UC Davis (by electronic survey) (completed on October 16, 2006)	51	3	36
Totals	169	37	82

³² The numbers in the parentheticals represent student populations of the participating schools in 2006, as reported by the American Bar Association. These numbers may not reflect the student population that existed when the focus groups were held.

³³ One student from this school attended the focus group session.

³⁴ Santa Clara University participated in two sessions because some of its participants were unable to attend at the UC Hastings location.

Appendix C:
Demographic Charts Of ABA-Approved California Law Schools
(Compiled From ABA Statistics, 2006)

Faculty and Administrators

All

School	Fall						Spring							
	Full-time		Others Who Teach		Part-time	Total	Full-time		Others Who Teach		Part-time	Total		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
California Western School of Law	44	52.4%	11	13.1%	29	34.5%	84	44	51.2%	11	12.8%	31	36.0%	86
Chapman University School of Law	27	49.1%	6	10.9%	22	40.0%	55	22	33.3%	5	7.6%	39	59.1%	66
Golden Gate University School of Law	36	32.7%	12	10.9%	62	56.4%	110	33	26.4%	12	9.6%	80	64.0%	125
Loyola Law School	65	50.0%	11	8.5%	54	41.5%	130	62	50.4%	10	8.1%	51	41.5%	123
Pepperdine University School of Law	30	32.6%	15	16.3%	47	51.1%	92	29	30.5%	14	14.7%	52	54.7%	95
Santa Clara University School of Law	54	56.8%	7	7.4%	34	35.8%	95	54	54.0%	7	7.0%	39	39.0%	100
Southwestern University School of Law	50	63.3%	8	10.1%	21	26.6%	79	51	60.7%	8	9.5%	25	29.8%	84
Stanford University Law School	62	64.6%	13	13.5%	21	21.9%	96	65	64.4%	13	12.9%	23	22.8%	101
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	30	50.0%	4	6.7%	26	43.3%	60	31	49.2%	4	6.3%	28	44.4%	63
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	71	55.5%	13	10.2%	44	34.4%	128	70	47.9%	13	8.9%	63	43.2%	146
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	37	69.8%	4	7.5%	12	22.6%	53	35	55.6%	5	7.9%	23	36.5%	63
University of California, Hastings College of Law	52	35.1%	11	7.4%	85	57.4%	148	56	37.6%	10	6.7%	83	55.7%	149
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	77	78.6%	7	7.1%	14	14.3%	98	75	67.6%	7	6.3%	29	26.1%	111
University of San Diego Law School	58	55.8%	12	11.5%	34	32.7%	104	64	58.2%	13	11.8%	33	30.0%	110
University of San Francisco School of Law	34	42.0%	6	7.4%	41	50.8%	81	29	38.2%	7	9.2%	40	52.6%	76
University of Southern California Law School	40	34.2%	15	12.8%	62	53.0%	117	42	35.0%	15	12.5%	63	52.5%	120
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	52	63.4%	8	9.8%	22	26.8%	82	55	55.0%	8	8.0%	37	37.0%	100
Western State University, College of Law	18	31.0%	8	13.8%	32	55.2%	58	18	36.7%	8	16.3%	23	46.9%	49
Whittier Law School	41	46.6%	6	6.8%	41	46.6%	88	44	56.4%	6	7.7%	28	35.9%	78

Men

School	Fall									
	Full-time			Others Who Teach			Part-time			Total
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Men	% of All	N
California Western School of Law	26	53.1%	31.0%	4	8.2%	4.8%	19	38.8%	22.6%	49
Chapman University School of Law	17	43.6%	30.9%	3	7.7%	5.5%	19	48.7%	34.5%	39
Golden Gate University School of Law	23	38.3%	20.9%	3	5.0%	2.7%	34	56.7%	30.9%	60
Loyola Law School	38	45.8%	29.2%	6	7.2%	4.6%	39	47.0%	30.0%	83
Pepperdine University School of Law	23	38.3%	25.0%	9	15.0%	9.8%	28	46.7%	30.4%	60
Santa Clara University School of Law	24	51.1%	25.3%	2	4.3%	2.1%	21	44.7%	22.1%	47
Southwestern University School of Law	31	59.6%	39.2%	5	9.6%	6.3%	16	30.8%	20.3%	52
Stanford University Law School	33	58.9%	34.4%	8	14.3%	8.3%	15	26.8%	15.6%	56
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	14	37.8%	23.3%	2	5.4%	3.3%	21	56.8%	35.0%	37
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	40	50.0%	31.3%	7	8.8%	5.5%	33	41.3%	25.8%	80
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	22	66.7%	41.5%	2	6.1%	3.8%	9	27.3%	17.0%	33
University of California, Hastings College of Law	33	36.7%	22.3%	5	5.6%	3.4%	52	57.8%	35.1%	90
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	57	80.3%	58.2%	3	4.2%	3.1%	11	15.5%	11.2%	71
University of San Diego Law School	37	54.4%	35.6%	4	5.9%	3.8%	27	39.7%	26.0%	68
University of San Francisco School of Law	22	45.8%	27.2%	3	6.3%	3.7%	23	47.9%	28.4%	48
University of Southern California Law School	25	34.7%	21.4%	6	8.3%	5.1%	41	56.9%	35.0%	72
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	30	61.2%	36.6%	5	10.2%	6.1%	14	28.6%	17.1%	49
Western State University, College of Law	13	32.5%	22.4%	3	7.5%	5.2%	24	60.0%	41.4%	40
Whittier Law School	19	41.3%	21.6%	5	10.9%	5.7%	22	47.8%	25.0%	46

School	Spring									
	Full-time			Others Who Teach			Part-time			Total
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Men	% of All	N
California Western School of Law	25	52.1%	29.8%	4	8.3%	4.8%	19	39.6%	22.6%	48
Chapman University School of Law	14	29.8%	25.5%	3	6.4%	5.5%	30	63.8%	54.5%	47
Golden Gate University School of Law	20	31.3%	18.2%	4	6.3%	3.6%	40	62.5%	36.4%	64
Loyola Law School	35	43.2%	26.9%	6	7.4%	4.6%	40	49.4%	30.8%	81
Pepperdine University School of Law	22	33.8%	23.9%	8	12.3%	8.7%	35	53.8%	38.0%	65
Santa Clara University School of Law	26	50.0%	27.4%	2	3.8%	2.1%	24	46.2%	25.3%	52
Southwestern University School of Law	34	57.6%	43.0%	5	8.5%	6.3%	20	33.9%	25.3%	59
Stanford University Law School	37	67.3%	38.5%	8	14.5%	8.3%	10	18.2%	10.4%	55
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	15	39.5%	25.0%	2	5.3%	3.3%	21	55.3%	35.0%	38
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	41	43.6%	32.0%	7	7.4%	5.5%	46	48.9%	35.9%	94
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	21	50.0%	39.6%	3	7.1%	5.7%	18	42.9%	34.0%	42
University of California, Hastings College of Law	39	38.6%	26.4%	4	4.0%	2.7%	58	57.4%	39.2%	101
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	54	70.1%	55.1%	3	3.9%	3.1%	20	26.0%	20.4%	77
University of San Diego Law School	44	58.7%	42.3%	5	6.7%	4.8%	26	34.7%	25.0%	75
University of San Francisco School of Law	19	40.4%	23.5%	3	6.4%	3.7%	25	53.2%	30.9%	47
University of Southern California Law School	26	33.8%	22.2%	6	7.8%	5.1%	45	58.4%	38.5%	77
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	33	51.6%	40.2%	5	7.8%	6.1%	26	40.6%	31.7%	64
Western State University, College of Law	12	37.5%	20.7%	3	9.4%	5.2%	17	53.1%	29.3%	32
Whittier Law School	20	54.1%	22.7%	5	13.5%	5.7%	12	32.4%	13.6%	37

**Appendix B:
Participating Law Schools**

Women

School	Fall										
	Full-time			Others Who Teach			Part-time			Total	
	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	
California Western School of Law	18	51.4%	21.4%	7	20.0%	8.3%	10	28.6%	11.9%	35	
Chapman University School of Law	10	62.5%	18.2%	3	18.8%	5.5%	3	18.8%	5.5%	16	
Golden Gate University School of Law	13	26.0%	11.8%	9	18.0%	8.2%	28	56.0%	25.5%	50	
Loyola Law School	27	57.4%	20.8%	5	10.6%	3.8%	15	31.9%	11.5%	47	
Pepperdine University School of Law	7	21.9%	7.6%	6	18.8%	6.5%	19	59.4%	20.7%	32	
Santa Clara University School of Law	30	62.5%	31.6%	5	10.4%	5.3%	13	27.1%	13.7%	48	
Southwestern University School of Law	19	70.4%	24.1%	3	11.1%	3.8%	5	18.5%	6.3%	27	
Stanford University Law School	29	72.5%	30.2%	5	12.5%	5.2%	6	15.0%	6.3%	40	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	16	69.6%	26.7%	2	8.7%	3.3%	5	21.7%	8.3%	23	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	31	64.6%	24.2%	6	12.5%	4.7%	11	22.9%	8.6%	48	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	15	75.0%	28.3%	2	10.0%	3.8%	3	15.0%	5.7%	20	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	19	32.8%	12.8%	6	10.3%	4.1%	33	56.9%	22.3%	58	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	20	74.1%	20.4%	4	14.8%	4.1%	3	11.1%	3.1%	27	
University of San Diego Law School	21	58.3%	20.2%	8	22.2%	7.7%	7	19.4%	6.7%	36	
University of San Francisco School of Law	12	36.4%	14.8%	3	9.1%	3.7%	18	54.5%	22.2%	33	
University of Southern California Law School	15	33.3%	12.8%	9	20.0%	7.7%	21	46.7%	17.9%	45	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	22	66.7%	26.8%	3	9.1%	3.7%	8	24.2%	9.8%	33	
Western State University, College of Law	5	27.8%	8.6%	5	27.8%	8.6%	8	44.4%	13.8%	18	
Whittier Law School	22	52.4%	25.0%	1	2.4%	1.1%	19	45.2%	21.6%	42	

School	Spring										
	Full-time			Others Who Teach			Part-time			Total	
	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	
California Western School of Law	19	50.0%	22.6%	7	18.4%	8.3%	12	31.6%	14.3%	38	
Chapman University School of Law	8	42.1%	14.5%	2	10.5%	3.6%	9	47.4%	16.4%	19	
Golden Gate University School of Law	13	21.3%	11.8%	8	13.1%	7.3%	40	65.6%	36.4%	61	
Loyola Law School	27	64.3%	20.8%	4	9.5%	3.1%	11	26.2%	8.5%	42	
Pepperdine University School of Law	7	23.3%	7.6%	6	20.0%	6.5%	17	56.7%	18.5%	30	
Santa Clara University School of Law	28	58.3%	29.5%	5	10.4%	5.3%	15	31.3%	15.8%	48	
Southwestern University School of Law	17	68.0%	21.5%	3	12.0%	3.8%	5	20.0%	6.3%	25	
Stanford University Law School	28	60.9%	29.2%	5	10.9%	5.2%	13	28.3%	13.5%	46	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	16	64.0%	26.7%	2	8.0%	3.3%	7	28.0%	11.7%	25	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	29	55.8%	22.7%	6	11.5%	4.7%	17	32.7%	13.3%	52	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	14	66.7%	26.4%	2	9.5%	3.8%	5	23.8%	9.4%	21	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	17	35.4%	11.5%	6	12.5%	4.1%	25	52.1%	16.9%	48	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	21	61.8%	21.4%	4	11.8%	4.1%	9	26.5%	9.2%	34	
University of San Diego Law School	20	57.1%	19.2%	8	22.9%	7.7%	7	20.0%	6.7%	35	
University of San Francisco School of Law	10	34.5%	12.3%	4	13.8%	4.9%	15	51.7%	18.5%	29	
University of Southern California Law School	16	37.2%	13.7%	9	20.9%	7.7%	18	41.9%	15.4%	43	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	22	61.1%	26.8%	3	8.3%	3.7%	11	30.6%	13.4%	36	
Western State University, College of Law	6	35.3%	10.3%	5	29.4%	8.6%	6	35.3%	10.3%	17	
Whittier Law School	24	58.5%	27.3%	1	2.4%	1.1%	16	39.0%	18.2%	41	

Minorities

School	Fall										
	Full-time			Others Who Teach			Part-time			Total	
	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	
California Western School of Law	9	81.8%	10.7%	1	9.1%	1.2%	1	9.1%	1.2%	11	
Chapman University School of Law	3	50.0%	5.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	50.0%	5.5%	6	
Golden Gate University School of Law	8	32.0%	7.3%	2	8.0%	1.8%	15	60.0%	13.6%	25	
Loyola Law School	11	55.0%	8.5%	4	20.0%	3.1%	5	25.0%	3.8%	20	
Pepperdine University School of Law	5	83.3%	5.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	16.7%	1.1%	6	
Santa Clara University School of Law	11	78.6%	11.6%	1	7.1%	1.1%	2	14.3%	2.1%	14	
Southwestern University School of Law	10	62.5%	12.7%	1	6.3%	1.3%	5	31.3%	6.3%	16	
Stanford University Law School	11	73.3%	11.5%	3	20.0%	3.1%	1	6.7%	1.0%	15	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	3	100.0%	5.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	9	69.2%	7.0%	2	15.4%	1.6%	2	15.4%	1.6%	13	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	13	92.9%	24.5%	1	7.1%	1.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	14	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	12	46.2%	8.1%	3	11.5%	2.0%	11	42.3%	7.4%	26	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	9	90.0%	9.2%	1	10.0%	1.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	10	
University of San Diego Law School	7	63.6%	6.7%	1	9.1%	1.0%	3	27.3%	2.9%	11	
University of San Francisco School of Law	11	50.0%	13.6%	1	4.5%	1.2%	10	45.5%	12.3%	22	
University of Southern California Law School	5	22.7%	4.3%	2	9.1%	1.7%	15	68.2%	12.8%	22	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	7	63.6%	8.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	36.4%	4.9%	11	
Western State University, College of Law	4	57.1%	6.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	42.9%	5.2%	7	
Whittier Law School	4	33.3%	4.5%	1	8.3%	1.1%	7	58.3%	8.0%	12	

School	Spring										
	Full-time			Others Who Teach			Part-time			Total	
	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	
California Western School of Law	10	90.9%	11.9%	1	9.1%	1.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	11	
Chapman University School of Law	3	37.5%	5.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5	62.5%	9.1%	8	
Golden Gate University School of Law	8	29.6%	7.3%	2	7.4%	1.8%	17	63.0%	15.5%	27	
Loyola Law School	13	68.4%	10.0%	3	15.8%	2.3%	3	15.8%	2.3%	19	
Pepperdine University School of Law	4	57.1%	4.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	42.9%	3.3%	7	
Santa Clara University School of Law	10	76.9%	10.5%	1	7.7%	1.1%	2	15.4%	2.1%	13	
Southwestern University School of Law	10	76.9%	12.7%	1	7.7%	1.3%	2	15.4%	2.5%	13	
Stanford University Law School	11	78.6%	11.5%	3	21.4%	3.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	14	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	3	75.0%	5.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	25.0%	1.7%	4	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	10	66.7%	7.8%	2	13.3%	1.6%	3	20.0%	2.3%	15	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	12	70.6%	22.6%	1	5.9%	1.9%	4	23.5%	7.5%	17	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	13	56.5%	8.8%	2	8.7%	1.4%	8	34.8%	5.4%	23	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	9	81.8%	9.2%	1	9.1%	1.0%	1	9.1%	1.0%	11	
University of San Diego Law School	7	58.3%	6.7%	2	16.7%	1.9%	3	25.0%	2.9%	12	
University of San Francisco School of Law	8	47.1%	9.9%	1	5.9%	1.2%	8	47.1%	9.9%	17	
University of Southern California Law School	5	20.8%	4.3%	2	8.3%	1.7%	17	70.8%	14.5%	24	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	7	70.0%	8.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	30.0%	3.7%	10	
Western State University, College of Law	3	37.5%	5.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5	62.5%	8.6%	8	
Whittier Law School	5	41.7%	5.7%	1	8.3%	1.1%	6	50.0%	6.8%	12	

J.D. Enrollment

All

School	All						
	Men			Women			Total
	N	%		N	%	N	
California Western School of Law	411	48.1%		444	51.9%	855	
Chapman University School of Law	279	50.2%		277	49.8%	556	
Golden Gate University School of Law	369	43.4%		482	56.6%	851	
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	689	52.2%		630	47.8%	1319	
Pepperdine University School of Law	335	47.6%		369	52.4%	704	
Santa Clara University School of Law	486	50.9%		469	49.1%	955	
Southwestern University School of Law	453	48.7%		478	51.3%	931	
Stanford University Law School	295	56.0%		232	44.0%	527	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	455	56.7%		348	43.3%	803	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	357	40.8%		517	59.2%	874	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	226	39.6%		345	60.4%	571	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	578	46.1%		677	53.9%	1255	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	488	50.3%		482	49.7%	970	
University of San Diego - School of Law	582	54.6%		484	45.4%	1066	
University of San Francisco School of Law	351	48.1%		378	51.9%	729	
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	326	51.9%		302	48.1%	628	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	555	53.3%		487	46.7%	1042	
Western State University - College of Law	239	48.9%		250	51.1%	489	
Whittier Law School	423	48.6%		448	51.4%	871	

Minorities

School	Minorities							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	% of Minorities	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	99	43.0%	11.6%	131	57.0%	15.3%	230	26.9%
Chapman University School of Law	62	41.9%	11.2%	86	58.1%	15.5%	148	26.6%
Golden Gate University School of Law	83	38.8%	9.8%	131	61.2%	15.4%	214	25.1%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	240	46.2%	18.2%	280	53.8%	21.2%	520	39.4%
Pepperdine University School of Law	53	40.2%	7.5%	79	59.8%	11.2%	132	18.8%
Santa Clara University School of Law	185	46.5%	19.4%	213	53.5%	22.3%	398	41.7%
Southwestern University School of Law	131	40.1%	14.1%	196	59.9%	21.1%	327	35.1%
Stanford University Law School	84	49.1%	15.9%	87	50.9%	16.5%	171	32.4%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	66	47.8%	8.2%	72	52.2%	9.0%	138	17.2%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	101	33.7%	11.6%	199	66.3%	22.8%	300	34.3%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	72	34.4%	12.6%	137	65.6%	24.0%	209	36.6%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	176	41.8%	14.0%	245	58.2%	19.5%	421	33.5%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	122	42.1%	12.6%	168	57.9%	17.3%	290	29.9%
University of San Diego - School of Law	147	50.0%	13.8%	147	50.0%	13.8%	294	27.6%
University of San Francisco School of Law	97	41.5%	13.3%	137	58.5%	18.8%	234	32.1%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	95	40.3%	15.1%	141	59.7%	22.5%	236	37.6%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	121	54.3%	11.6%	102	45.7%	9.8%	223	21.4%
Western State University - College of Law	68	39.8%	13.9%	103	60.2%	21.1%	171	35.0%
Whittier Law School	139	44.6%	16.0%	173	55.4%	19.9%	312	35.8%

African American

School	African American							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	9	2.2%	1.1%	17	3.8%	2.0%	26	3.0%
Chapman University School of Law	3	1.1%	0.5%	1	0.4%	0.2%	4	0.7%
Golden Gate University School of Law	7	1.9%	0.8%	14	2.9%	1.6%	21	2.5%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	20	2.9%	1.5%	29	4.6%	2.2%	49	3.7%
Pepperdine University School of Law	13	3.9%	1.8%	20	5.4%	2.8%	33	4.7%
Santa Clara University School of Law	17	3.5%	1.8%	21	4.5%	2.2%	38	4.0%
Southwestern University School of Law	13	2.9%	1.4%	24	5.0%	2.6%	37	4.0%
Stanford University Law School	24	8.1%	4.6%	17	7.3%	3.2%	41	7.8%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	4	0.9%	0.5%	9	2.6%	1.1%	13	1.6%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	13	3.6%	1.5%	26	5.0%	3.0%	39	4.5%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	4	1.8%	0.7%	6	1.7%	1.1%	10	1.8%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	8	1.4%	0.6%	25	3.7%	2.0%	33	2.6%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	21	4.3%	2.2%	21	4.4%	2.2%	42	4.3%
University of San Diego - School of Law	17	2.9%	1.6%	18	3.7%	1.7%	35	3.3%
University of San Francisco School of Law	13	3.7%	1.8%	18	4.8%	2.5%	31	4.3%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	15	4.6%	2.4%	42	13.9%	6.7%	57	9.1%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	12	2.2%	1.2%	12	2.5%	1.2%	24	2.3%
Western State University - College of Law	6	2.5%	1.2%	16	6.4%	3.3%	22	4.5%
Whittier Law School	14	3.3%	1.6%	26	5.8%	3.0%	40	4.6%

American Indian

School	American Indian							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	6	1.5%	0.7%	4	0.9%	0.5%	10	1.2%
Chapman University School of Law	1	0.4%	0.2%	4	1.4%	0.7%	5	0.9%
Golden Gate University School of Law	5	1.4%	0.6%	2	0.4%	0.2%	7	0.8%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	4	0.6%	0.3%	5	0.8%	0.4%	9	0.7%
Pepperdine University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.5%	0.3%	2	0.3%
Santa Clara University School of Law	1	0.2%	0.1%	3	0.6%	0.3%	4	0.4%
Southwestern University School of Law	1	0.2%	0.1%	8	1.7%	0.9%	9	1.0%
Stanford University Law School	5	1.7%	0.9%	1	0.4%	0.2%	6	1.1%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	2	0.4%	0.2%	1	0.3%	0.1%	3	0.4%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	3	0.8%	0.3%	6	1.2%	0.7%	9	1.0%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	1.2%	0.7%	4	0.7%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	2	0.3%	0.2%	2	0.3%	0.2%	4	0.3%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	9	1.8%	0.9%	8	1.7%	0.8%	17	1.8%
University of San Diego - School of Law	4	0.7%	0.4%	3	0.6%	0.3%	7	0.7%
University of San Francisco School of Law	2	0.6%	0.3%	3	0.8%	0.4%	5	0.7%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.7%	0.3%	2	0.3%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	8	1.4%	0.8%	3	0.6%	0.3%	11	1.1%
Western State University - College of Law	1	0.4%	0.2%	2	0.8%	0.4%	3	0.6%
Whittier Law School	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.4%	0.2%	2	0.2%

Asian American

School	Asian American							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	50	12.2%	5.8%	62	14.0%	7.3%	112	13.1%
Chapman University School of Law	39	14.0%	7.0%	61	22.0%	11.0%	100	18.0%
Golden Gate University School of Law	52	14.1%	6.1%	86	17.8%	10.1%	138	16.2%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	143	20.8%	10.8%	181	28.7%	13.7%	324	24.6%
Pepperdine University School of Law	29	8.7%	4.1%	41	11.1%	5.8%	70	9.9%
Santa Clara University School of Law	119	24.5%	12.5%	136	29.0%	14.2%	255	26.7%
Southwestern University School of Law	79	17.4%	8.5%	103	21.5%	11.1%	182	19.5%
Stanford University Law School	20	6.8%	3.8%	39	16.8%	7.4%	59	11.2%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	29	6.4%	3.6%	34	9.8%	4.2%	63	7.8%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	53	14.8%	6.1%	114	22.1%	13.0%	167	19.1%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	47	20.8%	8.2%	87	25.2%	15.2%	134	23.5%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	128	22.1%	10.2%	169	25.0%	13.5%	297	23.7%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	55	11.3%	5.7%	99	20.5%	10.2%	154	15.9%
University of San Diego - School of Law	81	13.9%	7.6%	73	15.1%	6.8%	154	14.4%
University of San Francisco School of Law	56	16.0%	7.7%	79	20.9%	10.8%	135	18.5%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	54	16.6%	8.6%	68	22.5%	10.8%	122	19.4%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	67	12.1%	6.4%	62	12.7%	6.0%	129	12.4%
Western State University - College of Law	34	14.2%	7.0%	58	23.2%	11.9%	92	18.8%
Whittier Law School	80	18.9%	9.2%	89	19.9%	10.2%	169	19.4%

Mexican American

School	Mexican American							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	23	5.6%	2.7%	36	8.1%	4.2%	59	6.9%
Chapman University School of Law	11	3.9%	2.0%	15	5.4%	2.7%	26	4.7%
Golden Gate University School of Law	7	1.9%	0.8%	15	3.1%	1.8%	22	2.6%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	37	5.4%	2.8%	39	6.2%	3.0%	76	5.8%
Pepperdine University School of Law	5	1.5%	0.7%	10	2.7%	1.4%	15	2.1%
Santa Clara University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Southwestern University School of Law	23	5.1%	2.5%	37	7.7%	4.0%	60	6.4%
Stanford University Law School	34	11.5%	6.5%	25	10.8%	4.7%	59	11.2%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	20	4.4%	2.5%	14	4.0%	1.7%	34	4.2%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	21	5.9%	2.4%	33	6.4%	3.8%	54	6.2%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	16	7.1%	2.8%	29	8.4%	5.1%	45	7.9%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	21	3.6%	1.7%	22	3.2%	1.8%	43	3.4%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	30	6.1%	3.1%	36	7.5%	3.7%	66	6.8%
University of San Diego - School of Law	23	4.0%	2.2%	24	5.0%	2.3%	47	4.4%
University of San Francisco School of Law	10	2.8%	1.4%	20	5.3%	2.7%	30	4.1%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	20	6.1%	3.2%	19	6.3%	3.0%	39	6.2%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	18	3.2%	1.7%	13	2.7%	1.2%	31	3.0%
Western State University - College of Law	10	4.2%	2.0%	15	6.0%	3.1%	25	5.1%
Whittier Law School	24	5.7%	2.8%	22	4.9%	2.5%	46	5.3%

Puerto Rican

School	Puerto Rican							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.2%	0.1%	1	0.1%
Chapman University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Golden Gate University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.2%	0.1%	1	0.1%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.3%	0.2%	2	0.2%
Pepperdine University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Santa Clara University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Southwestern University School of Law	1	0.2%	0.1%	3	0.6%	0.3%	4	0.4%
Stanford University Law School	1	0.3%	0.2%	3	1.3%	0.6%	4	0.8%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.3%	0.2%	1	0.2%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	1	0.2%	0.1%	4	0.6%	0.3%	5	0.4%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	1	0.2%	0.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.1%
University of San Diego - School of Law	2	0.3%	0.2%	5	1.0%	0.5%	7	0.7%
University of San Francisco School of Law	1	0.3%	0.1%	2	0.5%	0.3%	3	0.4%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.3%	0.2%	1	0.2%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	2	0.4%	0.2%	1	0.2%	0.1%	3	0.3%
Western State University - College of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.4%	0.2%	1	0.2%
Whittier Law School	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%

Hispanic

School	Hispanic							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	11	2.7%	1.3%	11	2.5%	1.3%	22	2.6%
Chapman University School of Law	8	2.9%	1.4%	5	1.8%	0.9%	13	2.3%
Golden Gate University School of Law	12	3.3%	1.4%	13	2.7%	1.5%	25	2.9%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	36	5.2%	2.7%	24	3.8%	1.8%	60	4.5%
Pepperdine University School of Law	6	1.8%	0.9%	6	1.6%	0.9%	12	1.7%
Santa Clara University School of Law	48	9.9%	5.0%	53	11.3%	5.5%	101	10.6%
Southwestern University School of Law	14	3.1%	1.5%	21	4.4%	2.3%	35	3.8%
Stanford University Law School	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.9%	0.4%	2	0.4%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	11	2.4%	1.4%	14	4.0%	1.7%	25	3.1%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	11	3.1%	1.3%	20	3.9%	2.3%	31	3.5%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	5	2.2%	0.9%	10	2.9%	1.8%	15	2.6%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	16	2.8%	1.3%	23	3.4%	1.8%	39	3.1%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	6	1.2%	0.6%	4	0.8%	0.4%	10	1.0%
University of San Diego - School of Law	20	3.4%	1.9%	24	5.0%	2.3%	44	4.1%
University of San Francisco School of Law	15	4.3%	2.1%	15	4.0%	2.1%	30	4.1%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	6	1.8%	1.0%	9	3.0%	1.4%	15	2.4%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	14	2.5%	1.3%	11	2.3%	1.1%	25	2.4%
Western State University - College of Law	17	7.1%	3.5%	11	4.4%	2.2%	28	5.7%
Whittier Law School	21	5.0%	2.4%	34	7.6%	3.9%	55	6.3%

For. Nation.

School	For. Nation.							
	Men			Women			Total	
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All
California Western School of Law	5	1.2%	0.6%	3	0.7%	0.4%	8	0.9%
Chapman University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.4%	0.2%	1	0.2%
Golden Gate University School of Law	3	0.8%	0.4%	4	0.8%	0.5%	7	0.8%
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	3	0.4%	0.2%	2	0.3%	0.2%	5	0.4%
Pepperdine University School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Santa Clara University School of Law	2	0.4%	0.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.2%
Southwestern University School of Law	10	2.2%	1.1%	5	1.0%	0.5%	15	1.6%
Stanford University Law School	10	3.4%	1.9%	5	2.2%	0.9%	15	2.8%
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	2	0.9%	0.4%	3	0.9%	0.5%	5	0.9%
University of California, Hastings College of Law	5	0.9%	0.4%	10	1.5%	0.8%	15	1.2%
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	5	1.0%	0.5%	5	1.0%	0.5%	10	1.0%
University of San Diego - School of Law	1	0.2%	0.1%	3	0.6%	0.3%	4	0.4%
University of San Francisco School of Law	1	0.3%	0.1%	3	0.8%	0.4%	4	0.5%
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	4	1.2%	0.6%	2	0.7%	0.3%	6	1.0%
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	14	2.5%	1.3%	9	1.8%	0.9%	23	2.2%
Western State University - College of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.4%	0.2%	1	0.2%
Whittier Law School	2	0.5%	0.2%	2	0.4%	0.2%	4	0.5%

Caucasian

School	Caucasian								
	Men			Women			Total		
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All	
California Western School of Law	247	60.1%	28.9%	255	57.4%	29.8%	502	58.7%	
Chapman University School of Law	158	56.6%	28.4%	140	50.5%	25.2%	298	53.6%	
Golden Gate University School of Law	218	59.1%	25.6%	290	60.2%	34.1%	508	59.7%	
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	386	56.0%	29.3%	312	49.5%	23.7%	698	52.9%	
Pepperdine University School of Law	200	59.7%	28.4%	205	55.6%	29.1%	405	57.5%	
Santa Clara University School of Law	296	60.9%	31.0%	253	53.9%	26.5%	549	57.5%	
Southwestern University School of Law	256	56.5%	27.5%	219	45.8%	23.5%	475	51.0%	
Stanford University Law School	169	57.3%	32.1%	117	50.4%	22.2%	286	54.3%	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	389	85.5%	48.4%	276	79.3%	34.4%	665	82.8%	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	142	39.8%	16.2%	188	36.4%	21.5%	330	37.8%	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	119	52.7%	20.8%	160	46.4%	28.0%	279	48.9%	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	274	47.4%	21.8%	295	43.6%	23.5%	569	45.3%	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	244	50.0%	25.2%	206	42.7%	21.2%	450	46.4%	
University of San Diego - School of Law	434	74.6%	40.7%	334	69.0%	31.3%	768	72.0%	
University of San Francisco School of Law	184	52.4%	25.2%	191	50.5%	26.2%	375	51.4%	
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	192	58.9%	30.6%	136	45.0%	21.7%	328	52.2%	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	420	75.7%	40.3%	376	77.2%	36.1%	796	76.4%	
Western State University - College of Law	137	57.3%	28.0%	121	48.4%	24.7%	258	52.8%	
Whittier Law School	207	48.9%	23.8%	193	43.1%	22.2%	400	45.9%	

Unknown

School	Unknown								
	Men			Women			Total		
	N	% of Men	% of All	N	% of Women	% of All	N	% of All	
California Western School of Law	60	14.6%	7.0%	55	12.4%	6.4%	115	13.5%	
Chapman University School of Law	59	21.1%	10.6%	50	18.1%	9.0%	109	19.6%	
Golden Gate University School of Law	65	17.6%	7.6%	57	11.8%	6.7%	122	14.3%	
Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	60	8.7%	4.5%	36	5.7%	2.7%	96	7.3%	
Pepperdine University School of Law	82	24.5%	11.6%	85	23.0%	12.1%	167	23.7%	
Santa Clara University School of Law	3	0.6%	0.3%	3	0.6%	0.3%	6	0.6%	
Southwestern University School of Law	56	12.4%	6.0%	58	12.1%	6.2%	114	12.2%	
Stanford University Law School	32	10.8%	6.1%	23	9.9%	4.4%	55	10.4%	
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	
University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall)	114	31.9%	13.0%	130	25.1%	14.9%	244	27.9%	
University of California, Davis School of Law (King Hall)	33	14.6%	5.8%	45	13.0%	7.9%	78	13.7%	
University of California, Hastings College of Law	123	21.3%	9.8%	127	18.8%	10.1%	250	19.9%	
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law	117	24.0%	12.1%	103	21.4%	10.6%	220	22.7%	
University of San Diego - School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	
University of San Francisco School of Law	69	19.7%	9.5%	47	12.4%	6.4%	116	15.9%	
University of Southern California, Gould School of Law	35	10.7%	5.6%	23	7.6%	3.7%	58	9.2%	
University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Western State University - College of Law	34	14.2%	7.0%	25	10.0%	5.1%	59	12.1%	
Whittier Law School	75	17.7%	8.6%	80	17.9%	9.2%	155	17.8%	