

# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688 www.courts.ca.gov

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: May 24-25, 2018

#### Title

Judicial Branch Administration: Release of Demographic Data on California Justices and Judges

#### Submitted by

Judicial Council staff Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager Office of Court Research, Budget Services Agenda Item Type Information Only

**Date of Report** April 4, 2018

**Contact** David Smith, Senior Research Analyst Office of Court Research, Budget Services 415-865-7696 david.smith@jud.ca.gov

#### **Executive Summary**

This informational report to the Judicial Council is of aggregate demographic information concerning the gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and veteran and disability status of California's justices and judges by specific jurisdiction, which council staff is required by statute to collect and release annually. In general, findings indicate that the California bench has become more diverse over time.

#### **Relevant Previous Council Action**

In 2006, Senate Bill 56 (Dunn) authorized 50 new judgeships in California and amended Government Code section 12011.5(n) to require the Judicial Council to collect and report on the demographics of the bench in the aggregate. The council has collected and released this demographic data since 2007, with the most recent information release occurring March 1, 2018. Currently, section 12011.5(n) requires that the council report on the composition of the bench by race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender-identity, and veteran and disability status. Data pertaining to veteran and disability status has been collected and released since 2015 as a result of an expansion of the legislative mandate for the collection of demographic data from new justices and judges. Similar reporting requirements apply to the Governor and the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation of the State Bar of California.

### Analysis/Rationale

The information in the attached charts reflects justices and judges on the bench as of December 31, 2017, who have reported demographic background information. In general, findings indicate that the California bench has become more diverse over time.

The charts show:

- The overall gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender identity of responding justices and judges in the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts;
- The gender of these justices and judges by jurisdiction (Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal by district, and trial courts by county);
- The race/ethnicity of responding justices and judges by jurisdiction;
- The specific race/ethnicity reported by those justices and judges who indicated that they consider themselves to be of more than one race/ethnicity;
- The sexual orientation and gender identity of responding justices and judges by jurisdiction;
- The veteran and disability status of responding judicial officers new to the bench, beginning in calendar year 2014; and
- Comparisons of the current overall data on gender, race, and ethnicity with data from prior years' reports.

The most recent demographic data reflect changes resulting from judicial retirements and other departures from the bench, new judicial appointments, and an increase in the number of trial court judges who have provided race/ethnicity information.

The demographic data indicate a trend toward a greater proportion of women serving as trial court judges over time. At the end of calendar year 2017, women represented 34.3 percent of this component of the judiciary, compared to 26.8 percent at the end of 2006, continuing an upward trend across this time period.

The data also show an increase in the total number of judges since 2006 in the following race/ethnicity categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Pacific Islander, and Some Other Race. In addition to increases in the foregoing categories, a slight decrease in the number of judicial officers was observed since 2006 in the response category of More Than One Race, and a more pronounced decline was noted in the response category Information Not Provided.

Of the 399 trial court judges responding to the question about their veteran status, 36 respondents (8 percent) indicated that they served in the military. Further, of the 428 judges responding to the question concerning their disability status, 11 judges (3 percent) indicated that they have a disability.

Finally, the additional data in this year's report regarding sexual orientation and gender identity show the following breakdown in six categories in the trial courts (please note that the total can exceed 100 percent because respondents may select more than one category):

- Heterosexual, 67.1 percent
- Lesbian, 1.3 percent
- Gay, 1.7 percent

- Bisexual, 0.1 percent
- Transgender, 0.1 percent
- Information Not Provided, 29.8 percent

The Judicial Council has released this data by posting the information on the California Courts website at <u>www.courts.ca.gov/13418.htm</u>.

#### **Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications**

There are no costs to the courts for the annual collection and release of demographic data on justices and judges. The release of this descriptive information is in response to legislative mandate for descriptive demographic data and on that basis is not intended to directly impact state or council policy.

#### **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: Demographic data tables on gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and veteran and disability status of California justices and judges.

#### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

#### Gender

Court	Fe	male	М	ale		otal ondents
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Supreme Court	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal	33	36.7%	57	63.3%	90	100.0%
Trial Court	543	34.3%	1,039	65.7%	1,582	100.0%
Total	579	34.5%	1,099	65.5%	1,678	100.0%

1

1

#### Race/Ethnicity<sup>2</sup>

Court	Indian	erican or Alaska ve Only		n Only		or African can Only	1	anic or o Only		Islander nly		e Only		Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		e Than Race		ation Not vided <sup>4</sup>		otal ondents
	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Supreme Court	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	10	11.1%	6	6.7%	0	0.0%	65	72.2%	2	2.2%	5	5.6%	0	0.0%	90	100.0%
Trial Court	9	0.6%	116	7.3%	111	7.0%	166	10.5%	4	0.3%	1,067	67.4%	17	1.1%	51	3.2%	41	2.6%	1,582	100.0%
Total	9	0.5%	120	7.2%	122	7.3%	173	<i>10.3%</i>	4	0.2%	1,133	67.5%	19	1.1%	57	3.4%	41	2.4%	1,678	100.0%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2017. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2017.

2. The race and ethnicity category descriptions were adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2000. The same category descriptions were used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2010. See page 22 for descriptions of race and ethnicity categories.

3. "Some other race only" includes respondents who indicated they do not consider themselves to be any of the six identified race and ethnicity categories. To provide the most accurate data, the "some other race only" category includes only those respondents who identified some other race or ethnicity that did not clearly fall within one or more of the six identified categories.

4. "Information not provided" includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

#### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

											Informa	ation Not	Т	otal
Court	Heter	osexual	Les	bian	C	Bay	Bis	exual	Trans	gender	Prov	vided <sup>2</sup>	Respo	ndents <sup>3</sup>
	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%
Supreme Court	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal	64	71.1%	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	25.6%	90	100.0%
Trial Court	1,061	67.1%	20	1.3%	27	1.7%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	471	29.8%	1,582	100.0%
Total	1,131	67.4%	22	1.3%	28	1.7%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	494	<i>29.4%</i>	1,678	100.0%

#### Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2017. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2017.

2. "Information not provided" includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

3. Since the selection of more than one response alternative is possible for the question pertaining to gender identity/sexual orientation, total responses to this question may be greater than the sum of justices and judges responding to the survey in a given year.

# Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Court	Fe	male	N	Iale	Total Re	espondents
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal	33	<i>36.7%</i>	57	63.3%	90	100.0%
First District	6	31.6%	13	68.4%	19	100.0%
Second District	11	47.8%	12	52.2%	23	100.0%
Third District	3	27.3%	8	72.7%	11	100.0%
Fourth District	10	43.5%	13	56.5%	23	100.0%
Fifth District	1	11.1%	8	88.9%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	5	100.0%
Trial Court	543	34.3%	1,039	65.7%	1,582	100.0%
Alameda	26	36.6%	45	63.4%	71	100.0%
Alpine	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Amador	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Butte	6	54.5%	5	45.5%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Contra Costa	19	52.8%	17	47.2%	36	100.0%
Del Norte	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%
Fresno	13	31.7%	28	68.3%	41	100.0%

# Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Court	Fe	emale	Ν	Iale	Total R	espondents
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	Ν	%
Glen	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6	100.0%
Imperial	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	10	100.0%
Inyo	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Kern	7	21.9%	25	78.1%	32	100.0%
Kings	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%
Lake	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%
Lassen	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Los Angeles	163	35.3%	299	64.7%	462	100.0%
Madera	1	12.5%	7	87.5%	8	100.0%
Marin	6	46.2%	7	53.8%	13	100.0%
Mariposa	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	9	100.0%
Merced	2	25.0%	6	75.0%	8	100.0%
Modoc	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Mono	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Monterey	9	52.9%	8	47.1%	17	100.0%
Napa	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%
Nevada	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	100.0%
Orange	33	28.7%	82	71.3%	115	100.0%
Placer	3	30.0%	7	70.0%	10	100.0%
Plumas	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Riverside	15	25.9%	43	74.1%	58	100.0%
Sacramento	17	29.3%	41	70.7%	58	100.0%
San Benito	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Court	Fe	emale	N	Male	Total R	espondents
Trial Court	N	⁰∕₀	N	⁰∕₀	Ν	⁰∕₀
San Bernardino	19	26.8%	52	73.2%	71	100.0%
San Diego	47	36.7%	81	63.3%	128	100.0%
San Francisco	19	38.8%	30	61.2%	49	100.0%
San Joaquin	8	27.6%	21	72.4%	29	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	12	100.0%
San Mateo	10	40.0%	15	60.0%	25	100.0%
Santa Barbara	6	27.3%	16	72.7%	22	100.0%
Santa Clara	32	45.1%	39	54.9%	71	100.0%
Santa Cruz	4	36.4%	7	63.6%	11	100.0%
Shasta	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	9	100.0%
Sierra	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Siskiyou	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Solano	6	30.0%	14	70.0%	20	100.0%
Sonoma	6	35.3%	11	64.7%	17	100.0%
Stanislaus	8	40.0%	12	60.0%	20	100.0%
Sutter	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	100.0%
Tehama	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	100.0%
Trinity	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Tulare	6	31.6%	13	68.4%	19	100.0%
Tuolumne	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	5	17.9%	23	82.1%	28	100.0%
Yolo	4	36.4%	7	63.6%	11	100.0%
Yuba	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2017. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2017.

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges **Relative to Race/Ethnicity** (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>	Ind Alask	erican lian or a Native Dnly	Asia	n Only	Af	ick or rican can Only	1	anic or 10 Only		Islander Dnly	Whit	te Only		e Other e Only <sup>3</sup>	-	e Than e Race		mation rovided <sup>4</sup>	Total R	espondents
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Supreme Court	0	0.0%	2	<i>33.3%</i>	1	<i>16.7%</i>	1	<i>16.7%</i>	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	<i>16.7%</i>	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	10	11.1%	6	6.7%	0	0.0%	65	72.2%	2	2.2%	5	5.6%	0	0.0%	90	100.0%
First District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	14	73.7%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	100.0%
Second District	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	82.6%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%
Third District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Fourth District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	3	13.0%	0	0.0%	17	7 <b>3.</b> 9%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%
Fifth District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Trial Court	9	0.6%	116	7.3%	111	7.0%	166	10.5%	4	0.3%	1,067	67.4%	17	1.1%	51	3.2%	41	2.6%	1,582	100.0%
Alameda	0	0.0%	8	11.3%	13	18.3%	6	8.5%	0	0.0%	39	54.9%	0	0.0%	5	7.0%	0	0.0%	71	100.0%
Alpine	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Amador	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Butte	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	90.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Contra Costa	0	0.0%	3	8.3%	3	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28	77.8%	0	0.0%	2	5.6%	0	0.0%	36	100.0%
Del Norte	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Fresno	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	5	12.2%	6	14.6%	0	0.0%	27	65.9%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	41	100.0%
Glenn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Imperial	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	10	100.0%
Inyo	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Kern	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	1	3.1%	3	9.4%	1	3.1%	24	75.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%	32	100.0%

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Race/Ethnicity (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup> Court	Ind Alaska	erican ian or a Native only	Asia	n Only	Af	ick or rican can Only	-	oanic or 10 Only		: Islander Dnly	Whi	te Only		e Other e Only <sup>3</sup>		e Than e Race	_	mation rovided <sup>4</sup>	Total R	espondents
Trial Court	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%
Kings	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Lake	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Lassen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Los Angeles	4	0.9%	47	10.2%	49	10.6%	67	14.5%	2	0.4%	256	55.4%	7	1.5%	15	3.2%	15	3.2%	462	100.0%
Madera	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Marin	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	10	76.9%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%
Mariposa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Merced	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Modoc	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mono	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Monterey	0	0.0%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	11	64.7%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	17	100.0%
Napa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Nevada	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Orange	0	0.0%	6	5.2%	6	5.2%	9	7.8%	0	0.0%	85	7 <i>3.9%</i>	2	1.7%	3	2.6%	4	3.5%	115	100.0%
Placer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Plumas	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Riverside	1	1.7%	2	3.4%	2	3.4%	7	12.1%	0	0.0%	43	74.1%	0	0.0%	3	5.2%	0	0.0%	58	100.0%
Sacramento	0	0.0%	6	10.3%	2	3.4%	6	10.3%	0	0.0%	38	65.5%	2	3.4%	1	1.7%	3	5.2%	58	100.0%
San Benito	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
San Bernardino	0	0.0%	6	8.5%	5	7.0%	7	9.9%	0	0.0%	49	69.0%	1	1.4%	3	4.2%	0	0.0%	71	100.0%
San Diego	0	0.0%	4	3.1%	9	7.0%	11	8.6%	0	0.0%	92	71.9%	2	1.6%	1	0.8%	9	7.0%	128	100.0%
San Francisco	0	0.0%	11	22.4%	5	10.2%	6	12.2%	0	0.0%	27	55.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	100.0%
San Joaquin	0	0.0%	2	6.9%	1	3.4%	3	10.3%	0	0.0%	23	79.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%

#### **Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Race/Ethnicity** (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup> Court	Ind Alaska	erican ian or a Native Dnly	Asia	n Only	Af	ick or rican can Only	-	panic or 10 Only		Islander Dnly	Whit	te Only		e Other e Only <sup>3</sup>		e Than Race	_	rmation rovided <sup>4</sup>	Total R	espondents
Trial Court	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%
San Mateo	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	2	8.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	72.0%	1	4.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	25	100.0%
Santa Barbara	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	0	0.0%	17	77 <b>.3</b> %	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	100.0%
Santa Clara	0	0.0%	8	11.3%	5	7.0%	7	9.9%	1	1.4%	42	59.2%	1	1.4%	3	4.2%	4	5.6%	71	100.0%
Santa Cruz	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Shasta	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	88.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9	100.0%
Sierra	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Siskiyou	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Solano	0	0.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	12	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	10.0%	20	100.0%
Sonoma	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	16	94.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	100.0%
Stanislaus	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	17	85.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	100.0%
Sutter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Tehama	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Trinity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Tulare	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	16	84.2%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	19	100.0%
Tuolumne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	10.7%	0	0.0%	24	85.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	28	100.0%
Yolo	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	10	90.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Yuba	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2017. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2017.

2. The race and ethnicity category descriptions were adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2000. The same category descriptions were used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2010. See page 22 for descriptions of race and ethnicity categories.

3. "Some other race only" includes respondents who indicated they do not consider themselves to be any of the six identified race and ethnicity categories. To provide the most accurate data, the "some other race only" category includes only those respondents who identified some other race or ethnicity that did not clearly fall within one or more of the six identified categories.

4. "Information not provided" includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Responses with Two or More Races (Gov. Code; § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

	Total Number of Responding	Responses with Ra	
	Justices/Judges	Number	Percent
Supreme Court	6	1	16.7%
Asian; Pacific Islander		1	
Court of Appeal			
Second District	23	1	4.3%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Third District	11	1	9.1%
American Indian; White		1	
Fourth District	23	2	8.7%
Black; Hispanic		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Sixth District	5	1	20.0%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Trial Court			
Alameda	71	5	7.0%
Asian; Pacific Islander		1	
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Black or African American; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	
Contra Costa	36	2	5.6%
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	
Fresno	41	1	2.4%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Imperial	10	1	10.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Kern	32	2	6.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
White; Some Other Race		1	

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Responses with Two or More Races (Gov. Code; § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

	Total Number of Responding	Responses with Ra	
	Justices/Judges	Number	Percent
Trial Court			
Los Angeles	462	15	3.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native; Black or African American		1	
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Asian; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Asian; Pacific Islander		2	
Asian; White		2	
Hispanic or Latino; White		5	
White; Some Other Race		2	
Marin	13	1	7.7%
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Mariposa	2	1	50.0%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Mendocino	9	1	11.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Monterey	17	1	5.9%
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Orange	115	3	2.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	
Riverside	58	3	5.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Asian; White		1	
Black or African American; White		1	
Sacramento	58	1	1.7%
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino		1	
San Benito	2	1	50.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	

#### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Responses with Two or More Races (Gov. Code; § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

	Total Number of Responding	Responses with Rae	
	Justices/Judges	Number	Percent
Trial Court			
San Bernardino	71	3	4.2%
African American; White		1	
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino		1	
San Diego	128	1	0.8%
White; Some Other Race		1	
San Mateo	25	2	8.0%
Asian; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Santa Clara	71	3	4.2%
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
American Indian or Alaska Native; Some Other Race		1	
Santa Cruz	11	1	9.1%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Tulare	19	2	10.5%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
American Indian or Alaskan Native ; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Ventura	28	1	3.6%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	

1. The data reflect responses from courts where one or more judicial officers have indicated that their race/ethnic backgounds include multiple groups. Only those justices and judges that are active as of December 31, 2017 are included. The tables do not include justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2017.

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Courts	Hater	Heterosexual		Lesbian Gay		D:-		Trans	a a a a a a a		ation Not vided <sup>2</sup>	Total Respondents <sup>3</sup>		
Courts						•		exual		sgender				-
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal	64	71.1%	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	25.6%	90	100.0%
First District	15	78.9%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	19	100.0%
Second District	20	87.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%	23	100.0%
Third District	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Fourth District	11	47.8%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	47.8%	23	100.0%
Fifth District	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	5	100.0%
Trial Court	1061	67.1%	20	1.3%	27	1.7%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	471	<i>29.8%</i>	1,582	100.0%
Alameda	54	76.1%	2	2.8%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	13	18.3%	71	100.0%
Alpine	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Amador	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Butte	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Contra Costa	29	80.6%	1	2.8%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	13.9%	36	100.0%
Del Norte	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Fresno	27	65.9%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	31.7%	41	100.0%
Glenn	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6	100.0%
Imperial	6	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10	100.0%
Inyo	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Kern	22	68.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	31.3%	32	100.0%

Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

<i>.</i>											Inform	ation Not		
Courts	Heter	osexual	Les	sbian	(	Gay	Bis	exual	Trans	sgender	Pro	vided <sup>2</sup>	Total R	espondents <sup>3</sup>
Trial Court	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kings	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
Lake	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3	100.0%
Lassen	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Los Angeles	290	62.8%	3	0.6%	11	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	158	34.2%	462	100.0%
Madera	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8	100.0%
Marin	12	92.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	13	100.0%
Mariposa	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9	100.0%
Merced	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Modoc	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mono	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Monterey	15	88.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	17	100.0%
Napa	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%
Nevada	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
Orange	74	64.3%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	33.9%	115	100.0%
Placer	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10	100.0%
Plumas	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Riverside	37	63.8%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	32.8%	58	100.0%
Sacramento	36	62.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	37.9%	58	100.0%
San Benito	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
San Bernardino	54	76.1%	1	1.4%	2	2.8%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	13	18.3%	71	100.0%
San Diego	79	61.7%	2	1.6%	4	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	43	33.6%	128	100.0%
San Francisco	30	61.2%	4	8.2%	3	6.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	24.5%	49	100.0%
San Joaquin	18	62.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	10	34.5%	29	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	12	100.0%
San Mateo	14	56.0%	1	4.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	36.0%	25	100.0%
Santa Barbara	20	90.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	9.1%	22	100.0%
Santa Clara	45	63.4%	2	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	33.8%	71	100.0%
Santa Cruz	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Shasta	5	55.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	9	100.0%

#### Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

·											Inform	ation Not		
Courts	Hete	rosexual	Les	sbian	Gay		Bis	exual	Trans	sgender	Pro	vided <sup>2</sup>	Total R	espondents <sup>3</sup>
Trial Court	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	0⁄0
Sierra	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Siskiyou	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Solano	9	45.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	55.0%	20	100.0%
Sonoma	14	82.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	17.6%	17	100.0%
Stanislaus	18	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	10.0%	20	100.0%
Sutter	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	4	100.0%
Tehama	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Trinity	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Tulare	15	78.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	21.1%	19	100.0%
Tuolumne	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	16	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	42.9%	28	100.0%
Yolo	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Yuba	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%

#### Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2017. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2017.

2. "Information not provided" includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

3. Since the selection of more than one response alternative is possible for the question pertaining to gender identity/sexual orientation, total responses to this question may be greater than the sum of judicial officers responding to the survey in a given year.

### Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges Relative to Veteran and Disability Status (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017

Court			Ve	eteran <sup>1</sup>					Dis	sabled <sup>1</sup>		
		No	Yes		-	'otal ondents	]	No	Ţ	Yes	Total Respondents	
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Supreme Court	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Court of Appeal	13	<i>93%</i>	1	7%	14	100%	14	100%	0	0%	14	100%
First District	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Second District	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Third District	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Fourth District	3	75%	1	25%	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%
Fifth District	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Trial Court	399	92%	36	8%	435	100%	428	97%	11	3%	439	100%
Alameda	15	100%	0	0%	15	100%	15	100%	0	0%	15	100%
Alpine	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Amador	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Butte	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Contra Costa	9	75%	3	25%	12	100%	12	92%	1	8%	13	100%
Del Norte	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
El Dorado	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Fresno	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%
Glenn	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Humboldt	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Imperial	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Inyo	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Kern	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Kings	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Lassen	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%

### Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges Relative to Veteran and Disability Status (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017

Court			Ve	teran <sup>1</sup>					Di	sabled <sup>1</sup>		
		No	Yes			'otal ondents	1	No		Yes		otal ondents
Trial Court	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Los Angeles	117	94%	7	6%	124	100%	124	98%	3	2%	127	100%
Marin	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Mariposa	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Mendocino	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Merced	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%
Monterey	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Napa	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Nevada	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Orange	32	89%	4	11%	36	100%	33	92%	3	8%	36	100%
Riverside	16	100%	0	0%	16	100%	16	100%	0	0%	16	100%
Sacramento	7	100%	0	0%	7	100%	7	100%	0	0%	7	100%
San Bernardino	20	83%	4	17%	24	100%	23	96%	1	4%	24	100%
San Diego	38	90%	4	10%	42	100%	42	98%	1	2%	43	100%
San Francisco	13	93%	1	7%	14	100%	14	100%	0	0%	14	100%
San Joaquin	5	83%	1	17%	6	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
San Luis Obispo	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
San Mateo	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Santa Barbara	5	83%	1	17%	6	100%	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%
Santa Clara	23	96%	1	4%	24	100%	25	100%	0	0%	25	100%
Santa Cruz	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Shasta	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Sierra	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Siskiyou	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%
Solano	3	50%	3	50%	6	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Sonoma	7	78%	2	22%	9	100%	8	100%	0	0%	8	100%

#### Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges Relative to Veteran and Disability Status (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017

Court			Ve	teran <sup>1</sup>			Disabled <sup>1</sup>							
		No	Ŋ	Yes	-	ondents		No		Yes	-	Total Respondents		
Trial Court	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%		
Stanislaus	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%	6	86%	1	14%	7	100%		
Sutter	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%		
Tehama	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%		
Trinity	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%		
Tulare	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%		
Tuolumne	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%		
Ventura	5	83%	1	17%	6	100%	6	100%	0	0%	6	100%		
Yolo	3	75%	1	25%	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%		
Yuba	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%		

1. Tabled values for veteran and disability status include responses from justices and judges new to the bench in calendar years 2014 through 2017, as well as experienced justices and judges that chose to update their demographic information during the same 4 year period. Demographic questions pertaining to veteran and disability status are new as of 2014 and reflect an expansion of the mandate for the collection of demographic information from new justices and judges.

# Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

	Gender Court / Year Formele Male Bespondente													
Court / Year	Fe	male	N	Iale		otal ondents								
	N	%	N	%	Ν	%								
Supreme Court														
2007	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%								
2008	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%								
2009	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%								
2010	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%								
2011	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%								
2012	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%								
2013	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%								
2014	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%								
2015	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%								
2016	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%								
2017	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%								
2018	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%								
Court of Appeal														
2007	32	30.5%	73	69.5%	105	100.0%								
2008	29	29.0%	71	71.0%	100	100.0%								
2009	29	29.0%	71	71.0%	100	100.0%								
2010	30	29.4%	72	70.6%	102	100.0%								
2011	33	32.7%	68	67.3%	101	100.0%								
2012	33	32.7%	68	67.3%	101	100.0%								
2013	31	31.0%	69	69.0%	100	100.0%								
2014	29	30.5%	66	69.5%	95	100.0%								
2015	31	31.6%	67	68.4%	98	100.0%								
2016	30	30.9%	67	69.1%	97	100.0%								
2017	31	33.3%	62	66.7%	93	100.0%								
2018	33	36.7%	57	63.3%	90	100.0%								

# Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Gender (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

		Ger	ıder			
Court / Year	Fe	male	М	ale		otal ondents
Trial Court	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
2007	398	26.8%	1,088	73.2%	1,486	100.0%
2008	421	28.1%	1,075	71.9%	1,496	100.0%
2009	430	28.7%	1,068	71.3%	1,498	100.0%
2010	444	29.2%	1,078	70.8%	1,522	100.0%
2011	486	30.6%	1,102	69.4%	1,588	100.0%
2012	484	30.8%	1,085	69.2%	1,569	100.0%
2013	484	31.2%	1,065	68.8%	1,549	100.0%
2014	508	32.2%	1,071	67.8%	1,579	100.0%
2015	499	32.2%	1,052	67.8%	1,551	100.0%
2016	517	32.9%	1,053	67.1%	1,570	100.0%
2017	531	33.5%	1,053	66.5%	1,584	100.0%
2018	543	34.3%	1,039	65.7%	1,582	100.0%
Total	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
2007	433	27.1%	1,165	<i>72.9%</i>	1,598	100.0%
2008	453	28.3%	1,150	71.7%	1,603	100.0%
2009	462	28.8%	1,143	<i>71.2%</i>	1,605	100.0%
2010	477	29.2%	1,154	<i>70.8%</i>	1,631	100.0%
2011	522	30.8%	1,174	<i>69.2%</i>	1,696	100.0%
2012	521	31.1%	1,156	<i>68.9%</i>	1,677	100.0%
2013	519	31.3%	1,137	68.7%	1,656	100.0%
2014	541	32.2%	1,140	67.8%	1,681	100.0%
2015	533	32.2%	1,122	67.8%	1,655	100.0%
2016	551	32.9%	1,123	67.1%	1,674	100.0%
2017	566	33.6%	1,118	66.4%	1,684	100.0%
2018	579	34.5%	1,099	65.5%	1,678	100.0%

1. The calendar years in which the demographic data was released may be found in the first column of the table. The 2007 and 2008 data reflect the number of justices and judges on the bench as of February 1 of those years. The 2009 through 2017 data reflect the number of justices and judges on the bench as of December 31 of the previous year.

Note: The changes in percentages from year to year are the result of more than one factor, including: (1) new judicial appointments; (2) judicial retirements; and (3) newly-acquired data from judges on the bench who previously did not provide their demographic information.

#### Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to **Race/Ethnicity** (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup> Court / Year	Indi Alaska	erican ian or a Native only	Asia	n Only	Af	ick or rican can Only	1	anic or to Only		: Islander Dnly	White	e Only		e Other e Only <sup>3</sup>	-	e Than e Race	-	mation rovided <sup>4</sup>	Total R	espondents
	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court																				
2007	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2008	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2009	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2010	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2011	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2012	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2013	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2014	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2015	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
2016	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2017	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2018	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Court of Appeal																				
2007	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	0	0.0%	86	81.9%	0	0.0%	9	8.6%	1	1.0%	105	100.0%
2008	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	3	3.0%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	82	82.0%	0	0.0%	8	8.0%	1	1.0%	100	100.0%
2009	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	4	4.0%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	81	81.0%	0	0.0%	8	8.0%	1	1.0%	100	100.0%
2010	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	0	0.0%	83	81.4%	0	0.0%	7	6.9%	3	2.9%	102	100.0%
2011	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	5	4.8%	4	3.8%	0	0.0%	83	79.8%	0	0.0%	7	6.7%	2	1.9%	104	100.0%
2012	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	5	5.0%	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	81	80.2%	1	1.0%	6	5.9%	1	1.0%	101	100.0%
2013	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	5	5.0%	5	5.0%	0	0.0%	79	79.0%	1	1.0%	6	6.0%	1	1.0%	100	100.0%
2014	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	5	5.3%	5	5.3%	0	0.0%	75	78.9%	1	1.1%	6	6.3%	1	1.1%	95	100.0%
2015	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	7	7.1%	6	6.1%	0	0.0%	75	76.5%	1	1.0%	7	7.1%	1	1.1%	98	100.0%
2016	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	8	8.2%	6	6.2%	0	0.0%	73	75.3%	1	1.0%	6	6.2%	1	1.0%	97	100.0%
2017	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	9	9.7%	5	5.4%	0	0.0%	71	76.3%	1	1.1%	5	5.4%	0	1.0%	93	100.0%
2018	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	10	11.1%	6	6.7%	0	0.0%	65	72.2%	2	2.2%	5	5.6%	0	0.0%	90	100.0%
Trial Court																				
2007	2	0.1%	66	4.4%	68	4.6%	96	6.5%	2	0.1%	1,030	69.3%	3	0.2%	61	4.1%	158	10.6%	1,486	100.0%
2008	2	0.1%	67	4.5%	74	4.9%	103	6.9%	2	0.1%	1,076	71.9%	7	0.5%	63	4.2%	102	6.8%	1,496	100.0%
2009	5	0.3%	71	4.7%	77	5.1%	110	7.3%	3	0.2%	1,080	72.1%	10	0.7%	58	3.9%	84	5.6%	1,498	100.0%
2010	5	0.3%	78	5.1%	81	5.3%	118	7.8%	3	0.2%	1,113	73.1%	15	1.0%	52	3.4%	57	3.7%	1,522	100.0%

#### Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Race/Ethnicity (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017<sup>1</sup>

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>		erican ian or			Bla	ck or														
		a Native				rican	Hisp	anic or	Pacific	: Islander			Some	Other	More	Than	Inform	mation		
Court / Year	0	nly	Asia	n Only	Americ	can Only	-	o Only		Only	White	e Only	Race	Only <sup>3</sup>	One	Race	Not Pr	rovided <sup>4</sup>	Total R	espondents
	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Trial Court</b>																				
2011	6	0.4%	88	5.5%	90	5.7%	134	8.4%	4	0.3%	1,142	71.9%	15	0.9%	52	3.3%	57	3.6%	1,588	100.0%
2012	7	0.4%	89	5.7%	91	5.8%	133	8.5%	4	0.3%	1,128	71.9%	18	1.1%	51	3.3%	48	3.1%	1,569	100.0%
2013	7	0.5%	91	5.9%	96	6.2%	133	8.6%	4	0.3%	1,101	71.1%	18	1.2%	51	3.3%	48	3.1%	1,549	100.0%
2014	8	0.5%	95	6.0%	99	6.3%	148	9.4%	4	0.3%	1,108	70.2%	18	1.1%	52	3.3%	47	3.0%	1,579	100.0%
2015	8	0.5%	97	6.3%	101	6.5%	149	9.6%	4	0.3%	1,079	69.6%	18	1.2%	50	3.2%	45	2.9%	1,551	100.0%
2016	9	0.6%	104	6.6%	101	6.4%	158	10.1%	4	0.3%	1,082	68.9%	19	1.2%	50	3.2%	43	2.7%	1,570	100.0%
2017	9	0.6%	106	6.7%	106	6.7%	163	10.3%	4	0.3%	1,086	68.6%	16	1.0%	52	3.3%	42	2.7%	1,584	100.0%
2018	9	0.6%	116	7.3%	111	7.0%	166	10.5%	4	0.3%	1,067	67.4%	17	1.1%	51	3.2%	41	2.6%	1,582	100.0%
Total																				
2007	2	0.1%	70	4.4%	71	4.4%	100	6.3%	2	0.1%	1,120	70.1%	3	0.2%	71	4.4%	159	<i>9.9%</i>	1,598	100.0%
2008	2	0.1%	71	4.4%	77	4.8%	107	6.7%	2	0.1%	1,162	72.5%	7	0.4%	72	4.5%	103	6.4%	1,603	100.0%
2009	5	0.3%	75	4.7%	81	5.0%	114	7.1%	3	0.2%	1,165	72.6%	10	0.6%	67	4.2%	85	5.3%	1,605	100.0%
2010	5	0.3%	82	5.0%	84	5.2%	122	7.5%	3	0.2%	1,200	7 <b>3.6</b> %	15	0.9%	60	3.7%	60	3.7%	1,631	100.0%
2011	6	0.4%	92	5.4%	95	5.6%	139	8.2%	4	0.2%	1,229	72.3%	15	0.9%	60	3.5%	59	3.5%	1,699	100.0%
2012	7	0.4%	94	5.6%	96	5.7%	137	8.2%	4	0.2%	1,212	72.3%	19	1.1%	59	3.5%	49	2.9%	1,677	100.0%
2013	7	0.4%	96	5.8%	101	6.1%	138	8.3%	4	0.2%	1,183	71.4%	19	1.1%	59	3.6%	49	3.0%	1,656	100.0%
2014	8	0.5%	99	5.9%	104	6.2%	153	9.1%	4	0.2%	1,186	70.6%	19	1.1%	60	3.6%	48	2.9%	1,681	100.0%
2015	8	0.5%	100	6.0%	108	6.5%	155	9.4%	4	0.2%	1,157	<i>69.9%</i>	19	1.1%	58	3.5%	46	2.8%	1,655	100.0%
2016	9	0.5%	108	6.5%	110	6.6%	165	<i>9.9%</i>	4	0.2%	1,157	69.1%	20	1.2%	57	3.4%	44	2.6%	1,674	100.0%
2017	9	0.5%	110	6.5%	116	6.9%	169	10.0%	4	0.2%	1,159	<i>68.8%</i>	17	1.0%	58	3.4%	42	2.5%	1,684	100.0%
2018	9	0.5%	120	7.2%	122	<i>7.3%</i>	173	<i>10.3%</i>	4	0.2%	1,133	67.5%	19	1.1%	57	3.4%	41	2.4%	1,678	100.0%

1. The calendar years in which the demograhic data was released may be found in the first column of the table. The 2007 and 2008 data reflect the number of justices and judges on the bench as of February 1 of those years. The 2009 through 2018 data reflect the number of justices and judges on the bench as of December 31 of the previous year.

2. The race and ethnicity category descriptions were adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2000. The same category descriptions were used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2010. See page 21 for descriptions of race and ethnicity categories.

3. "Some other race only" includes respondents who indicated they do not consider themselves to be any of the six identified race and ethnicity categories. To provide the most accurate data, the "some other race only" category includes only those respondents who identified some other race or ethnicity that did not clearly fall within one or more of the six identified categories.

4. "Information not provided" includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

### Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges Relative to Race/Ethnicity (Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n)) As of December 31, 2017

#### **Race/Ethnicity Categories**

The category descriptions are adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2000, which for the first time invited respondents to identify more than one category. The same category descriptions were used in Census 2010.

American Indian or Alaska Native: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

*Asian*: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent. The category includes persons who indicate their race as Cambodian, Chinese, East Indian, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Malaysian, Pakistani, Thai, or Vietnamese.

Black or African American: A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic or Latino: A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

*Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

White: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.