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The Honorable Rupert A. Byrdsong was appointed to the Los Angeles Superior Court on June 18, 2014 by Governor Jerry Brown. He presently sits in Dept. 28 in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse in downtown Los Angeles wherein he handles an unlimited jurisdiction individual court calendar with an inventory of over 500 cases. Prior to coming to Mosk, Judge Byrdsong was the first African-American in the Complex Civil Department wherein he handled and coordinated all of the asbestos cases in Los Angeles County. Judge Byrdsong began his legal career with Ivie, McNeill, & Wyatt as a law clerk in 1994, became an associate in 1995, and became a partner in 2001.

Judge Byrdsong received his undergraduate degree in Political Science with Honors from Morehouse College in 1991. He graduated magna cum laude, made the National Dean's List and earned membership into Phi Beta Kappa. Judge Byrdsong received his Doctor of Jurisprudence from Vanderbilt University School of Law in 1994.

Judge Byrdsong is active with the John M. Langston Bar Association (lifetime member and past president 2006), the California Association of Black Lawyers (CABL)(lifetime member), LACBA's Labor and Employment Executive and Saturday Seminar Committees, and a Founding Member of the Association of African American California Judicial Officers (AAACJO). He served on the Executive Committee of the Labor and Employment Section for the State Bar of California from 2003-2007.

Judge Byrdsong volunteers his time mentoring young lawyers and speaks to students in high schools, colleges, and law schools throughout Los Angeles. He also volunteers his time to interview prospective students for Vanderbilt School of Law. Because of his work and contributions to the community, Judge Byrdsong was recognized in Ebony Magazine's Power 100 for 2018.
KATHERINE M. FORSTER

Katherine M. Forster is a partner in the employment department at Munger, Tolles & Olson. In addition to having litigated scores of wage/hour and discrimination class actions, collective actions and representative actions, Ms. Forster has particular expertise in helping companies navigate highly sensitive claims for sexual harassment, gender discrimination and pay equity. Her litigation experience includes whistleblower retaliation claims, executive compensation matters, trade secrets disputes, constitutional issues and claims arising under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, as well as federal and state employment laws. Ms. Forster also handles internal investigations and provides strategic labor law compliance advice to employers and management. She has extensive experience in the entertainment and media, technology, retail, manufacturing, food and beverage distribution, financial services, utilities, communications and nonprofit sectors.

Ms. Forster authored an amicus curiae brief on behalf of the U.S. and California Chambers of Commerce in a California Supreme Court case of first impression regarding the state's suitable seating law. She was also one of the principal counsel of record in Reynolds v. Bement, in which the California Supreme Court held that corporate officers and directors could not be held personally liable under the then-existing California Labor Code for wage claims by corporate employees.

In addition to her regular practice, Ms. Forster does extensive pro bono work in the areas of non-profit advice and counseling and impact litigation to promote LGBTQ rights. Among other things, she led a Munger, Tolles & Olson team that, along with Lambda Legal, brought a lawsuit asserting sex discrimination claims on behalf of a transgender veteran who was denied service at a local barbershop. She is also part of a team that successfully defended California's law prohibiting licensed clinical professionals from practicing sexual orientation change efforts on minors.
Dr. Sangeeta R. Gupta is the president and lead consultant for Gupta Consulting Group.

Dr. Gupta is a globally recognized expert in Diversity, Inclusion, Unconscious Bias (UB) and Cultural Competency. Dr. Gupta also works as an executive coach with senior leadership to strengthen their communication and leadership skills.

Leveraging her more than 25 years of experience, Dr. Gupta works with her clients to craft a diversity and inclusion strategy. Using hard data, Dr. Gupta has helped numerous clients create a more inclusive and productive environment with a reduction in Unconscious Bias.

Dr. Gupta has developed and implemented training programs and consulted on organizational effectiveness issues, particularly initiatives focused on diversity and creating an environment of inclusion. She believes that training should be interactive, engaging and that it should utilize real world examples. Her intention is to provide tools that can be applied immediately upon returning to the workplace.

Dr. Gupta is a specialist in non-western cultures, and she speaks several languages. She is the author of four books including the Quick Guide to Cultural Competency and the forthcoming books Women and Leadership 2.0, and Unconscious Bias, part of the Quick Guide Business Series designed for the busy professional. Dr. Gupta is also the co-author of a series of children’s books on diversity, inclusion and multiculturalism including Maya & Rajan Go to North India and Maya & Rajan’s Rainbow of Friends. She received her Ph.D. from UCLA and graduated summa cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa, and as a departmental scholar.
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Agenda

• What is Unconscious Bias
• The science behind US and how bias is formed
• Types of Bias
• How bias impacts the working environment
• Mitigating Bias

Status of Women and Minorities in the Legal Profession

• Women have comprised half of law graduates for at least 25 years but remain underrepresented in the profession
  — Imbalance worsens as you move up the ranks
  — Private practice/in-house vs. government/law schools
• Population is diversifying racially but legal profession is lagging behind — and only part of it is due to the pipeline
  — Again, imbalance worsens as you move up the ranks
  — Asian and Hispanic lawyers have most of recent gains
  — Women of color are especially impacted

Stereotypes

- We create a mental picture of the attributes of a group of people in our mind.
- This set of primary comes up every time we meet someone from the group. We apply the same attributes to them.
- Column copy.
- A fixed and inflexible way of looking at people.

Generalizations

- A fluid concept, open to new information.
- "Most" people in a group behave in this manner but some differ.
- Provides a framework to understand differences but it is flexible and can encompass differences within a group.
Unconscious Bias

- Having a bias means we have a feeling/reaction, either positive or negative, towards a person or a group.
- It's a micro second reaction within our brain.
- We are not conscious of our reaction.
- It's something that we do not have direct control over.

Unconscious Bias

People can have a bias about anything:
- Gender
- Race
- Ethnic Origin
- Disability
- Communication Style
- Arrest
- National Origin
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Identification
- Appearance
- Weight
- Hair color
- Hair texture

We are all biased!
How UB shows up in the workplace

- When a man talks over a woman in a meeting
- When a question is raised whether a woman with children can manage a project
- When a single person is expected to work holidays/evenings because they don't have family obligations

Bias that impacts our working environment

- Similarity/Affinity Bias
- Conformity Bias
- Confirmation Bias

We gravitate towards people who are similar to us in some way:
- Shared culture/ethnic identity
- Gender
- LGBTQ
- Same college/university
- Group affiliation
- Shared professional
- Previously worked with them before
- "Like me"
Hypothetical: “Mel”

- Junior associate of Chinese descent
- Primarily works on a large document review
- Described in review as “pleasant, well organized, team player” (same as her secretary)
- A senior partner has repeatedly confused her with another Asian female associate
- Thinking about having children and concerned about impact on career
- What advice do you give Mel? What can the firm do to retain her?

Hypothetical: “Mel”

Potential advice for Mel

- Approach a champion for help getting better work assignments
- Inform HR or a mentor about the partner’s confusion
- Importance of having a strong advocate for oneself – seek out better opportunities
- Make sure others know you seek challenges, even if more demanding – especially important after having children to avoid well-meaning pigeonholing

Best practices to help

- Training on and correction for unconscious bias in reviews (role of stereotypes)
- Step up D&I training, especially at senior levels
- Circles back with reviewing attorneys to flag the issues
- Institutional support to monitor assignments and improve access to opportunities
- Regular feedback, not just annual reviews

Hypothetical: “Dwayne”

- Mid-level African-American associate
- Reviews have been mostly strong, with a couple of hiccups
- Exceeds at stand-up roles (e.g., depositions, court appearances); these opportunities arose on pro bono cases which are his favorite matters
- Mistaken by a partner’s secretary for a maintenance worker on casual Friday
- Active in legal community but not well known within the Firm
- Should the Firm try to keep Dwayne from leaving? If so, how? What can he do if he wants to stay?
Hypothetical: "Dwayne"

Potential advice for Dwayne
- Approach a mentor or champion to discuss the situation
- Make sure enthusiasm for the firm's paid work is not lost amidst strong pro bono efforts
- Consider stretching on hours for the right opportunity
- Being visible in the community is important, but also work to raise profile within the firm (e.g., volunteer)

Best practices to help
- Training on and correction for unconscious bias in reviews (ensure his contribution does not detract overall strong record)
- D&I training for staff
- Encourage more senior colleagues to reach out and include Dwayne in social events, client meetings, etc.
- Push paying clients to allow stand-up opportunities on paid matters (consider discounts, write-offs)

Mitigating bias...
- Understand the bias
- Understand the impact of this bias
- Conscious decision to mitigate
- Mitigating strategies
  - Can mitigate:
    - Individual
    - Team
    - Company-wide

Meetings
- Be present - Include everyone
Work Assignments

Make a list of what the task/job requires and then focus on the experience of anyone you are considering.

Don't focus on the gender, sexual orientation, nationality or anything that makes them different from you or where you may have pre-conceived ideas. For example: a married woman can't travel or work long hours.

More Best Practices for Diversity and Inclusion

- Ownership must come from the top
- Avoid tokenism (i.e., we have one, now we can stop)
- Encourage transparency and honest dialogue; open door
- Recognize the profound cultural impact of sexual harassment and the firm/organization's response to the same; even consensual sexual relationships between senior men and junior women can have a negative impact
- Same goes for "innocent missteps" as to lawyers of color
- Recognize that for many women and minority lawyers, getting good opportunities and/or building business are the real challenges - access to relationships is harder when the decision makers are usually white men
- Importance of "tending the garden"
- Mentor and champion across gender and race lines
- Effective reduced hours programs

Key Takeaways
- It is critical that you lead the change and model inclusive behaviors in your interactions and decisions.
- Regardless of your level, model the expected behavior and support others in your team and within the larger organization.
- Everyone has unconscious bias. You are not alone.
- Mitigating UB takes time and conscious effort.
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Status of Women in the Legal Profession

- Women have comprised approximately 50% of law graduates for at least 25 years, but...
  - 25% of all lawyers
  - 22.7% of law firm partners (50% of equity partners)
  - Approx. 20% of Fortune 1000 General Counsel
  - 32.4% of law school deans
  - 30% of authors published in top 10 law reviews
  - 30% of judges (state and federal combined)
- Pay inequity persists
  - $2,000/week for men, $1,619 for women on average
  - At 95% of law firms, 1 or 0 of top 10 earners are women

Status of Racial/Ethnic Minorities in the Legal Profession

- Comparison to population, which is diversifying
  - 23% of population, 15% of lawyers
  - African American: 5%, Hispanic: 5%, Asian: 2%
  - 30% of law students (up from 20% over last 20 years)
  - 24.2% of law firm associates (11% for minority women)
- Problem worsens at higher rank
  - 8.5% of equity partners, 11% of general counsel
  - Only 2-3% of equity partners are women of color
- There are still pipeline issues
- Progress over the last 10 years has been generally limited to Asian and Hispanic lawyers

Sources:
- ABA Commission on Women in the Profession, A Century of Women in the Law (January 2013)
- ABA Women
- ABA/Ravitch/Smith Project (August 2012)
Policy change vs. Cultural change - Gender

- Women as caretakers - some is gender stereotyping, but there is an element of truth
- Confirmation bias when women leave, especially after marriage or a pregnancy; no effective counterpoint when they stay
- Some issues that arise from parenting can be addressed by policy changes
- Issue is departure of women, not just mothers - requires cultural change, not just policy change
- Generational impact of Millennials - parenting is now an issue for many men as well as women

Policy change vs. Cultural change - Race

- Perception of lowering standards and/or attributing minority success to affirmative action instead of talent and effort
- Confirmation bias (they leave, why invest?)
- Cultural change is complicated; tensions between different minority groups
- Generational impact comes into play here too, though differently
- Double-whammy for women of color; strong role of stereotypes

Three Hypotheticals

"Mei"

- Third-year associate of Chinese descent
- Primarily works on a large document review
- Described in review as "pleasant, well organized, team player" (same as her secretary)
- A senior partner has repeatedly confused her with another Asian female associate
- Thinking about having children and concerned about impact on career
- What advice do you give Mei?
Three Hypotheticals

Potential advice for Mei
- Approach a champion for help; getting better work assignments
- Inform HR or a mentor about the problem
- Importance of being a strong advocate for oneself
- Seek out better opportunities
- Make sure others know you seek challenge, even if more demanding – especially important after having children to avoid well meaning micromanaging
- Best practices to help
- Training on and correction for unconscious bias in realities (role of stereotypes)
- Step up and training, especially at senior levels
- Cline back with reviewing attorneys to flag the issues
- Institutional support to monitor assignments and improve access to opportunities
- Regular feedback, not just annual reviews

Three Hypotheticals

"Dwayne"
- Mid-level African-American associate
- Reviews have been mostly strong, with a couple of hiccups
- Excels at stand-up roles (e.g., depositions, court appearances), these opportunities are his favorite
- Misleading by a partner's secretary for a maintenance worker on casual Friday
- Active in legal community but not well known within the firm
- Should the firm try to keep Dwayne from leaving? If so, how? What can he do if he wants to stay?

Three Hypotheticals

Potential advice for Dwayne
- Approach a mentor or champion to discuss the situation
- Make sure enthusiasm for the firm's paid work is not lost amid strong pro bono efforts
- Consider stretching on hours for the right opportunity
- Work to raise profile within the firm (e.g., volunteer)
- Best practices to help
- Training on and correction for unconscious bias in realities (ensure feedback do not derail overall strong record)
- Pillar learning for staff
- Encourage more senior colleagues to reach out and include Dwayne in social events, client meetings, etc.
- Push paying clients to allow stand-up opportunities on paid matters (consider discounts, write-offs)
Three Hypotheticals

"Pam"
- Partner well respected for skills
- Has own book but spends much of her time servicing clients for which Bob gets origination credit
- Clients view her as lead
- Used to be active in firm but has cut back
- She says it is to focus on her cases, but she has expressed frustration with the compensation process
- How to keep Pam at the firm?

Potential advice for Pam
- Approach a mentor outside the firm to discuss the situation
- Think about what she really wants – OK servicing Bob's book, or does she want her own exclusively?
  - She should suggest a causus in the firm
  - Ask for what she really needs
- Try with higher problem & legal

Best practices to help Pam
- Incentivize Bob to share credit (Pam may leave if pay differential between Bob and a peer of hers about same)
- Include other components besides origination credit in compensation process (responsibility for cases, teambuilding)

Best Practices for Inclusive Culture
- Ownership must come from the top
  - Make diversity and inclusion a firm priority
  - Devote the necessary time, attention, resources
  - Need measurement, tracking, evaluation, cause correction
- Avoid tokenism (i.e., we have one, now we can stop)
- Encourage transparency and honest dialogue; open door
- Recognize the profound and initial impact of sexual harassment of female associates and the firm’s response to the same; even consensual sexual relationships between male partners and female associates can have a negative impact
- Same goes for "innocent missteps" as to lawyers of color
- Recognize that for many women and minority lawyers, getting good opportunities and/or building business are the real challenges – access to relationships is harder when the decision makers are usually white men
Best Practices for Career Development

- "Champion" model works well
- "Supervising partner" concept as an alternative
- Formal training to reduce bias in evaluations
- Examine and talk about unconscious bias as much as possible
- Include women and minority lawyers in firm leadership
- Encourage community involvement, leadership skills development
- Monitor associate reviews for fairness in evaluations, work assignments, opportunities
- Have in-hire and outside partners who are not providing good opportunities for development
- Choose women and minority lawyers for pitches, high profile matters, etc. (but for money roles, not as tokens)

Best Practices for Business Development

- Build relationships within the firm
- Select women and minority lawyers for business and marketing efforts
- Encourage women and minority lawyers to develop substantive expertise
- Encourage women and minority lawyers to develop reputation outside firm
- Ask other successful women about how to socialize with male clients without awkwardness or misinterpretations
- Business development retreat and/or skills building workshops
- Emphasize "farming the garden" from early in career
- Host functions with women/minority clients, firm alumni
- Push younger lawyers, including women and minority lawyers, to clients, install "back room" business relationships

Best Practices for Mentoring

- Mentoring for junior partners, not just junior associates
- Quarterly time to mentors and mentees on how to get most out of process
- Multiple mentors
  - those one works with
  - clients inside firm
  - outside firm
- Try mentoring circles to increase chance of real connection and reduce burden on mentors
- No need to focus solely on women or minority mentors
  - those mentors are already overburdened
  - have best mentoring relationships w/ mid/low minorities
- Consider partnering with clients for mentoring
- Ideally, value mentoring as partner compensation process
Best Practices for Reduced Hours Programs

- Essential element:
  - Warm experimentering to get it right
  - Deloitte "corporate lattice" approach: ability to ramp up or down

- Key is flexibility by participants:
  - Limit number of matters, not depth of involvement on those matters
  - Use technology; downplay importance of "face time"
  - Conversely, understand impact of sparse "face time"

- Reject reduced schedule where actually working a full load
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Agenda
- Diversity & Inclusion: Review
- What is Unconscious Bias
- The science behind UB and how bias is formed
- Types of bias
- How bias impacts the working environment
- Mitigating bias
Diversity & Inclusion Review

"We have 90 different kinds of coffee, 8 types of creamer and 4 different water... That equals to diversity, doesn't it?"

Diversity is about differences.
- It is about understanding differences and not judging them.
- It is about accepting them.
- It is about treating people with courtesy and respect.
Inclusion is not...

Stereotypes

- Overgeneralizing
- Incorrect generalization
- We see a mental picture of what a group of people look like
- We see who we imagine someone from that group to be
- We judge them the same way we judge other groups
- People are different
- We judge people on their race or gender
- We make assumptions about an individual or a group of people based on their skin tone or the way they dress
- We believe that “everyone” acts the same way and that anyone who does not fit in can be stereotyped

Generalizations

- Fluid concept, open to new information
- “Most” people in a group behave in this manner but some will not
- Provides a framework to understand differences but is flexible and can encompass differences within a group
The subtle inequities

- Subtle or "Micro-inequities"
- Micro-aggressions
- Little acts of discrimination
- Often go unnoticed
- Maligned
- "Fine points."
- "Looking for reasons."
- "Not a good fit for our culture."

Micro-inequities at work

- Lack of mentoring
- Less access to higher visibility and key assignments
- Perceived or actual quality work
- "Accidentally" left out of key meetings or meetings held after hours
- "Non-present" location

Many of these occur because of our unconscious bias.
Unconscious Bias

- Having a bias means we have a feeling/reaction, either positive or negative, towards a person or a group.
- It's a micro-second reaction within our brain.
- We are not conscious of our reaction.
- It's something that we do not have direct control over.

Unconscious Bias

People can have a bias about anything:
- Gender
- Race
- Ethnic Origin
- Disability
- Communication Style
- Accent
- National Origin
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Identification
- Appearance
- Age
- Hair color
- Fatness

We are all biased!
How UB shows up in the workplace

- When a man talks over a woman in a meeting
- When a question is raised whether a woman with children can manage a project
- When a single person is expected to work holidays/evenings because they don't have family obligations

Bias that impacts our working environment

- Similarity/Affinity Bias
- Conformity Bias
- Confirmation Bias

We may see homogeneous people who are similar to us in some way:

- Same ethnicity
- Social status
- Gender
- LGBTQ
- Same college/university
- Same age grouping
- Familiar to us because we have worked with them before
- "Natives"
How similarity/affinity bias impacts the working environment

- Decreases diversity of thought
- Decreases diversity of employees
- Keeps 'families' from promoting employees with assignments
- Mentoring

Confirmation Bias

We think in a certain way about a person or group and then we look for actions to confirm "what we know".

How confirmation bias impacts the working environment

We are basically snow-white with this bias:

- Women
  - With work, focus home or be less focused on their careers once they get married and especially when they have children
  - “odega"
- Caucasians
  - Certain generations are not willing to work hard and just expect promotions
  - Some age groups do not have tech in language technology
- Asian groups
  - Women talk less
  - Asians are good at math
- We take in the information that confirms the bias but not the information that goes against what we think.
Mitigating bias...

- Understand the bias
- Understand the impact of bias
- Consciously consider mitigation strategies
- Can mitigate:
  - Individual
  - Team
  - Company-wide

Meetings

- Be present
- Include everyone

Work Assignments

Make a list of what the task/job requires and then focus on the experience of anyone you are considering.

Don't focus on the gender, sexual orientation, nationality or anything that makes them different from you or where you may have pre-conceived bias. For example, a married woman can't travel or work long hours.
Key Takeaways

- It is critical that you lead the change and model inclusive behaviors in your interactions and decisions.
- Regardless of your level, model the expected behavior and support others in your team and within the larger organization.
- Everyone has unconscious bias. You are not alone.
- Mitigating UB takes time and conscious effort.
Women in the Legal Profession

American Bar Association Market Research Department, October 2017. This figure represents the 46 states that reported demographics data for resident and active attorneys as of 12/31/2016.

Women in Private Practice

Women in Corporations

*Fortune 500 General Counsel*


*Fortune 501-1000 General Counsel*

Law School Administration - Deans

Association of American Law Schools (January 13, 2018). This represents 179 deans at AALS member schools, one of which has two co-deans, and includes permanent and interim deans.

Women in Law Schools

Women on Law Reviews

"A random sample of the top 10 law reviews suggests that the number of women authors in 2017 is around 20%.”

Women in the Judiciary

Representation of United States Federal Court Women Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Court</th>
<th>Total # of Seats</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>% of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Supreme Court</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court of Appeals (Active)(^1)</td>
<td>160 (active)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36.8%(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal District Court Judges (Active) in the U.S.(^3)</td>
<td>570 (active)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>34%(^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) When considering the 19 vacancies that existed as of June 1, 2017, women were appointed to 33% of the 179 U.S. circuit court judgeships.
\(^4\) When considering the 103 vacancies that existed as of June 1, 2017, women were appointed to 25% of the 673 federal district court judgeships.

2016 Representation of United States State Court Women Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Women of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gavel Gap (www.gavelgap.org)

Total Representation of Women - Federal & State Judgeships

Women lawyers’ weekly salary as a percentage of male lawyers’ salary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Women Equity Partners Compensation**

At the median, the typical female equity partner in the 200 largest firms earns 94% of the compensation earned by the typical male partner.

This figure represents the 90 firms that provided this data. *Report of the Tenth Annual Survey on Promotion and Retention of Women in Law Firms. National Association of Women Lawyers and NAWL Foundation, September 2017*. [http://www.nawl.org/d/dt/363](http://www.nawl.org/d/dt/363)
Women Presidents of the ABA:
  • Hilarie Bass (2017-)
  • Linda A. Klein (2016-2017)
  • Paulette Brown (2015-2016)
  • Laurel Bellows (2012-2013)
  • Carolyn B. Lamm (2009-2010)
  • Karen J. Mathis (2006-2007)
  • Martha W. Barnett (2000-2001)
  • Roberta Cooper Ramo (1995-1996)

Women Chairs of the House of Delegates:
  • Deborah Enix-Ross (2016-)
  • Patricia Lee Refo (2014-2016)
  • Linda A. Klein (2010-2012)
  • Laurel G. Bellows (2006-2008)
  • Martha W. Barnett (1994-1996)

Secretaries
  • Mary L. Smith (2017-)
  • Mary T. Torres (2014-2017)
  • Cara Lee T. Neville (2011-2014)
  • Bernice B. Donald (2008-2011)
  • Ellen F. Rosenblum (2002-2005)
  • Donna C. Willard-Jones (1996-1999)

Treasurer
  • Michelle A. Behnke (2017-)
  • Alice E. Richmond (2008-2011)

First Women Members of the ABA:
  • Mary B. Grossman; Cleveland, OH (1918)
  • Mary Florence Lathrop; Denver, CO (1918)

For more information on women’s advancement into leadership positions in the ABA, see the ABA Commission on Women’s Goal III Report at www.ambar.org/goal3women.

American Bar Association - Commission on Women in the Profession
321 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654
Phone: 312-988-5715 • Email: abacwp1@americanbar.org • Website: www.americanbar.org/wom
The data regarding the stalled career trajectories of many women in the legal profession, especially in the law firm, is indisputable. NAWL itself has collected data for the last 11 years demonstrating a consistent and relatively undisturbed pattern showing the absence of women in the upper echelon of law firm and legal profession leadership, and in the 11 years that NAWL has tracked the data, there has been relatively little progress made in the representation of women in these roles. With this year's survey, NAWL thought it important to take the first steps toward more systematic study of the mechanisms underlying these well-known statistics. Each year, the goal of the NAWL Survey has been to provide objective statistics regarding the position and advancement of women lawyers in law firms in particular, and the NAWL Survey remains the only national survey that collects this industry benchmarking data in such detail.

Survey Methodology in Brief
The 2018 NAWL Survey was sent to the 200 largest U.S. law firms1.

---

1 As reported in the 2017 AmLaw 200 Rankings.
in February 2018 and responding law firms had until April 30, 2018 to submit their responses. This year, 97 of 200 law firms completed all or significant portions of the survey, a response rate of 48.5 percent. An additional 7 firms formally declined to participate, an option given in this year’s survey, and these firms answered questions about their reasons, leading to an overall response rate of 52%.

As discussed in more detail below, firms completed questions regarding the demographics of attorneys at various levels, particularly women, as well as the structure of the partnership track, credit awarding processes, compensation and hours, and women’s initiatives and other programming designed to support women in law firms.

The responding firms represent the full spectrum of the AmLaw 200 rankings. The quartile showing the lowest response rates were from Quartile 4 (AmLaw rank 151 – 200), with about 38% percent of those firms responding to the survey, and Quartile 1 (AmLaw rank 1 – 50), with about 42% of those firms responding. By comparison, 60% of those ranked in Quartile 2 (AmLaw 51 – 100) and 54% of Quartile 3 (AmLaw 101 – 150) responded. Overall, there were few significant differences between firms of different quartiles, but some nuances are discussed in the results below.

Following Women through the Law Firm

For over a decade, approximately 50% of law students nationwide have been women, law firms have recruited women as entry-level associates roughly in proportion to their representation among law school graduates, and yet the statistics repeatedly show that these women are not reflected in the numbers of non-equity or equity partners in those same law firms. This report proceeds by highlighting the representation at three key points in the career trajectory of law firm lawyers: associate, non-equity (income) partner, and equity partner. Along the way, practices and procedures that could impact the experiences of women and diverse attorneys and their continued success in the law firm are also discussed, including management of the client relationship and succession planning, credit assignment and sharing procedures, and the ways that firms internalize their commitments to gender and racial/ethnic diversity as part of these practices and procedures.

---

2 As noted in more detail in the compensation sub-section, fewer law firms completed questions about compensation and hours, with many declining to provide the data, often noting that it’s either considered confidential or is not collected in a way that matches the reporting format requested on the survey. As in most survey administrations, very few questions receive 100 percent response rates for various reasons, and firms were encouraged to complete as much of the survey as they were willing while also maintaining the ability to skip other portions.

3 This represents an increase in responses compared to the 2015 Survey (37 percent) and is consistent with response rates from 2017 (90 of 200 firms or 45% response rate). Firms that declined to participate cited reasons such as too many surveys, the length of this particular survey, and the sensitive nature of some of the data requested. NAWL will continue working to address some of these concerns to encourage increasing firm participation.

4 The participation rate goes up to 60% (or 119 of the AmLaw 200 firms) when the participation rates for the last two years are taken together. There is a core group of firms that have participated in both years, but there is a sizable number of firms who participated in either 2017 or 2018.

5 For all law schools, women made up a simple majority (51 percent) of all law students for the first time in 2016, as reported by Law School Transparency (LST), a non-profit organization aimed at making entry to the legal profession more transparent, affordable, and fair. Report available at www.lawstuden.com/documents/MeritBasedAdmissionsResearchSummary_Nov-2016.pdf. In the last 20 years, the percentage of women earning law school degrees has hovered between 45 and 50 percent according to statistics from the US Department of Education. Discussion of findings available at www.theatlantic.com/sexes/archive/2012/12/more-women-are-doctors-and-lawyers-than-ever-but-progess-is-stalling/266115.
Women as Associates & Non-Partner Track Attorneys

Women are 47% of all law firm associates, 39% of counsel, and 57% of "other" attorneys. Women of color (including Black, Asian, and Hispanic/Latina women) are about 24% of law firm associates and 8% of non-partner track attorneys (made up of both counsel and other full-time attorneys). And for those firms reporting numbers, LGBTQI individuals (of all genders) are about 4% of associates and 2% of non-partner track attorneys. Persons with disabilities are less than 1% of all associates and non-partner track attorneys.

As discussed further below, this year's survey again shows that while women start off in essentially equal numbers as men at the entry level, they are not represented in similar numbers at the non-equity partner level and are even less represented at the equity partner level.

In this year's report, we also break out the hours, billing rates, and compensation to better understand disparities and to compare data across attorney types in the law firm. Overall, the data shows not only relatively equal representation of women among associates, but also relatively equal compensation, billing rates, and hours worked for female and male associates. This evidences the continued importance of investigating the variables that contribute to the underrepresentation of women at higher levels in the law firm despite the starting points of men and women in the law firm being relatively equal on a number of dimensions.

Associate & Non-Partner Attorney Compensation

For associates, the median man makes, on average, about $7,712 more a year than the median woman ($190,614

---

6 Associates are partner-track attorneys who have not yet achieved partnership.
7 Counsel attorneys are those attorneys known often as Senior Counsel, Special Counsel, Senior Attorney, and are neither associates nor partners and are full-time, permanent salaried employees of the firm.
8 This "other" category is a catchall for any other full-time, permanent salaried lawyers at the law firm that do not fit into any of the above categories, regardless of title.
9 For LGBTQI individuals and persons with disabilities, a large hurdle to getting an accurate picture of their representation in the law firm is in the collection of data on these identities. About 10% of firms explicitly indicated that they do not collect demographic data on LGBTQI individuals, and about 36% indicated they do not collect data on persons with disabilities.
10 There may be increasing equity at the median compensation level, for individuals at the middle of the compensation distribution, but this pattern co-exists with a persistent pattern that women are not represented among the most highly compensated attorneys at law firms. Thus, the pay gap may have closed some in the middle (at the median), but has remained wide or is widening at the extremes. NAWL first mentioned this possibility in the 2017 report, but the 2017 data didn't allow for an investigation of this hypothesis. In response, this year's survey collected median compensation, allowing for comparison of the man and woman at the middle of their respective distributions, and mean or average compensation, which better captures and reflects the full range of compensation. Overall, we find little difference between the results based on median vs. mean numbers except at the level of equity partner, as discussed below. This suggests that the distributions are more equivalent between men and women until they reach the most highly compensated level in the law firm.
11 As in the past and as mentioned previously, the response rate for the compensation and billing questions is lower than that for the other sections of the survey. For the compensation questions, we had an average n = 36, representing 18 percent of the AmLaw 200 and 37% of the responding firms. As with the overall response rate, those firms in Quarte 1 (AmLaw rank 1 - 50) were the least likely to respond, with only 31% of the responding firms in Quarte 1 providing the data compared to up to 37% of the responding firms in Quarte 3 (AmLaw rank 101 - 150) providing the data. Overall the response rates for these questions went down in 2018 even though the overall response rate for the survey as a whole increased.
vs. $182,902, respectively). This pattern persists across the AmLaw 200, and on average, the median woman associate makes 96% of what the median man makes. When mean compensation is considered, the mean male associate makes about $8,959 more a year than the mean female associate ($192,536 vs. $183,577, respectively). Thus, the mean female associate makes 95% of what the mean male associate makes. While this does represent a compensation gap, it suggests that men and women start off with relatively more equivalent compensation, and the gap widens over time.

For non-partner track attorneys, specifically counsel, the median man makes, on average, $18,308 more a year than the median woman ($237,500 vs. $219,192, respectively). This pattern persists across the AmLaw 200, and on average, the median woman counsel makes 92% of what the median man makes. For mean compensation, the mean male counsel makes $22,208 more a year than the mean female counsel ($255,677 vs. $233,469, respectively). Thus, the mean woman counsel makes 91% of what the mean man makes.

**Associate Billing Rates**

As part of the discussion about observable differences in both compensation and billings for men and women in the law firm, differential billing rates have been suggested as one possible source of a disparity that creates gaps at subsequent steps. For the first time this year, NAWL collected data on median and mean billing rates for men and women. We found that men and women start with similar billing rates at the associate level but diverge by the time they reach non-equity and equity partner. At the associate level, there was essentially no difference between reported billing rates for men and women ($408 vs. $403, respectively).

**Associate & Non-Partner Attorney Hours**

Despite existing hypotheses to the contrary, many years of NAWL data have shown that there are no

---

12 The response rate for the client billing questions was consistent with that for the other compensation-related questions, about n = 40. Billable hours include client billable hours and at most firms (78%) at least some pro bono hours. A minority of firms include administrative hours, service to firm, firm legal work, etc., as billable hours. Non-billable hours include administrative hours (94%), personal professional development (88%), business development (88%), practice group development (88%), all or some pro bono hours (65%), and some other categories of hours. Most firms said they compensate non-billable pro bono hours (74%), but a majority of firms said they didn’t compensate other categories of non-billable hours explicitly. Some firms reported that they took non-billable hours into account in a non-formulaic way when reviewing attorneys and determining base and bonus compensation, recognizing exceptional service in these areas.

13 The response rate for billing rates questions was on par with that of the compensation data, with about n = 39.
Supporting Women on the Path to Partner

There are many practices that law firms can and do engage in that are meant to support women and diverse attorneys throughout their careers. These practices often focus on trainings, diversity and inclusion efforts, and implementing policies that help support women and families.

Diversity Training & Bias Reduction Efforts: Firms engage in a variety of firm-wide training programs that often serve similar purposes as similar training and programming provided inside of women's or diversity initiatives. For example, 76% of firms report offering firm-wide implicit bias training, 36% offer training on micro-aggressions or micro-inequities, 79% offer diversity and inclusion training, 90% offer business development training, 72% offer management training, and 82% offer leadership training. These are most commonly reported to be made available to attorneys of all varieties and sometimes also include law firm staff.

This year we also asked firms about bias reduction efforts. Specifically, we asked firms whether they had implemented bias interrupting procedures and processes meant to reduce the likelihood of biases (such as gender and racial biases) affecting evaluations and outcomes. A moderate majority of firms (65%) reported that they had implemented bias interrupting procedures in at least one of the following areas: recruitment, hiring, performance evaluation, promotion (pre-partnership), elevation to non-equity partner, and elevation to equity partner. Specifically, the earlier in the process, the more likely firms were to report that they engaged in bias interrupting processes and procedures: 89% at recruitment, 86% at hiring, 70% for performance evaluations, 58% at promotion, 44% at elevation to non-equity partner, and 54% at elevation to equity partner.

Firms reported that the types of procedures and processes they used included the following: structured interviews, the use of objective criteria for decisions, intentionally diverse decision-making teams, targeted recruiting to diversify the applicant pools, the use of centralized hiring processes (e.g., HR), training on implicit biases for decision-makers, standardized content for interview questions, and more. A minority of firms provided this detail, so a more systematic collection and analysis of firm processes and procedures would allow for a more nuanced view of both what firms are doing and whether they align (and to what degree) with evidence-based best practices for bias reduction in employment settings. Of those firms who reported implementing such bias reducing processes and procedures, firms said they had been doing so for an average of 5 years, with a range from 1 to 20 years. In addition, some firms reported that

\footnote{Multiple firms reported using Diversity Lab's 2016 Women in Law Hackathon idea of incorporating the Mansfield Rule, which says law firms should consider at least 30% women, LGBTQ+, and minority lawyers for significant leadership roles. Information available at http://www.diversitylab.com/pilot-projects/mansfield-rule.}
they began with one stage or process and then added additional measures in subsequent years.

It is important to point out that firms are much more likely to engage in these bias reduction efforts at the earliest stages of an attorney's relationship with the firm, where the disparities between men and women are non-existent or small, but less likely to engage in similar efforts across the career lifespan where men and women’s trajectories diverge. Thus, firms may have found ways to effectively reduce bias at the recruitment and hiring stages, but the stalled progress of women at subsequent levels combined with the decreased likelihood that firms are engaging in bias reducing processes at these higher level decision points evidences a need for firms to consider expanding their bias reduction efforts to decisions made once a woman is at the firm and advancing through her career.

**Women and Family Friendly Policies:** In addition to active women's initiatives aimed at training and skill development (discussed in more detail below), we also asked firms about policies that are understood to benefit and support families and women in particular, such as flexible and part-time work schedules and help transitioning back into work after a family leave. Most firms reported offering both flexible (97%) and part-time work schedules (100%), the option to work from home (88%), as well as on-ramping for those attorneys returning from leaves (71%). As reported above, most firms reported allowing partner-track attorneys who work part-time schedules to be promoted to partner, although it was more likely for firms to allow this for non-equity partnership promotion than equity partner promotion. In other words, most firms report allowing for flexible or part-time work schedules that don’t prevent the possibility of future promotion in theory.

**Pathways to Partnership**
Central to establishing the credentials for elevation to equity partner is building one's book of business and attaining and maintaining client relationships. Discussion in the field has begun to home in on the importance of client relationships and credit processes and procedures for partner promotion decisions. Better understanding how law firms manage both the client relationships and credit processes allows for a more nuanced view of who is getting access to the crucial building blocks of a book of business that merits promotion to equity partner.

**Client Relationships & Credit Origination**
Another important component of career advancement in the law firm is the credit allocation and succession structures that affect how attorneys build their books of business. Most firms award credit for a variety of roles with respect to clients and matters at the firm: origination credit for relationship partners (86%), matter proliferation credit for partners eliciting new business from existing clients (71%), credit for
2018 NAWL Survey at a Glance

- The likelihood that women will become equity partners remains on a sluggish upward trajectory over the last 12 years, with the data reflecting an increase from 15 percent in 2006 to 20 percent in 2018.

- The representation of women declines significantly as she rises in seniority at law firms, making up 47 percent of associates, 30 percent of non-equity partners (unchanged from last year) and 20 percent of equity partners.

- Among equity partners, women work as many hours as men, but their client billings are only 92 percent of those of men. The billing rates for men and women start at the associate level essentially equal but develop a 5 percent gap by the time attorneys reach non-equity partnership and persist at 5 percent into equity partnership.

- Entering classes of equity partners were 31 percent women, a slight drop from last year (33 percent) and a failure to meet the NAWL One-Third by 2020 Challenge for incoming equity partner classes.

- Men continue to dominate the top earner spots, with 93 percent of firms reporting their top earner is a man and of the 10 most highly compensated lawyers in the firm 1 or none of those top 10 is a woman.

- Women make up 25 percent of firm governance roles, 22 percent of firm-wide managing partners, 20 percent of office-level managing partners, and 22 percent of practice group leaders. This is the area of the most progress, but the numbers still lag behind the representation of women in the legal profession as a whole.

- Firms bias interruption interventions reflect the lack of progress at the higher levels of law firms, with firms reporting that the earlier in the process, the more likely they were to engage in bias interrupting processes and procedures: 89 percent at recruitment, 86 percent at hiring, 70 percent for performance evaluations, 58 percent at promotion, 44 percent at elevation to non-equity partner, and 54 percent at elevation to equity partner.

- The median woman equity partner earns 91 percent of what the median male equity partner makes and 88 percent of what the mean male equity partner makes. However, female equity partners generate 94 percent of the revenue that male equity partners generate.

- Among new relationship partners - those that inherited clients due to transitions within firms' top 20 clients - 36 percent are women compared to 20 percent of the current relationship partners for all top 20 clients.

- People of color, women of color, LGBTQ and persons with disabilities fare worse across all positions. People of color make up about 8 percent of equity partners, and only two percent of equity partners are women of color. Openly LGBTQ attorneys represent only 2 percent of equity partners, and persons with disabilities represent less than 1 percent. These percentages match those measured in 2015 after a dip in the representation of people of color in equity partnership last year.
management of the matter for partners and attorneys actively managing the client's matters (73%), and production credit for partners and attorneys billing hours on the client/matter (57%). Of the responding firms that have credit allocation structures, 90% of firms reported that they allow credit sharing, and 97% of those firms reported that they encourage credit sharing. They report that they do so by taking credit sharing into account for both bonus allocations (75%) and promotion reviews (80%). About a third of firms indicated that they had credit sharing requirements on at least some projects. Firms also offered that they further encourage credit sharing via the following: considering credit sharing in compensation in general not just for bonuses; developing a culture of credit sharing, starting with endorsement and encouragement by firm management; tracking credit sharing; and allowing attorneys to report matters and clients they worked on. Collecting more information from firms as to how they allocate credit and encourage credit sharing will better represent what firms, on average, are doing to this end and allow for discussion of whether what firms are doing is effective in increasing credit sharing overall as well as whether credit is being allocated to and shared with women and diverse attorneys in the same way as white men attorneys.

Managing Client Relationship Transitions

We asked firms about the succession planning practices and procedures in an effort to uncover more detail about how firms handle the transfers of highly valuable relationships and status in the law firm. A slight majority (59%) of firms reported having formal succession plans that govern all or most successions, but firms were not willing, at the present time, to share those processes with NAWL. 15 With respect to succession processes and procedures, whether formalized or not, 82% of firms reported that they have extended their diversity efforts to consider succession processes and outcomes. In addition, 74% of firms reported that they had succession processes for transitions in practice group leadership, and 76% reported that they had succession processes for transitions on governance committee(s). Firms overwhelmingly (91%) reported that they allowed for relationships to be passed down to multiple new partners (i.e., shared), although the results below show that more recent transitions haven't resulted in greater numbers of relationship partners overall. All responding firms report that they have made efforts to encourage the incorporation of women into client relationships. Some firms report fostering the development of women's relationships with clients through the following activities: hosting events, networking and substantive, for women to interact with clients; fostering ongoing collaboration and relationship-building between women in the law firm and clients, particularly women, through projects, pro bono work, and the development of mentoring.
relationships that pair women with clients; placing attorneys in-house at their client to serve as ambassadors for the firm and to learn the client and their business from the inside; and training aimed at business development and client relationships. Again, a minority of firms elected to submit responses to this open-ended request for firm practices that encourage client relationship-building for women. More sharing of firm practices and analysis of what firms are doing would better allow for development of best practices in this area.

As for who makes the decisions about a succession and when, there was no standardized approach across firms. Most firms reported that some combination of the client (58%), the current relationship partner(s) (72%), firm leadership (58%), and the practice group leaders(s) (59%) determine how the succession will be assigned, and many firms acknowledged that exactly how the process plays out is dependent on the specifics of the particular client/matter. Further, succession planning is also largely an individualized and ongoing process, with 63% of firms reporting that the eventual succession is considered throughout the relationship and tenure of the existing relationship partner. Only 27% of firms reported that they started thinking about it either as the existing relationship partner approaches retirement age and/or once they announce retirement. While the idiosyncratic nature of existing succession planning and the eventual transitions affords firms flexibility that may be, research suggests that less standardized, more subjective processes are ripe for the influence of biases that may lead certain groups or individuals to be disfavored in the process, such as women and racial/ethnic minorities.  

For the first time this year, NAWL asked firms about the relationship partners for their top 20 clients. Specifically, firms were asked about recent transitions in relationship partners for these top clients and the representation of women and diverse attorneys among them. Among responding firms, 65% (63 firms) answered at least some questions about their relationship partners. On average, the total number of relationship partners assigned to the top-20 clients was 39. Of those 39, on average about 8 are women (21%), 2 are racial/ethnic minorities (5%), and none are openly LGBTQI or a person with a disability. Among the responding firms, about 57% reported they had relationship partner transitions for their top 20 clients in the last three years (Jan 1, 2015 – Dec 31, 2017). On average, firms reported that they had about 5 relationship partners change during that time, and the results reflect that the new relationship partners were more likely to be women than the departing relationship partners were (36% vs. 20%, respectively). There was no noticeable change in the representation of diverse attorneys between the departing and new

---

17 Firms were allowed to consider their top-20 clients based on their own, unreported, criteria.
relationship partners, and their representation was overall low, with racial/ethnic minorities, LGBTQI, and persons with disabilities all likely to be absent from both the departing and new relationship partner pools.

The vast majority of these decisions were made at the firm rather than as directed primarily by the client.

**Women as Non-Equity (Income) Partners**

As discussed in more detail in last year's report, NAWL documented the transition that many firms have made to a two-tier model of partnership. One effect of a two-tier partnership model is that it creates an additional level before reaching the highest status (and most highly compensated) equity partner role, possibly making it harder to achieve equity partner in general, but particularly for women and other diverse groups who have been historically underrepresented.

With the move over the last two decades toward two-tier partnership models in a majority of firms, the percentage of women equity partners has not followed suit. This year, 81% of our sample reported that they are two-tier firms.

As in past years, women are 30% of non-equity or income partners. Women of color (including Black, Asian, and Hispanic/Latina women) are 5% of non-equity partners. LGBTQI individuals of all genders are 2% of non-equity partners. Persons with disabilities are less than 1% of non-equity partners.

**Non-Equity Partner Compensation**

For non-equity partners, the median man makes, on average, about $8,005 more a year than the median woman ($309,279 vs. $301,274, respectively). On average, the median woman non-equity partner makes 97% of what the median man makes. When considering mean compensation, the mean male non-equity partner makes about $13,609 more per year than the mean female non-equity partner ($323,008 vs. $309,399, respectively). Thus, women non-equity partners make 96% of what the mean man makes.

Women are 30% of non-equity or income partners. Women of color (including Black, Asian, and Hispanic/Latina women) are 5% of non-equity partners. LGBTQI individuals of all genders are 2% of non-equity partners. Persons with disabilities are less than 1% of non-equity partners.

Women in non-equity partner and non-partner track attorney roles have reached or surpassed the 2006 NAWL Challenge goal of 30% representation, but the...
Note, these numbers reflect a similar gap to that at the associate level, but it is a smaller gap than exists at the equity partner level where men’s and women’s salaries diverge more.

Non-Equity Partner Billing Rates
As suggested above, the billing rates of men and women diverge by the time they reach non-equity partner despite starting at the same point as associates. For non-equity partners, the median billing rate for men was $585/hour compared to a median for women of $554/hour. This billing rate gap is similar to that seen between male and female equity partners, and represents an average premium of about 5% for male non-equity partners compared to female non-equity partners.

Women as Equity Partners
The number of women equity partners and women in leadership roles in the law firm are of primary interest, given the focus of the One-Third by 2020 Challenge issued by NAWL in 2016. This challenge renewed the call for the legal field to increase its representation of women to one-third of General Counsels of Fortune 1000 companies, of new law firm equity partners, of law firm lateral hires, and of law school deans. The One-Third by 2020 Challenge also calls for an increase of at least one-third for diverse women attorneys, including LBTO and women of color, in every segment of the legal profession.

This year’s survey shows a similar percentage of women equity partners compared to last year (20% vs. 19%, respectively). Last year we reported that this represents an increase over the 15% - 16% recorded.


22 In raw numbers, in 2017 there was an average of 29 female equity partners reported per firm compared to 33 in 2018. Although it’s also of note that the average
10 years prior, but it also highlights the uneven progression that often occurs whereby there may be larger increases over a period of time but incremental changes or plateaus in the short term.

**Diversity among Equity Partners**

The One-Third by 2020 Challenge explicitly identified goals related to the representation of diverse women attorneys in the legal profession, including women of color, LGBTQI individuals, and people with disabilities. This specific challenge is to increase the numbers (with a baseline at the 2016 numbers) of these diverse women by a third by 2020. In 2018, White women represent 89% of female equity partners and 18% of equity partners overall. In the aggregate, women of color (including Black, Asian, Hispanic/Latina women) represent only about 12% of female equity partners, on average, and about 2% of all equity partners. For all equity partners, people of color (men and women) account for only 8% of equity partners. Black equity partners are 2% of equity partners, Asian equity partners account for 3%, Hispanic/Latina equity partners account for 2%, and all other racial/ethnic minorities combined account for about 1%. This represents a bump up from 6% equity partners of color reported in 2017 and a return to the levels reported in 2015. For those firms reporting numbers, LGBTQI individuals were 2% of all equity partners and persons with disabilities were less than 1% of all equity partners. These numbers are unchanged since 2017.

**Equity Partner Compensation**

Ninety-three percent (93%) of responding firms reported that their most highly compensated attorney is a man. Of the 10 most highly compensated lawyers in the firm, on average, 1 of those top 10 is a woman. We also asked firms about their top 10 revenue-generators, and of those 10, firms reported that there was, on average, 1 woman among them. Most firms reported no women in the ranks of those attorneys generating the most revenue or those being the most highly compensated.

Taken with the above-reported data on compensation at the associate and non-equity partner levels, across all types and levels of attorneys, men made more per year than women, and this pattern existed without

---

24 As a reminder, people of color (including but not limited to Black, Asian, Hispanic/Latina individuals), make up an average of 24% of associates. And their representation is higher at higher-ranked firms. Quartile 1 and 2 firms (AmLaw 1 – 100) report 26% associates of color, whereas the bottom two quartiles report about 20% associates of color.
25 There was a noticeable difference especially in the percentages of Asian equity partners at AmLaw 50 firms (Quartile 1). These firms reported higher percentages of Asian equity partners (5% compared to about 2% in the other quartiles). For all other racial/ethnic groups, there was no noticeable difference across the AmLaw 200.
27 As a reminder, for LGBTQI individuals and persons with disabilities, a large hurdle to getting an accurate picture of their representation in the law firm is in the collection of data on these identities. About 10% of firms explicitly indicated that they do not collect demographic data on LGBTQI individuals, and about 36% indicated they do not collect data on persons with disabilities.
28 The response rate for these questions compared to the more detailed compensation questions was slightly higher, ranging from n = 51 to n = 56, depending on the question. This represents about 25% of the AmLaw 200 and 55% of the responding firms.
significant variance across the AmLaw 200 for all attorney types and levels.

Among equity partners, the median man makes, on average, about $64,320 more a year than the median woman ($750,215 vs. $685,895, respectively).\(^9\) On average, the median woman equity partner makes 91% percent of what the median man makes. Among equity partners, the mean man makes about $99,421 more a year than the mean woman ($847,266 vs. $747,845, respectively). Thus, the mean woman equity partner makes 88% of what the mean male equity partner makes. These findings support the hypothesis that the compensation distribution skews higher for men than for women as evidenced by a greater pay gap when using the mean vs. median compensation numbers. This offers additional support to the data that shows that men tend to have near exclusive domain over the most highly compensated roles in the firm. In addition, it highlights that only looking at the median numbers may hide the differences in the distribution of compensation, particularly at the high end where women are less likely to be represented. Further, this difference only appears among the most highly compensated attorneys. There is no significant difference between median and mean compensation numbers before reaching equity partner, suggesting that the smaller but persistent gap that begins at the associate level expands much more dramatically at the level of equity partner.

**Equity Partner Hours**

As discussed previously, for the median female and male equity partners, there was essentially no difference in median billable hours on average (1532 vs. 1542 hours, respectively). No significant difference is recorded if mean hours for women and men are considered instead (1496 vs. 1507, respectively). For total hours there was also no significant difference between the median woman and man in hours recorded (2178 vs. 2134 hours, respectively). Again, the mean total hours also did not differ significantly between women and men (2215 vs. 2232, respectively).

**Equity Partner Client Billings\(^{10}\) & Billing Rates**

For equity partner median client billings, the median male equity partner bills more than the median woman ($1,348,306 vs. $1,262,683, respectively). On average, the median woman equity partner bills 94% of what the median man bills. The mean client billings show a similar pattern. It has been suggested before that disparities in compensation, at least among equity

---

9 Equity partners at Quartile 1 firms bill more hours than those in the other quartiles, with Quartile 1 equity partners averaging about a median of about 1625 billable hours and the equity partners in the other quartiles averaging a median 1512 billable hours. Across the quartiles, there appears to be no significant difference in hours billed between men and women equity partners. For total hours, Quartile 1 equity partners again record more hours compared to those from the other quartiles (average 2392 total hours vs. 2080 total hours). For total hours, there appear to be some small differences between men and women equity partners at the higher ranked firms, with women equity partners recording greater median total hours than men (in Quartile 1, women recorded a median of 2442 total hours to men’s median of 2342 total hours). This effect reverses when mean hours are considered such that men record a higher mean total hours compared to women (in Quartile 1, 2876 vs. 2442, respectively).

10 NAWL defined client billings as the dollar amount credited by the firm to a given equity partner as their billings. Variations on what NAWL was trying to identify with its definition of “client billings” include origination credit, fee credits, book of business, credited revenue, and similar terms.
partners, may align with differences in client billings between men and women. In other words, men bill more and thus they are compensated more. On the other hand, this raises questions as to how client billings are generated and how credit is assigned for client billings. For this reason, in this year's survey, we attempted to dig deeper into this question of what explains these disparities by collecting data on billing rates. In other words, one reason for higher billings could be a difference in the rates that underlie the billings. However, when compared to the pay gap at the equity partnership level (91% at the median and 88% at the mean), a discrepancy remains that cannot be explained by billing generation.

As discussed above, we found that men and women start with similar billing rates as associates but diverge by the time they reach non-equity partner. While billing rates go up overall for equity partners compared to non-equity partners, a gap between men and women remains. The overall median billing rate for equity partners was $683/hour, and the overall mean billing rate for equity partners was $676/hour. By gender, the median billing rate for male equity partners was $686/hour compared to a median of $655/hour for women equity partners. This, again, represents an average premium of about 5% for male equity partners compared to female equity partners.

When hours and billing rates are taken together, the fact that women work the same hours as men but bill at 95% the rate of men at the same level could explain, in part, why women equity partners record 94% of the client billings of male equity partners. To get at perceptions of why these billing rate differences may exist, we asked firms which common anecdotal explanations they thought were tied to any billing rate differences that may exist between men and women. Most firms reported that they thought that men and women working in practice groups with different billing rates (65%) and men's longer tenures in law firms (73%) explained differences in billing rates of men and women. More work needs to be done to determine the more precise relationship between hours worked, billing rates, client billings, and compensation, particularly at the level of equity partner.

**New Equity Partners & Availability of Partner-Track**

Firms were asked to report how many new equity partners they promoted in the previous two years (2016 and 2017). On average, 16 individuals were
promoted to equity partner during that period. Of those 16 new equity partners, about 5 (31%) were women. This is similar to 2017 when firms reported that they had promoted, on average, 15 attorneys to equity partner in the prior two years, and 1/3 of those were women. In addition, a third of the new equity partners were homegrown (i.e., started their careers at the firm), and 13% of the new equity partners spent three or fewer years at the firm before promotion to equity partner, suggesting some recruitment of laterals that were expected to advance to equity partner. For homegrown partners, about 41 percent were women (2 of 5), and for recent laterals who were promoted to partner, 50 percent were women (1 of 2), on average. These numbers match those reported in 2017, providing another year of data suggesting that some firms in recent years may be promoting more gender equity in newer classes of equity partners, in line with the One-Third by 2020 Challenge.

In addition, most firms reported allowing partner-track attorneys who work part-time schedules to be promoted to partner, although it was more likely for firms to allow this for promotion to non-equity partnership (95%) compared to equity partnership (89%). All responding firms with non-partner track attorneys reported allowing non-partner track attorneys, such as counsel attorneys, to transition to the partner track. In theory, this access could also serve to increase the diversity of the partnership track.

Women in Leadership Roles in the Law Firm

Women on Firm Governance Committees

Much like the continued underrepresentation of women in the equity partner ranks, women have been consistently underrepresented among the leadership positions in the law firm, such as on the governance committee(s) that oversee the operations of the firm and often set compensation. While the particular name and function of the highest-level governance committee varies across firms, the responding firms reported an average membership for those governance committees of 12 people, and, on average, 3 of those 12 (25%) are women. These numbers are exactly the same as those reported in 2017.31 In the last 10 years, the participation of women on these committees has increased substantially, with the 2017 and 2018 numbers nearly double those from 2007.32 This increase in representation for women has not resulted in similar levels of representation for other diverse groups. The average governance committee of 12 people has only one person of color and no LGBTQI person or person with a disability on average.

For 47% of responding firms, the highest governance committee sets compensation for equity partners. The other 53% of firms reported having dedicated compensation committees, and the average compensation committee looks similar to the

31 This year's data did show that Quartile 1 firms (AmLaw 1 – 50) reported greater representation of women on governance committees compared to both their numbers last year and firms in the other quartiles this year. Quartile 1 firms reported 37% of their governance committee members were women compared to the 20 – 25% women reported by firms in the other three quartiles.

“Ninety-three percent (93%) of responding firms reported that their most highly compensated attorney is a man. ... Most firms reported no women in the ranks of those attorneys generating the most revenue or those being the most highly compensated.”

high-level governance committees.\textsuperscript{33} The average membership of the compensation committee is 11 people, and the average number of women is 3 of those 11 (27%). The numbers for women are the best of any underrepresented group. At best 1 of 11 members, on average, is likely to be a person of color, and none are likely to be openly LGBTQI or a person with a disability. These numbers, again, mirror those from 2017.

**Women as Managing Partners & Practice Group**

\textbf{Leaders}

In addition to serving on governance committees, managing partner roles at the firm, office, and practice group levels provide additional leadership opportunities. The average firm has two firm-wide managing partners, and most firms have no women, people of color, LGBTQI individuals, or persons with disabilities among those firm-wide managing partners. Only 22\% of firms report having a woman among their firm-wide managing partners. In addition, only 9.5\%
of firms have a person of color, 6% of firms have an LGBTQI individual, and 1.5% of firms have a person with a disability serving in this role.

Most firms (90%) also report having office-level managing partners. On average, firms have 12 of these office-level managing partners, and, on average, 2.5 are women (20%), one is a person of color (8%), and none are LGBTQI or a person with a disability. Finally, 98% of firms report having practice group partners/leaders. Most firms (86%) report allowing for co-leadership of practice groups. Firms have an average of 25 practice group partners/leaders, and of those, 6 are women (24%), two are people of color (8%), and none are LGBTQI or a person with a disability.

Across the governance positions in the law firm, in terms of committees and managing positions, the results are consistent, with women representing about a quarter of all of these positions.

Time to Rethink the Women’s Initiative?

As in 2017, all but one responding firm reported having a women’s initiative (99%), and this number represents firms across the AmLaw 200 rankings. In addition, firms reported that their initiatives had been in place for an average of 13 years, with a range from two years to a few decades. Overall, women’s initiatives, once implemented, report similar longstanding practices over time, but it is unclear what impact, if any, these efforts have had on women’s representation in more senior and higher status positions in the law firm.

Women’s Initiative Mission & Objectives: Most (91%) firms report that they have mission statements specifically for their women’s initiatives. Ninety-percent (90%) report that their women’s initiative is part of the overall strategic plan of the firm. In addition to women’s initiatives being incorporated into the strategic vision of the law firm, essentially all firms also report that they have specific objectives for their initiatives (93% percent). Finally, 96% percent of firms report that their women’s initiative is part of the firm’s diversity plan.

Women’s Initiative Budget & Resources: In terms of resources, 60% of firms report that they have specific budgets for their women’s initiatives. Other firms indicated that their women’s initiative budgets fall under the umbrella of their broader diversity budgets or did not report any specific budget numbers for their women’s initiative. For the firms that have dedicated women’s initiative budgets, the average budget is $176,971, and the range of budgets is $15,000 to $1.5 million. Firms in higher-ranked quartiles reported larger budgets than those in lower-ranked quartiles. Firms in Quartile 1 (AmLaw 1 – 50) reported an

34 Last year we reported a suggestive finding that firms that reported more mature women’s initiatives had greater percentages of women equity partners. This year, by capturing how many years the initiatives had been in place, we could examine the relationship between years of existence and the numbers of women equity partners.

35 If firms indicated that their reported budgets were not funds earmarked specifically for the women’s initiative, their reported numbers were not included in the calculations. We asked firms to report only budgets designated specifically for women’s initiatives.
average budget of $335,834 compared to $217,712 for firms in Quartile 2 (AmLaw 51 – 100), $79,598 for firms in Quartile 3 (AmLaw 101 – 150), and $100,129 for firms in Quartile 4 (AmLaw 151 – 200).

**Women’s Initiative Organizational Infrastructure & Support:** Firms take different approaches to the structural integration of their women’s initiatives, but 74% report having a hybrid structure that involves both firm-level budget and strategy, as well as specific activities (and sometimes budget and strategy) determined at a more local level. Specifically, nearly all firms (95%) report that women’s initiative leaders are in place at the firm level, in the form of a firm-level Chair, firm-level Co-Chairs, and/or a firm-level planning committees. Some firms report multi-layered levels of leadership from the firm-level down to the office level, but it was clear that nearly all firms view the head of the initiatives as existing at the firm-level. In addition to firms providing firm-level support and resources, many firms report that there is also active monitoring of the career trajectories of women in the firm. For example, most firms report monitoring promotion rates (83%) and succession plans (61%) by gender, taking into account the performance of women compared to men in these processes. Almost half of firms report monitoring work assignments by gender (46%).

**Women’s Initiative Programming:** All firms report that their women’s initiatives sponsor programming at least quarterly and 55% of firms hold programs monthly or weekly. A vast majority of firms report that their women’s initiatives offer programming around business development (98%) and development of “soft skills” such as negotiation and navigating the law firm (87%), but only about a third offer programming around developing legal and research skills. Further, most firms’ women’s initiatives offer women management and leadership training (65% and 76%, respectively). Besides programming around business development, the most common activity for women’s initiatives is networking, including opportunities for women to network with clients (95%) and for women within the firm to network with each other (99%). Women’s initiatives are more likely to have mentorship...
programs than sponsorship programs (85% vs. 50%, respectively). Finally, most firms report that their women’s initiatives highlight the achievements of women in the firm (87%), advocate for women- and family-friendly policies (79%), and advocate for individual women in the firm (70%).

**Women’s Initiative Impacts & Outcomes:** Nearly all firms (91%) report that they attempt to measure the outcomes of their women’s initiatives, and they look at factors like the business development of women in the firm, women’s relationship development with clients, others in the firm, mentors, etc., as well as the particular, it is likely that firms still struggle to be strategic with their programming such that they do not tie it effectively to the goals and objectives they identify, they do not direct it specifically at different audiences (e.g., attorney type) with unique needs, or the programming is not deep or targeted enough to produce changes in the law firm where women’s advancement is most affected.36 Overall, what firms report doing within their women’s initiatives has changed little since at least the comprehensive study of women’s initiatives published by NAWL in 2012, and the progress of women in the law firm, especially at the higher levels, has remained similarly stalled. As called

The median woman equity partner makes 91% percent of what the median man makes. Among equity partners, the mean man makes about $99,421 more a year than the mean woman ($847,266 vs. $747,845, respectively). Thus, the mean woman equity partner makes 88% of what the mean male equity partners makes.

representation of women in leadership positions. On the other hand, despite the now universal adoption of women’s initiatives, reports of near universal adoption of mission statements and objectives, and high rates of participation and diverse programming for women attorneys across their career spans, there is little evidence that these initiatives have led to substantial increases in the representation of women at the highest levels of the law firm. As suggested in NAWL’s 2012 report on the efficacy of women’s initiatives in for in 2012, firms may need to rethink their women’s initiatives and broaden diversity initiatives to more effectively utilize them in service of supporting and advancing women and diverse attorneys.

**Promising Trends for Women’s Advancement in Law Firms**

While the percentage of women equity partners (and diverse equity partners) has not changed dramatically in a decade, there are some promising results that may

---

suggest focused attempts to increase representation that will translate into greater representation of women going forward. These results also show that firms seem to be taking NAWL’s 2020 Challenge seriously. Among recently promoted equity partners – those promoted in the last two years - about one-third (31%) are women compared to 20% overall. In 2017, 33% of new equity partners were women compared to 19% overall.

Among new relationship partners - those that inherited clients due to transitions within the top 20 clients - 36% are women compared to 20% of the current relationship partners for all top 20 clients.

Over the last decade, women have seen significant increases in their representation in firm leadership roles, including service on governance committees and compensation committees, and as managing partners and practice group leaders. This year, firms in the AmLaw 50 reported that 37% of their governance committee seats were filled by women, an increase from their own numbers from last year, as well as a greater percentage than that reported by the rest of the AmLaw 200 this year or last.

**Continued Challenges for Women in Law Firms**

On the whole, the numerical results of the 2018 survey are an almost exact replication of those from 2017. This may not come as a surprise, as NAWL has observed that the progress women have made in law firms over the last decade has been slow and incremental at best, and law firms continue to face challenges with respect to supporting and promoting women. Despite universal adoption of women’s initiatives, a ramping up of broader diversity initiatives, and increased awareness of the challenges women face in their advancement through the law firm, there has been little progress made in recent years that is reflected in noticeable increases in representation of women and diverse attorneys, particularly at the more senior and higher status levels of the law firm. As law firms confront this reality, it has become clear that there is more that needs to be done to interrogate the processes and decision points for women’s advancement to better identify where and why women’s progress stalls during their careers. And what’s needed most to do this is a willingness of firms to share their practices and data to provide as full a picture as possible of what is happening as attorneys progress through the law firm over the course of their careers. NAWL hopes this year’s report will serve as a call to action for firms - a call to share both practices and data that can help the profession, as a whole, better understand the problem of stalled advancement and the potential solutions to that problem by more completely capturing what firms are doing that is and is not producing changes in status quo for women in the law firm.

---

37 See e.g., 2017 NAWL Annual Survey, available at http://www.nawl.org/page/2017

As discussed above, there are multiple areas where
Many firms are hungry for best practices, and it is the collection of baseline data on practices, policies, and procedures currently in place that allow for a comparison to the evidence on best practices from the organizational research literature, but also allow for benchmarking the existing practices of law firms and identifying innovative practices and procedures that may not be well-known externally. NAWL hopes that law firms will take this call for more information seriously and consider ways that they can contribute to the general knowledge about the practices, policies, and procedures that can increase the rate of advancement of women and other underrepresented attorneys in law firms across the profession.
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2018 Report on Diversity in U.S. Law Firms
Introduction

Women and Black/African Americans made small gains in representation at major U.S. law firms in 2018 compared with 2017, according to the latest law firm demographic findings from the National Association for Law Placement (NALP). However, representation of Black/African-Americans among associates remains below 2009 levels. NALP's recent analyses of the 2018-2019 NALP Directory of Legal Employers (NDLE) — the annual compendium of legal employer data published by NALP — shows that women and minorities continued to make small gains in their representation among law firm partners in 2018. However, the overall percentage of women associates has decreased almost as often as not since 2009, and the percentage of Black/African-American associates has declined most years since 2009, and despite small increases in the last three years remains below its 2009 level.

— COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS BY JAMES LEIPOLD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR —

NALP Executive Director James Leipold commenting on these new findings noted, "The story of NALP's 2018 Report on Diversity in U.S. Law Firms is a good news/bad news story. On the good news side, representation of women associates has finally rebounded and surpassed pre-recession highs for the first time, the jump in the representation of minorities among partners is the largest since NALP began tracking this data, and the number and percentage of LGBT lawyers reached all-time highs with the percentage of LGBT summer associates at firms of more than 700 hundred lawyers reaching 6.42%. On the bad news side, representation of Black/African-American associates remains below its pre-recession level, the representation of Black/African-American partners has barely changed since the recession, and minority women continue to be the most underrepresented group at the partnership level, with Black/African-American women least well represented of all."

Leipold continued, "There are also good news/bad news stories to be told when we parse the data by geography. Miami, for instance, stands alone with its law firms reporting a higher percentage of minority partners, a higher percentage of minority women partners, a higher percentage of minority associates, a higher percentage of minority women associates, and a higher percentage of minority and minority women summer associates than law firms in any other city. On the other hand, Boston law firms report minority partner and associate numbers well below the national mean, and well below other cities of its size and importance in the legal market, and report that just 0.9% of the partners in that city are Black/African-American, and only 0.26 of the partners are Black/African-American women. Worse, firms in Phoenix, report no Black/African-American partners. So, while progress towards greater diversity and inclusion among lawyers in US law firms continues to be made, and underlying population demographics play a role, much, much work remains to be done."
ASSOCIATES

- Despite small increases in the past three years, representation of Black/African-American associates remains just below its 2009 level of 4.66% and is now 4.48%.

PARTNERS

- An increase of about seven-tenths of a percentage point in representation of minorities among partners is noted as the largest over the entire span of NALP’s compilation of these figures.
- Minority women continue to be the most dramatically underrepresented group at the partnership level.
- Representation of Black/African-Americans among partners has barely increased since 2009.

SUMMER ASSOCIATES

- Over one-third — 35% — of summer associates were racial/ethnic minorities.

LAWYERS WITH DISABILITIES

- The reporting of lawyers with disabilities (of any race or gender) remains scant, both at the associate and partner levels.

LGBT LAWYERS

- There are wide geographic disparities in these numbers, and in fact about 55% of the reported LGBT lawyers are accounted for by just four cities: New York City, Washington, DC, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.
- The percentage of LGBT summer associates continues to suggest that there is still potential for some growth of the presence of LGBT associates at these firms.
- In firms of more than 700 lawyers, the percentage of LGBT associates has exceeded 5% in the five most recent years. In firms of 251+ lawyers, the figures were above 5% for the first time.
Significant Findings

ASSOCIATES:

Representation of women, minorities, and minority women among associates saw small gains in 2018. Representation of women has climbed for three years in a row and now exceeds the high previously reached in 2009.

NALP’s analysis found that representation of minority associates has continued to increase since 2010 (from 19.53% to 24.22%) following widespread layoffs in 2009. Over the same period of time, however, representation of women finally saw a net increase in 2018. In 2018, the percentage of women stood at 45.91%, compared with 45.48% in 2017, and higher than the 2009 figure, but by just 0.25 percentage points.

In contrast to the pattern for women as a whole, representation of minority women among associates has increased from about 11% (2009-2012) to 13.52% in 2018, though some backsliding in 2010 is noted. (See Table 1.)

Much of the increase in minority representation since 2011 can be attributed to increased representation of Asians among associates. While overall minority representation fell in 2010, this was not the case for Asian associates. Asian associates now make up 11.69% of all associates, with representation having risen about 2.4 percentage points, from 9.28% in 2009 to 11.69% in 2018. Hispanic associate representation has also risen. After fluctuating between 3.81% and 3.95% of associates between 2009 and 2014, Hispanics have slightly outnumbered Black/African-Americans among associates since 2015. In 2018, Hispanics accounted for 4.71% of associates. In contrast to trends among Asian associates and even Hispanic associates, representation of Black/African-Americans among associates fell every year from 2010 to 2015. Despite small increases in the past three years, representation of Black/African-American associates remains just below its 2009 level of 4.66% and is now 4.48%. (See Table 2.)

PARTNERS:

In 2018, representation of women, minorities, and minority women among partners in law firms across the nation all increased a bit over 2017.

During the 26 years that NALP has been compiling this information, law firms have made steady, though very slow, incremental progress in increasing the presence of women and minorities in the partner ranks. In 2018, that slow upward trend continued, with minorities accounting for 9.13% of partners in the nation’s major firms, and women accounting for 23.36% of the partners in these firms, up from 8.42% and 22.70%, respectively, in 2017. An increase of about seven-tenths of a percentage point in representation of minorities among partners is noted as the largest over the entire span of NALP’s compilation of these figures. Increases have generally been in the 0.1 to 0.4 percentage point range. The next largest increases of about 0.5 percentage points occurred only in 2008 and 2016.

Nonetheless, over this period, the gains have been minimal at best. In 1993 minorities accounted for 2.55% of partners and women accounted for 12.27% of partners. And at just 3.19% of partners in 2018, minority women continue to be the most dramatically underrepresented group at the partnership level, a pattern that holds across all firm sizes and most jurisdictions. The representation of minority women partners is somewhat higher (3.66%) at the largest firms with more than 700 lawyers. Minority men, meanwhile, accounted for just 5.94% of partners in 2018, compared with 5.52% in 2017. This means that the increase in minorities among partners was not quite three-tenths of one percent.
for women and somewhat more than four-tenths of one percent for men.

But, as is the case with associates, most of the increase in minority representation among partners since 2009 can be attributed to an increase of Asian and Hispanic male partners in particular. Representation of Black/African-Americans among partners has barely changed over the period and was 1.83% in 2018, flat compared with 2017, and not much higher than the 1.71% figure in 2009. (See Table 2.)

**LAWYERS OVERALL:**

Overall, representation of women among lawyers as a whole was up, and has more than recouped losses in 2010, 2011, and 2015, and has exceeded the 2009 level since 2014.

This increase reflects both the increase among partners and associates noted above and also among lawyers other than partners and associates such as “of counsel” and staff attorneys who, in 2018, accounted for almost 15% of attorneys at these firms. For example, women accounted for 41% of these other attorneys in 2018, compared with 40% in 2016. Although the overall figure for women fell in 2010 and 2011, and again in 2015, the overall percentage for women (35.41% in 2018) and has exceeded the 2009 figure of 32.97% since 2014.

The representation of minorities among lawyers as a whole rose some in 2018, to 16.10%. Consistent with findings for minority women among partners and associates, representation of minority women as a whole also increased slightly from 7.54% in 2017 and minority women now make up 8.08% of lawyers at these law firms. (See Table 1.)

**SUMMER ASSOCIATES:**

The representation of women and minorities in the summer associate ranks compares much more favorably to the population of recent law school graduates. The 2018 minority representation figure of just about 35% is an almost 3 percentage point increase over the 2017 figure of 32.33%.

According to the American Bar Association (ABA), since 2000, the percentage of minority law school graduates has ranged from 20% to 30%, while women have accounted for 46% to 49% of graduates with the high point coming in the mid-2000s. In 2018, women comprised 51.42% of summer associates, minorities accounted for 35.04%, and 20.83% of summer associates were minority women. Although measures for women have improved steadily since 2013, when representation of women as a whole and minority women specifically edged down, the gains in 2018 were preceded by an unchanged percentage for minorities as a whole in 2017 compared with 2016. It also should be kept in mind that these percentages are in the context of far fewer summer associates overall, with the number of summer associates off by about 25% compared with 2009, despite increases in the numbers after they bottomed out in 2010 and 2011. The number of summer associates accounted for in the Directory was about 6,900 in 2018, compared with about 7,100 in the prior two years.

**LAWYERS WITH DISABILITIES:**

Lawyers with disabilities (of any race or gender) are scarce, both at the associate and partner levels.

The NALP Directory of Legal Employers also collects information about lawyers with disabilities, though this information is much less widely reported than information on race/ethnicity and gender, making it much harder to conclude anything definitive about the representation of lawyers with disabilities. About one-half of one percent of partners self-reported as having a disability in 2018, compared with about four-tenths of one percent in 2017 and about one-third of one percent from 2012-2016. Representation of associates with disabilities declined some, from 0.60% in 2017 to 0.46% in 2018. However, these figures are still tiny,
making it difficult to draw any conclusions about movement going forward. Although the presence of individuals with disabilities among law school graduates is not precisely known, other NALP research suggests that between 1 and 2% of graduates self-identify as having a disability. Disability figures for partners, associates, and all attorneys with disabilities are reported in Table 7.

**LGBT LAWYERS:**

The percentage of LGBT lawyers has generally been trending upward over the period since 2002 when NALP first began compiling these figures, and small increases from 2017 to 2018 occurred across all lawyer types.

The overall percentage of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) lawyers reported in 2018 increased to 2.86% compared with 2.64% in 2017. Increases were seen across all lawyer types and ranged from less than 0.1 percentage point for counsel and non-traditional track attorneys to about 0.35 percentage points for associates. The percentage of offices reporting LGBT counts has been relatively stable at about 90% of offices since 2008. About half of these reporting offices reported at least one LGBT lawyer among partners and associates in 2018.

The overall count in 2018 of 2,827 LGBT lawyers is up by just over 6% from 2017. Over a longer span of time, the number now is over 2.5 times larger than it was in the 2002 NDLE, when the numbers were first collected/compiled. In the 2002 NDLE, the number of LGBT lawyers reported was just over 1,100 — less than 1% of the total lawyers represented. It took until 2012 for the overall percentage to exceed 2%.

The presence of LGBT lawyers continues to be highest among associates, at 3.80% (see Table 8), and is up from the figure of 3.45% reported in 2017. LGBT associates are also better represented at large law firms — with firms of 701+ lawyers reporting 4.17% LGBT associates. Firms of 701+ lawyers reported 2.33% LGBT partners, compared to 2.17% in 2017. For smaller firms, the percentages are closer to 2%.

There are wide geographic disparities in these numbers, and in fact about 55% of the reported LGBT lawyers are accounted for by just four cities: New York City, Washington, DC, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. These same four cities accounted for about 39% of the not quite 99,000 lawyers included in these analyses. Thus the percentage of LGBT lawyers in these cities is correspondingly higher — about 4% overall (and highest in San Francisco specifically at 5.8%) compared with the 2.86% nationwide figure. In these same four cities, the percentage of LGBT summer associates is also higher — about 7% compared with 5.73% nationwide.

The percentage of LGBT summer associates continues to suggest that there is still potential for some growth of the presence of LGBT associates at these firms. The overall figure for summer associates was 5.73%, compared with 4.66% in 2017. In firms of more than 700 lawyers, it has exceeded 5% in the five most recent years. In firms of 251+ lawyers, the figures were above 5% for the first time.

**BREADTH OF LAWYER REPRESENTATION IN THE NALP DIRECTORY**

The 2018-2019 NALP Directory of Legal Employers (NDLE), which provides the individual firm listings on which these aggregate analyses are based, includes attorney race/ethnicity and gender information for over 109,000 partners, associates, and other lawyers in 1,009 offices, and for almost 6,900 summer associates in 725 offices nationwide. The NDLE is available online at www.nalpdirectory.com.
For purposes of the figures in Tables 1-6, minority attorneys include those whose race or ethnicity is Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and those of multi-racial heritage, as reported by the law firms in the NDLE. The partner numbers include both equity and non-equity partners. The data in Table 2 ("Partner and Associate Demographics at Law Firms — 2009-2018") does not include data for minority attorneys whose race or ethnicity is American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and those of multi-racial heritage, as these groups are a very small fraction of minorities reported.
### Table 1. Women and Minorities at Law Firms — 2009-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Total Lawyers</th>
<th>Summer Associates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>% Minority Women</td>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>19.21%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>45.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19.43%</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>45.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19.54%</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td>45.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>19.91%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>45.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20.22%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>44.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>44.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>21.46%</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22.13%</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>45.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>23.36%</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>45.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The NALP Directory of Legal Employers.

### Table 2. Partner and Associate Demographics at Law Firms — 2009-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>9.39%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>9.65%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>10.01%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>10.93%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The NALP Directory of Legal Employers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Minority Women</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Minority Women</th>
<th># of Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47,625</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>45,807</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By # of Lawyers Firm-wide:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-250</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500</td>
<td>9,577</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>6,587</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701+</td>
<td>21,013</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>26,918</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>42.71</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston area</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>45.85</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>22.94</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>44.12</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>43.46</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>42.71</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>48.27</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit area</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46.32</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>50.62</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles area</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>37.76</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Minority Women</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Minority Women</th>
<th># of Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern NJ/Newark area</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Co., CA</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR area</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>53.26</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose area</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>47.35</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle area</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>45.69</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in Connecticut</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>51.01</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in Florida</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in New York State</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 2018-2019 NALP Directory of Legal Employers. Some city information includes one or more offices in adjacent suburbs. Orange County includes offices in Costa Mesa, Irvine, and Newport Beach. The San Jose area includes offices in Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto and E. Palo Alto, Redwood Shores/Redwood City, and San Jose. The Los Angeles area includes offices in Santa Monica and Long Beach. The Northern New Jersey/Newark area includes offices in Newark, Roseland, Florham Park, Hackensack, Morristown, and Westfield. Northern Virginia includes offices in McLean/Tyson's Corner, and Reston. State figures exclude cities reported separately. For multi-office firms that reported only firmwide figures, the information was attributed to the reporting city if at least 60% of the firms lawyers are in that city.
Table 4. Women and Minorities at Law Firms — Total Lawyers and Summer Associates — 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Lawyers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Summer Associates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>% Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109,459</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By # of Lawyers Firm-wide:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-250</td>
<td>15,349</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500</td>
<td>19,121</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700</td>
<td>13,694</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701+</td>
<td>56,005</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston area</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>37.46</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6,638</td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit area</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>32.62</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles area</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>33.76</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>21,346</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern NJ/Newark area</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Lawyers</th>
<th>Summer Associates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>32.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Co., CA</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>29.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>29.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR area</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>33.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>33.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>42.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose area</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>39.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle area</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>36.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>32.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>27.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>11,597</td>
<td>36.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>32.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>States:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in Connecticut</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>36.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in Florida</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>33.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in New York State</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>40.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 2018-2019 NALP Directory of Legal Employers. Some city information includes one or more offices in adjacent suburbs. Orange County includes offices in Costa Mesa, Irvine, and Newport Beach. The San Jose area includes offices in Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto and E. Palo Alto, Redwood Shores/Redwood City, and San Jose. The Los Angeles area includes offices in Santa Monica and Long Beach. The Northern New Jersey/Newark area includes offices in Newark, Roseland, Florham Park, Hackensack, Morristown, and Westfield. Northern Virginia includes offices in McLean/Tyson's Corner, and Reston. State figures exclude cities reported separately. For multi-office firms that reported only firmwide figures, the information was attributed to the reporting city if at least 60% of the firm's lawyers are in that city.

Note: The number of offices reporting one or more summer associates, including demographic information, was 725. Dashes in the summer associates columns indicate that fewer than five offices in that city reported summer associates, or that the total number of summer associates reported was less than 10.
### Table 5. Partner Demographics at Law Firms — 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners by Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>All Partners</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>% Minority Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47,625</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By # of Lawyers Firm-wide:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer lawyers</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-250 lawyers</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500 lawyers</td>
<td>9,577</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700 lawyers</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701+ lawyers</td>
<td>21,013</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston area</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit area</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles area</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>37.76</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern NJ/Newark area</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table continues on next page*
### Partners by Race or Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners by Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>All Partners</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th># of Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>% Minority Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Co., CA</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose area</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle area</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 2018-2019 NALP Directory of Legal Employers. The few Native American, Native Hawaiian and multi-racial lawyers reported are included in the overall minority percentages but are not reported separately. Some city information includes one or more offices in adjacent suburbs. Orange County includes offices in Costa Mesa, Irvine, and Newport Beach. The San Jose area includes offices in Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto and E. Palo Alto, Redwood Shores/Redwood City, and San Jose. The Los Angeles area includes offices in Santa Monica and Long Beach. The Northern New Jersey/Newark area includes offices in Newark, Roseland, Florham Park, Hackensack, Morristown, and Westfield. Northern Virginia includes offices in McLean/Tyson's Corner, and Reston.
### Table 6. Associate Demographics at Law Firms — 2018

**Associate Demographics by Race or Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Associates</th>
<th>Associates by Race or Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total #</strong></td>
<td>% Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By # of Lawyers Firm-wide:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By # of Lawyers Firm-wide</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Minority Women</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th># of Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer lawyers</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-250 lawyers</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500 lawyers</td>
<td>6,587</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700 lawyers</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701+ lawyers</td>
<td>26,918</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offices in:**

- Atlanta: 919
- Austin: 199
- Boston: 1,832
- Charlotte: 297
- Chicago: 2,575
- Cincinnati: 152
- Cleveland: 283
- Columbus: 199
- Dallas: 908
- Denver: 491
- Detroit area: 227
- Ft. Lauderdale/ W. Palm Beach: 95
- Houston: 1,281
- Indianapolis: 162
- Kansas City: 274
- Los Angeles: 2,294
- Miami: 282
- Milwaukee: 320
- Minneapolis: 606
- New York City: 12,270
- Northern NJ/Newark area: 331
- Northern Virginia: 130

*Table continues on next page*
### Associates by Race or Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Associates</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th># of Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>% Minority Women</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Co., CA</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose area</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle area</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>4,947</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 2018-2019 NALP Directory of Legal Employers. The few Native American, Native Hawaiian and multi-racial lawyers reported are included in the overall minority percentages but are not reported separately. Some city information includes one or more offices in adjacent suburbs. Orange County includes offices in Costa Mesa, Irvine, and Newport Beach. The San Jose area includes offices in Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto and E. Palo Alto, Redwood Shores/Redwood City, and San Jose. The Los Angeles area includes offices in Santa Monica and Long Beach. The Northern New Jersey/Newark area includes offices in Newark, Roseland, Florham Park, Hackensack, Morristown, and Westfield. Northern Virginia includes offices in McLean/Tyson's Corner, and Reston.
### Table 7. Lawyers with Disabilities — 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Firms</th>
<th>Firms of 250 or Fewer Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 251-500 Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 501-700 Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 701+ Lawyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Reported</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td># Reported</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td># Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All lawyers</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures for lawyers with disabilities are based on 693 offices/firms reporting counts, including zero, in all lawyer categories. Counts of individuals with disabilities, including zero, cover 69,854 lawyers. Because so few summer associates with disabilities were reported (15 total), they are not included in the table.

### Table 8. LGBT Lawyers — 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Firms</th>
<th>Firms of 100 or Fewer Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 101-250 Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 251-500 Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 501-700 Lawyers</th>
<th>Firms of 701+ Lawyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Reported</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td># Reported</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td># Reported</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lawyers</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All lawyers</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Associates</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures for LGBT lawyers are based on 914 offices/firms reporting counts, including zero, in all lawyer categories; figures for LGBT summer associates are based on 594 offices/firms with a summer program and reporting counts, including zero. Overall, LGBT counts, including zero, cover 98,942 lawyers and 5,807 summer associates.
For additional information about NALP research, contact Judith Collins (jcollins@nalp.org), Director of Research, or James G. Leipold (jleipold@nalp.org), Executive Director, at (202) 835-1001. Mailing address: National Association for Law Placement, 1220 19th Street NW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20036-2405.
## Resident Active Attorney Demographics: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-4.8 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4.9 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0 pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Count of States Reporting Statistic | 42   | 39   | 40   | 41   | 42   | 44   | 43   | 43   | 43   | 45   | 46   | 4     |
| % of Lawyers with Reported Statistic | 57%  | 54%  | 55%  | 57%  | 57%  | 59%  | 59%  | 61%  | 63%  | 65%  | 61%  | 4.3 pp         |

## Resident Active Attorney Demographics: Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.6 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.8 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5.4 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.4 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial (1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1 pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Count of States Reporting Statistic | 17   | 15   | 16   | 16   | 16   | 16   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 18   | 22   | 5     |
| % of Lawyers with Reported Statistic | 19%  | 15%  | 15%  | 22%  | 21%  | 21%  | 21%  | 21%  | 25%  | 31%  | 29%  | 9.7 pp |

* Data Source: American Bar Association's National Lawyer Population Survey
** Individual state bar associations or licensing agencies are asked to provide demographics data for resident and active attorneys as of December 31st of the prior year, e.g. 2017 data is as of 12/31/2016. The numbers reflected here are the best available data provided to us from the respective associations or agencies.
† This report was revised October 2017 to correct an error in the 2016 data and eliminate the 'unknown' category on the race/ethnicity demographics. Those percentages now represent only those who have a reported race/ethnicity.

(1) Beginning with the 2016 survey, choices included "Multiracial" as an option for race/ethnicity and "Other" as an option for gender.
(2) Race/ethnicity percentages may total to more than 100% as many states allow responders to choose more than one option for race/ethnicity.
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