

**20<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY**  
**EQUALITY SURVEY - 2011**



*Private Law Firms & Public Agencies  
Published October 2011*

**Lawyers Club of San Diego  
Equality Survey Publication Committee:**

*Johanna S. Schiavoni, Jacobs Schlesinger & Sheppard LLP, Committee Chair  
Paula Rosenstein, Rosenstein, Wilson & Dean PLC  
Regina Knoll, Jacobs Schlesinger & Sheppard LLP*

**Administrative Assistance Provided By:**  
*Elaine Lawrence, Lawyers Club of San Diego  
Vicky Frank, Lawyers Club of San Diego*

**Contents:**

***2011 Equality Survey Results – Private Law Firm  
2011 Equality Survey Results – Public Agencies  
2011 Equality Survey Methodology***

See also article regarding the 2011 Equality Survey results published in the November 2011 issue of *Lawyers Club News*. Article also available at [www.lawyersclubsandiego.com](http://www.lawyersclubsandiego.com).  
Lawyers Club of San Diego – 701 B Street – Suite 224 – San Diego – California – 92101 – 619-595-0650 (phone) – 619-595-0657 (fax)

## 2011 Private Sector Survey Results

	Law Firm	% of Female Partners	Total Partners	Female Partners	Total Equity Partners	Female Equity Partners	Total Non-equity Partners	Female Non-equity Partners	% of Female Attorneys	Total Attorneys	Female Attorneys	% of Female Associate Attorneys	Total Associates	Female Associates	% of Female Other Attorneys	Total Other Attorney	Female Attorney	% Non-White Attorneys	Non-White Attorneys	% Non-White Attorneys Female	Non-White Attorneys Female	% Leadership positions	Total Leadership Position	Female Leadership Position
1	Wilson Turner Kosmo	60%	10	6	8	4	2	2	67%	24	16	71%	14	10	0%	0	0	29%	7	13%	3	60%	10	6
2	Best Best & Krieger*	50%	18	9	U	U	U	U	64%	33	21	80%	15	12	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
3	Duane Morris	50%	18	9	6	3	12	6	59%	27	16	83%	6	5	67%	3	2	11%	3	4%	1	U	U	U
4	Littler Mendelson	50%	14	7	14	7	N/A	N/A	64%	28	18	71%	14	10	50%	2	1	18%	5	11%	3	50%	2	1
5	Paul Hastings Janofsky & Walker	44%	9	4	9	4	N/A	N/A	57%	28	16	63%	19	12	0%	0	0	18%	5	11%	3	0%	1	0
6	Fagen Friedman & Fulfrost*	38%	8	3	U	U	U	U	53%	15	8	71%	7	5	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
7	Kimball Tiry & St. John*	38%	13	5	U	U	U	U	48%	27	13	57%	14	8	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
8	Stutz Artiano Shinoff & Holtz*	27%	11	3	U	U	U	U	28%	25	7	36%	11	4	0%	3	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
9	Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith	26%	23	6	6	1	17	5	35%	43	15	41%	17	7	67%	3	2	30%	13	14%	6	14%	7	1
10	Higgs Fletcher & Mack LLP	25%	44	11	18	1	26	10	35%	63	22	56%	16	9	67%	3	2	5%	3	3%	2	10%	10	1
11	Klinedinst PC	23%	13	3	7	2	6	1	41%	29	12	56%	16	9	0%	0	0	10%	3	3%	1	33%	6	2
12	Latham & Watkins LLP*	22%	27	6	U	U	U	U	38%	86	33	42%	50	21	67%	9	6	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
13	Cooley LLP	21%	28	6	28	6	N/A	N/A	38%	93	35	43%	56	24	56%	9	5	19%	18	6%	6	17%	6	1
14	Gordon & Rees*	21%	53	11	U	U	U	U	32%	116	37	65%	31	20	19%	32	6	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
15	Fish & Richardson	20%	15	3	10	3	5	0	23%	26	6	27%	11	3	0%	0	0	4%	1	4%	1	50%	2	1
16	Hecht Solberg Robinson Goldberg & Bagley*	20%	10	2	U	U	U	U	22%	18	4	50%	4	2	0%	3	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
17	Jones Day *	20%	20	4	U	U	U	U	29%	34	10	46%	13	6	0%	1	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
18	Neil Dymott Frank Harrison & McFall*	20%	10	2	U	U	U	U	32%	25	8	40%	15	6	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
19	Paul Plevin Sullivan & Connaughton*	20%	10	2	U	U	U	U	40%	27	11	56%	16	9	0%	1	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
20	Allen Matkins Leck Gamble & Mallory*	19%	21	4	U	U	U	U	31%	32	10	50%	4	2	57%	7	4	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
21	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	19%	48	9	48	9	N/A	N/A	36%	109	39	40%	30	12	58%	31	18	17%	18	8%	9	0%	9	0
22	DLA Piper LLP**	18%	51	9	U	U	U	U	34%	116	39	48%	44	21	43%	21	9	15%	17	8%	9	U	U	U
23	Duckor Spradling Metzger & Wynne	18%	11	2	11	2	0	0	31%	16	5	60%	5	3	0%	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	20%	5	1
24	Seltzer Caplan McMahon Vitek*	18%	45	8	U	U	U	U	22%	72	16	30%	23	7	25%	4	1	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
25	Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton	16%	38	6	23	1	15	5	26%	81	21	27%	33	9	60%	10	6	16%	13	2%	2	19%	31	6
26	Luce Forward Hamilton & Scripps	15%	62	9	41	6	21	3	28%	105	29	57%	35	20	0%	8	0	7%	7	5%	5	20%	5	1
27	Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear*	14%	28	4	U	U	U	U	18%	57	10	21%	29	6	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
28	McKenna Long & Aldridge*	14%	7	1	U	U	U	U	22%	18	4	25%	8	2	33%	3	1	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
29	Morrison & Foerster*	14%	21	3	U	U	U	U	38%	66	25	50%	42	21	33%	3	1	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
30	Perkins Coie LLP*	14%	7	1	U	U	U	U	12%	17	2	0%	8	0	50%	2	1	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
31	Lincoln Gustafson & Cercos	13%	8	1	7	1	1	0	42%	24	10	56%	16	9	0%	0	0	4%	1	4%	1	0%	1	0
32	Grimm Vranjes McCormick & Graham*	11%	9	1	U	U	U	U	18%	17	3	25%	8	2	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
33	Procopio Cory Hargreaves & Savitch*	11%	57	6	U	U	U	U	24%	108	26	41%	27	11	38%	24	9	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
34	Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith	11%	18	2	18	2	0	0	23%	30	7	50%	10	5	0%	2	0	3%	1	0%	0	33%	3	1
35	Daley & Heft*	9%	11	1	U	U	U	U	30%	27	8	47%	15	7	0%	1	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
36	Sullivan Hill Lewin Rez & Engel	7%	15	1	15	1	0	0	41%	27	11	100%	5	5	63%	8	5	11%	3	11%	3	33%	3	1
37	Foley & Lardner	6%	17	1	17	1	0	0	20%	41	8	35%	20	7	0%	4	0	12%	5	7%	3	0%	0	0
38	Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo*	6%	16	1	U	U	U	U	21%	29	6	30%	10	3	67%	3	2	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
39	Robbins Umeda LLP	0%	7	0	U	U	U	U	30%	23	7	40%	15	6	100%	1	1	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
40	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati*	0%	11	0	U	U	U	U	23%	35	8	33%	24	8	0%	0	0	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>1817</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>23</b>

\* Data from firm's website. \*\* Data from firm's website, including NALP form.  
N/A = Not applicable. U = Unavailable

## 2011 Public Sector Survey Results

Agency	% Female	Total #	# Female	# Entry	# Female	% Female	# Mid-	# Female	% Female	# Top	# Female	% Female	Agency	% Non-White Attys	Total #	% Female	# Female	Work Options *
Name	Attorneys	Attorneys	Attorneys	Level	ELP's	ELP's	level	MLP's	MLP's	Level	TLP's	TLP's	Head		N/W Attys	N/W Attys	N/W Attys	
				Positions			Positions			Positions								
																		PT
SDVLP	91%	11	10	7	6	86%	2	2	100%	1	1	100%	Female	0%	0	0%	0	
																		PT/
Legal Aid	78%	27	21	17	15	88%	8	5	63%	2	1	50%	Male	56%	15	48%	13	TC
Appellate																		PT/
Defenders	78%	18	14	1	1	100%	1	1	100%	16	12	75%	Female	17%	3	17%	3	Flex
Superior Ct.																		
Attorneys	71%	72	51	N/A	N/A	N/A	67	48	72%	4	2	50%	Female	14%	10	11%	8	PT
Ct. of App./																		
Research	63%	30	19	1	1	100%	12	6	50%	16	11	69%	Female	7%	2	3%	1	Flex/PT
Attorneys																		
SD Unified																		
Port Dist.***	60%	5	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	2	50%	1	1	100%	Male	20%	1	0%	0	None
City																		
Attorney**	58%	173	100	52	35	67%	91	20	22%	30	16	53%	Male	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	None
Attorney																		
General	52%	170	89	12	7	58%	132	72	55%	26	10	39%	Female	24%	41	15%	25	PT/Flex
District																		PT/TC/
Attorney	51%	297	150	43	24	56%	109	61	56%	145	65	45%	Female	26%	77	13%	37	JS/Flex
Public De-																		
fenders/APD**	50%	207	103	13	9	69%	173	87	50%	21	7	33%	Male	30%	61	13%	26	None
County																		
Counsel	46%	69	32	17	12	71%	46	17	37%	6	3	50%	Male	12%	8	7%	5	Flex/PT
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>1079</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>645</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>118</b>	

Work Options: JS \_ Job Share; PT \_ Part Time; Flex \_ Flex\_time; TC \_ Telecommuting.

\*\* P.D.'s office and APD are now combined.

\*\*\* Did not respond to this year's survey. Data from 2008 (City Attorney) and 2010 (Port) is used.

\*\*\*\* The U.S. Attorney and Federal Defender's offices have not responded for the last 9 and 6 years, respectively, and so are no longer included.

### Lawyers Club of San Diego Equality Survey Methodology

Set forth below is a description of Lawyers Club of San Diego's 2011 Equality Survey of Private Law Firms and Public Agencies and the methodology used in connection therewith. In each respective survey, the firms and agencies are listed in descending order based upon the percentage of female partners in each private firm or the percentage of female attorneys in each public agency. If two or more entities have an identical percentage, they are listed alphabetically. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest percentile.

#### Private Sector Law Firms

The data set forth in this portion of the survey was compiled from information provided to Lawyers Club by participating San Diego law firms with 15 or more attorneys in their respective San Diego County offices. Where a firm has offices in multiple locations, the survey asks for information only relating to the firm's office(s) in San Diego County. The foregoing firms provided the information in response to a questionnaire Lawyers Club sent to the firms during the Summer 2011. If the information submitted to Lawyers Club reflected computational errors (e.g., Total Number of Partners: 2, plus Total Number of Associates: 2, equals Total Number of Attorneys: 5), those errors were corrected before the information was inserted into the final version of the survey results matrix. If a firm did not return a completed questionnaire, Lawyers Club compiled the data set forth in the survey based on information obtained from the law firm's website. The data set forth in the survey does not reflect changes in firm composition that may have occurred after the date on which each firm returned their completed survey questionnaires or the date on which the Lawyers Club Equality Committee gathered responsive information.

The first, second and third columns of the survey describe the percentage of female partners, the total number of partners, and the total number of female partners in each firm. The fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh columns reflect detail regarding the number of equity partners, female equity partners, nonequity partners, and female nonequity partners. The eighth, ninth and tenth columns describe the percentage of female attorneys, the total number of attorneys and the total number of female attorneys in each firm. The eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth columns show the percentage of female associates, the total number of associates and the total number of female associates in each firm. The fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth columns show the percentage of female "other" attorneys in the firm (i.e., attorneys who do not fall into the traditional partner or associate categories, such as special counsel or of counsel), the total number of "other" attorneys, and the number of female "other" attorneys. The seventeenth and eighteenth columns show the percentage of "non-white" (e.g., African American, Alaskan, American Indian, Asian, Islander, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, etc.) attorneys and the total number of non-white attorneys in each firm. The nineteenth and twentieth columns show the percentage of non-white female attorneys and the total number of non-white female attorneys in each firm. Finally, the twenty-first, twenty-second and twenty-third columns show the percentage of female attorneys in leadership positions in the firm, the total number of leadership positions, and the total number of women in leadership positions.

#### Public Sector Law Firms

The data set forth in this portion of the survey was compiled from information provided to Lawyers Club by participating public agencies in San Diego. The foregoing agencies provided the information in response to a questionnaire Lawyers Club sent to the firms during the Summer 2011 time frame. The data set forth in the survey does not reflect changes in agency composition that may have occurred after the date on which each agency returned their completed questionnaires. If a public agency did not return a completed questionnaire, Lawyers Club compiled the data set forth in the survey based on information obtained from the agency's most recent Equality Survey response.

The first three columns of the survey describe the percentage of females in each agency and the size and composition of the agency as a whole. The next three columns describe the composition of the entry level positions in each agency (i.e., new attorneys and attorneys who have little or no supervisory responsibilities). The next three columns describe the composition of the middle level positions in each agency (i.e., attorneys who have supervisory responsibilities). The next four columns describe the composition of the top echelons of each agency. The last column describes what, if any, work options, e.g., job sharing, part time or flex time, the organization has available to its employees.