



DIVERSITY AMONG PARTNERS IN 20 OF CALIFORNIA'S LARGEST LAW FIRMS

SECTION 1: AFRICAN AMERICAN PARTNERS

The rankings and grades in this section are based on a curve. An “A” requires 5% of population parity or better. A “B” requires a minimum of 3.5%. A “C” requires a minimum of 2%. A “D” requires a minimum of over 1%.

Rank	Law Firm	Number of Partners	Number of African American Partners	Percentage	Grade
1	Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	52	3	5.77%	A
2	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	109	3	2.75%	C +
3	Morrison & Foerster LLP	198	5	2.53%	C +
4	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati	136	3	2.21%	C
5	Bingham McCutchen LLP	147	3	2.04%	C
6	Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	150	3	2.00%	C
7	Latham & Watkins LLP	213	4	1.88%	C -
8	Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP	110	2	1.82%	C -
9	Heller Ehrman LLP	167	3	1.80%	C -
10	Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP	120	2	1.67%	C -
11	Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	142	2	1.41%	D +
12	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold LLP	71	1	1.41%	D +
13	Gordon & Rees LLP	79	1	1.27%	D
14	Jones Day	84	1	1.19%	D
15	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	175	2	1.14%	D
16	Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	117	1	0.85%	D -
17	Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	128	1	0.78%	D -
18	O’Melveny & Myers LLP	158	1	0.63%	F
19	DLA Piper	187	1	0.53%	F
20	Cooley Godward Kronish LLP	117	0	0.00%	FF

SECTION 2: LATINO PARTNERS

The rankings and grades in this section are based on a curve. An “A” requires 80 % of population parity, or 27% or better. A “B” requires a minimum of 12%. A “C” requires a minimum of 5%. A “D” requires a minimum of 2%.

Rank	Law Firm	Number of Partners	Number of Latino Partners	Percentage	Grade
1	Latham & Watkins LLP	213	11	5.16%	C
2	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati	136	7	5.15%	C
3	Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP	120	5	4.17%	C -
4	Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	52	2	3.85%	D +
5	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	109	4	3.67%	D +
6	Morrison & Foerster LLP	198	7	3.54%	D +
7	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	175	5	2.86%	D
8	Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	150	4	2.67%	D
9	Jones Day	84	2	2.38%	D
10	Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	128	3	2.34%	D
11	O’Melveny & Myers LLP	158	3	1.90%	D -
12	Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	142	2	1.41%	D -
13	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold LLP	71	1	1.41%	D -
14	Bingham McCutchen LLP	147	2	1.36%	D -
15	Heller Ehrman LLP	167	2	1.20%	D -
16	DLA Piper	187	2	1.07%	D -
17	Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP	110	1	0.91%	F
18	Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	117	1	0.85%	F
19	Cooley Godward Kronish LLP	117	1	0.85%	F
20	Gordon & Rees LLP	79	0	0.00%	FF

SECTION 3: ASIAN AMERICAN PARTNERS

The rankings and grades in this section are based on a curve. An “A” requires 12.4 % of population parity. A “B” requires a minimum of 9.3%. A “C” requires a minimum of 6.2%. A “D” requires a minimum of 3.1%.

Rank	Law Firm	Number of Partners	Number of Asian American Partners	Percentage	Grade
1	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati	136	14	10.29%	B
2	Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	142	12	8.45%	B -
3	Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP	120	9	7.50%	C +
4	Jones Day	84	6	7.14%	C
5	DLA Piper	187	12	6.42%	C
6	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	175	11	6.29%	C
7	Bingham McCutchen LLP	147	9	6.12%	C -
8	O’Melveny & Myers LLP	158	9	5.70%	C -
9	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	109	6	5.50%	C -
10	Cooley Godward Kronish LLP	117	6	5.13%	D +
11	Gordon & Rees LLP	79	4	5.06%	D +
12	Morrison & Foerster LLP	198	10	5.05%	D +
13	Heller Ehrman LLP	167	6	3.59%	D
14	Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP	110	3	2.73%	D -
15	Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	52	1	1.92%	F
16	Latham & Watkins LLP	213	4	1.88%	F
17	Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	128	2	1.56%	F
18	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold LLP	71	1	1.41%	F
19	Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	150	2	1.33%	F
20	Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	117	1	0.85%	FF

SECTION 4: NATIVE AMERICAN PARTNERS

Of the twenty laws firms surveyed, only five have Native American partners. Each has just one Native American partner.

- Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
- Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP
- O'Melveny & Myers LLP
- Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
- Latham & Watkins LLP

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATIONS

Greenlining recommends that majority-owned law firms remove barriers to the full participation of minorities in the legal profession, and that senior partners take the lead in this endeavor.

Greenlining recommends that majority-owned law firms foster a culture that values diversity by creating a top-down diversity training system to develop awareness and understanding within the firm.

Greenlining recommends that majority-owned law firms focus on developing a strong pipeline program that starts as early as elementary school, by creating initiatives to ensure that young students have the resources they will need to succeed in law school.

Greenlining recommends that majority-owned law firms create stronger internal mentoring programs focusing on the success of minority associates.

Greenlining recommends that majority-owned law firms proportionally promote minority attorneys to partner.

Greenlining recommends that majority-owned law firms create plans to ensure that all minority attorneys maintain substantial and significant client visibility.

While Greenlining believes that none of the data relating to majority-owned law firms should be included as part of supplier diversity reporting, we have previously submitted criteria to the California Public Utilities Commission encouraging a modification of the present 51% standard for majority-owned law firms, as part of hearing or a separate rulemaking, but only if majority-owned law firms are required to:

1. Establish significant goals for, and foster the achievements of, minorities at the associate, equity partner and non-equity partner levels;
2. Develop initiatives focused on improving the educational pipeline for minorities interested in the legal profession, beginning with students in junior high school or above;
3. Give minority attorneys substantial responsibility in utility cases with the intention of preparing them to, if they wish, form minority-owned law firms that can represent the utilities in the future;
4. Develop and commit significant resources to a pro bono program designed to address the needs of underserved communities.