



# COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL NOMINEES EVALUATION

## THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

180 HOWARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-1617 • (415) 538-2274

KIMBERLY A. KNILL  
Chair  
Laguna Beach  
JODY A. NUÑEZ  
Vice Chair  
Oakland

DAVID M. AXELRAD  
Encino  
JOHN C. BEIERS  
Redwood City  
ANGELIQUE G. BONANNO  
Rancho Cucamonga  
DAMON M. BROWN  
Los Angeles  
MANUEL F. CACHÁN  
Los Angeles  
THOMAS M. CECIL  
Carmichael  
JAMES CLAPP  
Carlsbad  
CLAIRE COOPER  
Oakland  
MARK C.T. CUMBA  
San Diego  
SALLY J. ELKINGTON  
Oakland  
SARAH J. ELLENBERG  
Los Angeles  
E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
Los Angeles  
DAVID W. FERMINO  
San Francisco  
DAVID D. FU  
San Gabriel  
RICHARD L. GILBERT  
Sacramento  
SHAY AARON GILMORE  
San Francisco  
TONY K. HEIDER  
Bakersfield  
TIM L. LASKE  
Torrance  
JANICE F. MULLIGAN  
San Diego  
CHERI L. NOBRIGA  
Livermore  
YVETTE OTT  
San Jose  
PAUL E. RICE  
San Jose  
NANCY ROSENBLUM  
Beverly Hills  
SAMRA ROTH-FURBUSH  
San Bernardino  
TOBY J. ROTHSCHILD  
Westminster  
KATHLEEN RYALS  
Hayward  
MICHAEL B. SILVERMAN  
Riverside  
AMY F. SOLOMON  
Los Angeles  
KALPANA SRINIVASAN  
Los Angeles  
JODI ZUCKER TAKSAR  
Pasadena  
MICHAEL LI-MING WONG  
San Francisco  
SUSAN YU  
Los Angeles

HEIDI SCHWAB-WILHELM  
Senior Administrative Specialist

June 10, 2016

### **BY EMAIL**

Board of Trustees  
Stakeholder Committee  
State Bar of California  
180 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1617

Re: Activities and Statistical Report 2015-2016 Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation

Dear Board of Trustees and Members of the Stakeholder Committee:

As the 2015-2016 Chair of the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation (JNE), I write to submit our Activities and Statistical Report.

### **Our Work, Our Commissioners, and the Governor's Appointments**

I want to begin by thanking you for the privilege of serving this past year as Chair of the JNE Commission. Few volunteer positions rival the professional satisfaction and personal reward I have received while serving this body. The work of the commission is critical to the governor's efforts to appoint an exceptional and diverse judiciary. We all take that work very seriously and strive to uphold the strictest confidentiality and professionalism in every investigation we undertake. The fellow professionals I worked with are inspiring and dedicated. It has been a marvelous experience. This never would have been possible without the impressive dedication of Heidi Schwab-Wilhelmi, Esq., Senior Administrative Specialist, and State Bar staff members Diane Blackmon, Michelle Pierce, and Anne Baxter. Each is a valuable and respected asset, and their historical knowledge of the commission assisted me throughout my service on the commission and particularly while serving as Chair.

During my term as Chair, our commission consisted of 30 attorneys and four public members from Los Angeles, Orange, Alameda, San Francisco, San Diego, San Mateo, San Bernardino, Santa Clara, Riverside, Kern, and Sacramento Counties. Not included in the above totals are three commissioners who resigned this year in the midst of their first term of service – Zaida Hackett, O.G. Magno, and Tammy Warren. These resignations created the need to regularly utilize pro tem commissioners. We owe a great deal of thanks to former commissioners Jason Lee, Todd Thompson, Robert Brody, Jason de Bretteville, David George, and Leisa Biggers, for returning to serve as pro tem commissioners. The presence of these seasoned former commissioners added unparalleled depth and experience to the training of newer commissioners. We met for 12 days (six two-day meetings approximately every 60 days) and investigated 145 candidates while conducting 173 evaluations at the governor's request.

In 2015-2016, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. appointed a total of 56 candidates:

- 14 were rated Exceptionally Well Qualified – or 25%
- 22 were rated Well Qualified – or 40%
- 20 were rated Qualified – 35%
- 0 were rated Not Qualified – 0%

Of the above appointments, 50 were to superior courts. When an appellate court candidate is appointed, the Chair is asked to personally appear before the Commission on Judicial Appointments (CJA) to offer testimony on the JNE Commission's rating of the candidate. Governor Brown appointed six appellate court candidates during my term as Chair, and I appeared at all the CJA hearings as the JNE Commission representative.

### **Outreach to the Legal Community**

We strongly believe in outreach to the legal and at-large communities. In this spirit, at the beginning of my term, I sent letters to hundreds of Bar Associations and Inns of Court chapters throughout California offering my and the commission's resources to the members of these organizations. Experience has shown those contemplating judicial appointment, and the communities they represent, are better prepared when they possess a thorough understanding of our investigation process and the statutory basis for our assessments, before an application is submitted. Even though the specifics of a candidate's investigation are strictly confidential, the process we utilize should be transparent. We offered our availability to help explain how to navigate that process and what to expect from JNE if the governor requests an evaluation. We also invited members to consider service on the JNE Commission, noting the State of California and its judiciary are best served by commissioners who reflect diversity in geography, practice area, practice environment, gender, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

As a result of this outreach, I'm pleased to report we sent the following JNE commissioners to make personal appearance presentations (usually accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation and written handout materials) at the following events:

- September, 2015 meeting of the Warren J. Ferguson Inn of Court in Orange County (Chair)
- October, 2015 meeting of the Hispanic Bar Association in Orange County (Chair)
- October, 2015 meeting of the Wiley Manuel Bar Association, with a joint presentation by the State Bar Council on Access & Fairness (COAF), in Sacramento County (Commissioner Kathleen Ryals)
- November, 2015 meeting of the Contra Costa County Bar Association, with a joint presentation by COAF, in Contra Costa County (Chair)
- November, 2015 meeting of the William L. Gordon Inn of Court, in Santa Barbara County (Commissioner David Axelrad)
- November, 2015 joint meeting of the Benjamin Aranda III Inn of Court and the South Bay Bar Association in Los Angeles County (Chair)

- January, 2016 meeting of the Joseph B. Campbell Inn of Court in San Bernardino County (Chair)
- January, 2016 meeting of the Asian Pacific American Bar Association in Los Angeles County (Chair)

Additionally, I was asked by the Orange County chapter of the American Business Trial Lawyers to author an article on the judicial selection process. The article was published in the April issue of the ABTL Newsletter. A copy of the newsletter is enclosed. A similar article will be published in an upcoming edition of the Los Angeles Lawyer; it is presently scheduled for publication in August or September, 2016.

### **Paperless CCFs to the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal**

JNE's primary means of investigating judicial candidates is the solicitation of comments regarding the candidate from members of the bar and the judiciary, and until recently, we did so by mailing written Confidential Comment Forms (CCFs). Our rules require us to send a CCF on every candidate to each Supreme Court justice and to each Court of Appeal justice and Superior Court judge (except Los Angeles County which allows a smaller mailing) in the county where any judicial applicant has applied. During past terms, we were able to secure the cooperation of several Superior Courts to send individual CCFs by email, and this practice continues.

One of our goals during my term was to streamline the process of sending CCFs to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal justices. Ms. Schwab-Wilhelmi and I worked closely with Supreme Court staff and developed a new protocol, which is succinct and efficient. Rather than send a separate paper copy CCF or electronic CCF to each justice, we draft one email for each investigation cycle, and it contains the names of all candidates, along with the judicial office each seeks, and a hyperlink to each candidate's CCF that can be accessed from the email. This protocol allows each justice to receive one email from the JNE Commission approximately every 60 days, and to quickly peruse the list to efficiently determine whether he or she wishes to offer feedback on a candidate. The new method for seeking input from the Supreme Court justices has been well-received.

Building on that success, we then endeavored to expand the same protocol to the Courts of Appeal. As a result of our outreach, I'm pleased to report the First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth District Courts of Appeal have granted approval for the JNE Commission to send CCFs through email using a similar protocol. We are still waiting on the Sixth District to grant approval.

### **Our New Technology**

Over the past year, Ms. Schwab-Wilhelmi, State Bar IT staff, and the JNE Commission's Technology Committee have worked tirelessly to implement a new software system for handling the massive task of sending electronic CCFs to each candidate's lists of individuals with whom the candidate has worked or listed as a personal reference, as well as to attorneys at random. We now have the capability to manage this process as individual commissioners, which has shifted many of the tasks from State Bar staff to

commissioners. I'd like to acknowledge the many additional volunteer hours devoted to this effort by Vice Chair Jody Nuñez, former commissioner Todd Thompson, and commissioners David Fu, Richard Gilbert, Kalpana Srinivasan, Shay Gilmore, and Tim Laske. They, along with Ms. Schwab-Wilhelmi, worked to troubleshoot and test beta versions of the software, and participated in numerous conference calls to help address bugs and kinks along the way.

### **Best Practices for Handling Not Qualified Ratings**

While it is never pleasant to rate a candidate Not Qualified, we all take very seriously the effect this rating has on the candidate's future. We want to ensure that our Not Qualified ratings are well-supported and only given in cases where the rating will be upheld. During Jason Lee's term as Chair, we were able to implement a feedback system from RJNE that allows us to receive a short report each time one of our Not Qualified ratings is rescinded by RJNE. During my term, we had only three rescissions of a Not Qualified rating. Conversely, four Not Qualified ratings were affirmed by RJNE. On each occasion resulting in a rescission, RJNE provided us with its reasons, and I was able to share with the entire commission best practices moving forward to avoid any further rescissions under similar circumstances. It has been helpful to us as a body and an excellent learning opportunity for our newer commissioners.

### **The State of the JNE Commission**

Our mission is to assist the governor in the judicial selection process and thereby promote a California judiciary of quality and integrity by providing independent, comprehensive, accurate and fair evaluations of candidates for judicial appointment and nomination. I stand in awe of the dedication and commitment shown by the professionals that serve in furtherance of fulfilling this mission. The responsibility is sobering, and our efforts will shape the future of the State's judiciary for generations to come. As a result, each commissioner volunteers hundreds of hours each year. We endeavor to maximize the experience of seasoned commissioners by pairing them on investigations with newer commissioners. The institutional knowledge builds upon itself, and in this way, the commission becomes stronger over time.

I have complete confidence that incoming Chair, Jody Nuñez, and incoming Vice Chair, David Fu, will continue the outstanding work of the commission. During my term, they were always at the ready, responsive, professional, enthusiastic, and extremely competent. The commission is in good hands. I look forward to following its progress in the years to come.

Cordially,

Kimberly A. Knill

Kimberly A. Knill  
Chair  
Commission on Judicial Nominees and Evaluation

Enc. (ABTL Newsletter)

cc: Heidi Schwab-Wilhelmi, Esq., Jody Nuñez, David Fu

**COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL NOMINEES EVALUATION**  
**Statistical Report**  
**2013-2015**

Presented in this report are the ratings of the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation (JNE Commission) and the appointments by the Governor in response to those ratings for the years 2013-2015. The data for the years 2013 and 2014 are included for the purpose of comparison and to demonstrate a greater overview of ratings and appointments. Please be advised that the data comparing the three years may provide an inaccurate picture of appointments due to candidates who are evaluated in one year and may be appointed to the bench in a later year.

Please note that the five tables incorporate data from the statewide demographic report that the JNE Commission released on or before March 1<sup>st</sup> 2016 under California Government Code Section 12011.5(n).

The JNE Commission rates candidates for judicial appointment as Exceptionally Well Qualified (EWQ), Well Qualified (WQ), Qualified (Q), and Not Qualified (NQ).

Table 1: Total Judicial Evaluations, 2013-2015

Table 2: Judicial Appointments by Rating, 2013-2015

Table 3: Judicial Evaluations by County, 2013-2015

Table 4: Evaluations by District, 2013-2015

Table 5: Commissioner Workloads and Budgetary Statistics, 2013-2015

Table 1

**Total Judicial Evaluations  
2013-2015**

<b>Year</b>	<b>EWQ</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>WQ</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>NQ</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Withdrawn/Elected</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2013</b>	23	12.30	71	37.97	70	37.43	20	10.70	3	1.60	187
<b>2013</b>	21	12.43	68	40.24	64	37.87	12	7.10	4	2.37	169
<b>2015</b>	20	11.56	74	42.77	61	35.26	15	8.67	3	1.73	173
<b>Total</b>	64	12	213	40	195	37	47	9	10	2	529

**Number of Evaluations**

<b>Year</b>	<b>EWQ</b>	<b>WQ</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>NQ</b>
<b>2013</b>	23	71	70	20
<b>2014</b>	21	68	64	12
<b>2015</b>	20	74	61	15

Table 2

**Judicial Appointments by Rating  
2013 – 2015**

Year	EWQ	Percent	WQ	Percent	Q	Percent	NQ	Percent	Total
2013	6	13	28	58.33	14	29.17	0	0	48
2014	11	16.42%	37	55.22%	19	28.35%	0	0	67
2015	13	24.53%	22	41.51%	18	33.96%	0	0	53
<b>Total</b>	30	18%	87	52%	51	30%	0	0	168

**Number of Appointments**

Year	EWQ	WQ	Q	NQ
<b>2013</b>	6	28	14	0
<b>2014</b>	11	37	19	0
<b>2015</b>	13	22	18	0

Table 3 – Page 1

**Evaluations by County/District – 2013-2015**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Alameda</b>	1	14	12	11	37
<b>Alpine</b>	3	0	0	3	3
<b>Amador</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Butte</b>	3	0	0	3	3
<b>Calaveras</b>	3	1	0	0	1
<b>Colusa</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Contra Costa</b>	1	4	6	4	14
<b>Del Norte</b>	1	0	0	0	0
<b>El Dorado</b>	3	1	0	1	2
<b>Fresno</b>	5	6	0	3	9
<b>Glenn</b>	3	0	0	1	1
<b>Humboldt</b>	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Imperial</b>	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Inyo</b>	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Kern</b>	5	4	4	2	10
<b>Kings</b>	5	0	0	0	0
<b>Lake</b>	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Lassen</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Los Angeles</b>	2	41	41	54	136
<b>Madera</b>	5	0	0	1	1
<b>Marin</b>	1	1	6	2	9
<b>Mariposa</b>	5	0	0	0	0
<b>Mendocino</b>	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Merced</b>	5	2	1	1	4
<b>Modoc</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Mono</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Monterey</b>	6	3	0	0	3
<b>Napa</b>	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Nevada</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Orange</b>	4	10	13	12	35



Table 3-Page 2

**Evaluations by County/District – 2013-2015**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Placer</b>	3	0	1	2	3
<b>Plumas</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Riverside</b>	4	7	7	2	16
<b>Sacramento</b>	3	8	3	5	16
<b>San Benito</b>	6	0	0	0	0
<b>San Bernardino</b>	4	4	7	7	18
<b>San Diego</b>	4	13	10	4	27
<b>San Francisco</b>	1	12	11	7	30
<b>San Joaquin</b>	3	0	0	5	5
<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	2	0	0	3	3
<b>San Mateo</b>	1	5	1	4	10
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	2	5	2	4	11
<b>Santa Clara</b>	6	11	9	4	24
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	6	1	0	1	2
<b>Shasta</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Sierra</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Siskiyou</b>	3	0	0	1	1
<b>Solano</b>	1	1	1	8	10
<b>Sonoma</b>	1	3	0	0	3
<b>Stanislaus</b>	5	1	3	1	5
<b>Sutter</b>	3	0	1	1	2
<b>Tehama</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Trinity</b>	3	2	1	0	3
<b>Tulare</b>	5	4	6	1	11
<b>Tuolumne</b>	5	2	0	2	4
<b>Ventura</b>	2	3	2	5	10
<b>Yolo</b>	3	1	2	1	4
<b>Yuba</b>	3	0	1	0	1
<b>Supreme Ct.</b>	n/a	0	2	0	2
<b>Cts of Appeal</b>	n/a	17	16	7	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	n/a	187	169	173	529

Table 4

**Judicial Evaluations by District 2013-2015**

<b>Dist No.</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>1</b>	40	37	36
<b>2</b>	49	45	66
<b>3</b>	13	9	23
<b>4</b>	34	37	25
<b>5</b>	19	14	11
<b>6</b>	15	9	5
<b>Supreme</b>	0	2	0
<b>App.</b>	17	16	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>173</b>

**Table 5****Commissioner Workloads and Budgetary Statistics****Meeting Days/Assignments 2013-2015**

Year	Commissioners	Meeting Days	Evaluations	Total Assignments	Assignments Per Commissioner
2013	37	13	187	427	12
2014	37	15	169	407	11
2015	35	12	174	385	11

**Expenses for Travel, Postage, and Printing/Outside Services 2013-2015**

Year	Travel Expense	Postage	Printing/Outside Services
2013	\$148,204	\$13,852	\$4,279
2014	\$196,270	\$14,312	\$2,835
2015	\$157,471	\$9,228	\$1,809

**Budget Used 2013-2015**

Year	Budget Used
2013	\$572,408
2014	\$802,387
2015	\$856,744