

An Empirical Analysis of the Impact of Student-Faculty Demographics on Law School Graduate Attrition, Attrition Rates, J.D.s Awarded, and Bar Passage

Paola Cecchi Dimeglio*

Introduction

As we embark on our journey through legal education, our experiences and sense of belonging are most profoundly shaped by the personal interactions we have with our peers and faculty. These relationships, fostered by regular and meaningful contact, not only provide guidance and support but also instill in us a feeling of value and belonging. The intricate network of student-faculty relationships, where advice, support, and a sense of shared community are interwoven, lays the foundation for our perseverance and success in law school. However, underlying these supportive engagements is a complex layering of interactions that can significantly shape the academic outcomes of students from underrepresented groups.

This paper seeks to delve into one of legal education's most critical yet scarcely explored questions: How does the interplay between student and faculty demographics impact law students' sense of belonging and, in turn, their rates of attrition, the earning of Juris Doctor degrees, and their success

***Paola Cecchi-Dimeglio**, Ph.D., J.D., LL.M., Ms.C. is a Behavioral & Data Scientist and a lawyer. She is the Chair of the Executive Leadership Research Initiative for Women and Minority Attorneys at the Center for the Legal Profession at Harvard Law School and a Senior Research Fellow at Harvard Law School and affiliated faculty at Harvard Kennedy School Women and Public Policy Program (WAPPP). She can be reached at pcecchidimeglio@law.harvard.edu or @HLSPaola. Acknowledgment and appreciation are extended to many members of the Harvard Law School, Harvard Kennedy School, and Harvard Business School and to colleagues at other universities, especially for their faculty scholarship and feedback. The author is in particular thankful to David Wilkins, John F. Manning, Bruce Green, Scott Cummings, David Luban, Carole Silver, Swethaa Ballakrishnen, Renee Knake, Michele DeStefano, Russ Pearce, Leslie Levin, Atinuke Adediran, and Peter Kamminga for their helpful comments, guidance, assistance, and support. The author also wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editorial team of the Journal of Legal Education, as well as all the participants who provided feedback at the Behavioral Insights Institute (2022), AccessLex (2022), and Law and Society Conferences (2023). Acknowledgments: This research received external funding from AccessLex Institute Research.

on the bar exam? The necessity for this exploration is highlighted by enduring disparities in bar passage rates and the continual underrepresentation of women and minorities within the legal profession.

Despite a growing emphasis on the alienation experienced by women and minority students in law schools and its effects on their graduation rates, a significant understanding gap remains regarding the potential for faculty-student demographic congruence—or its absence—to either mitigate or exacerbate these challenges.

Introducing our investigation at the beginning is vital, especially against the backdrop of a thirty-four-year low in first-time bar passage rates in 2018 and the persistent performance gaps among diverse examinees. The traditional emphasis on LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs as barometers for bar exam success has not only perpetuated, but possibly worsened, the lack of diversity within law school classes, further cementing the exclusion of women and minorities from the legal profession.

To shed light on these issues, this research aims to illuminate the significant influence of faculty diversity—or its absence—on the educational paths and professional gateways open to law students.

Through a detailed empirical examination, this research aims to make a vital contribution to the conversation on enhancing inclusivity and equity in legal education. It seeks to enrich the ongoing dialogue around legal education reform and to underscore the critical role that faculty diversity plays in creating a more inclusive and supportive environment for all law students.

Using a combined dataset from the Legal Lex and ABA 509 disclosures and adjusting for the size of different schools, this study employs the Mann Whitney Wilcoxon nonparametric method to offer a detailed analysis of the relationship between student demographics and faculty composition.

I compared the deviation of law school faculty demographics to establish a profile of university subgroups and determine their impact on student attrition, attrition rates, the percentage of J.D.s awarded, and bar success rates, all of which reflect students' sense of belonging and persistence in law school. I used a 3-by-2 model for faculty demographics. I divided law school faculty demographics into two categories: female faculty demographics and diverse faculty demographics (women and men). Law school faculty demographics were then categorized either as above or below average of the faculty body at other law schools. I carried out three types of analysis of faculty demographics (including full-time and part-time faculty) and a separate analysis for full- and part-time faculty to determine whether differences exist for each of the categories.

Then I performed an analysis on the attrition, attrition rates, the percentage of J.D.s awarded, and bar success rates of students. The analysis investigates the phenomenon and the impact on students by using a 2-by-2-by-4-by-6-by-12 analysis model. First, each category was analyzed by gender (women and men), then by population (white Caucasian and minority), and then by

both gender and population (white Caucasian and minority women and white Caucasian and minority men). The analysis then moved forward by looking at any impact on race (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Latinx/Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, two or more races/other) before examining each race by gender (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Latinx/Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, two or more races/other student women and American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Latinx/Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, two or more races/other men).

The bar passage per school was investigated by overall characteristics and not by race and gender of students, as this could not be derived even using a tridimensional model.

This sequenced, step-by-step approach provides a robust assessment of whether faculty demographics impact student attrition, attrition rates, the percentage of J.D.s awarded, and bar success rates, all of which reflect the sense of belonging. The overall results show that more diverse faculty demographics, both in terms of women in the faculty body and diverse individuals, impact students' sense of belonging, further highlighting the impact related to the composition of both full-time and part-time faculty demographics.

This article is organized into five main parts: Part I provides an overview of the relevant literature, Part II presents the methodology, Part III provides an overview of the data, Part IV presents the results, and Part V delivers a discussion and concluding commentary.

Literature Review

A. The sense of belonging

The inextricable connection between students' academic and psychological well-being and their sense of belonging is well documented. Sense of Belonging at School (known as SOBAS) denotes a state in which students view school as integral and essential to their long-term well-being. SOBAS influences participation and performance in academic and nonacademic settings. It further impacts how students interact with staff and with peers.¹ Statistically, students with strong SOBAS also present stronger cognitive and psychosocial functioning.²

1 JON D. WILLMS, STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AT SCHOOL: A SENSE OF BELONGING AND PARTICIPATION (2003); Ming-Te Wang & Jacquelynne S. Eccles, *School Context, Achievement Motivation, and Academic Engagement: A Longitudinal Study of School Engagement Using a Multidimensional Perspective*, 28 *LEARNING & INSTRUCTION* 12 (2013); Jacquelynne S. Eccles, *Schools, Academic Motivation, and Stage-Environment Fit*, in *HANDBOOK OF ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY* 125 (2004), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9780471726746.ch5>.

2 Paula Baron & Lillian Corbin, *Student Engagement: Rhetoric and Reality*, 31 *HIGHER EDUC. RSCH. & DE.* 759 (2012); Judith L. Meece, Eric M. Anderman & Lynley H. Anderman, *Classroom Goal Structure, Student Motivation, and Academic Achievement*, 57 *ANN. REV. PSYCH.* 487 (2006).

Better academic performance, stronger intrinsic motivation, and overall positive attitudes about school are evident in individuals with strong SOBAS, as indicated by research.³ These students have a lower incidence of social and psychological health problems such as depression, peer social rejection, delinquency, use of illicit drugs, and dropping out.⁴ While SOBAS positively influences these health and social factors, these factors, in turn, bolster SOBAS.⁵

Culture, race, gender, and other contexts impact a person's sense of belonging. Factors in the environment and community exert an influence on overall human development and SOBAS. These factors include family and school at the immediate or microsystem level, broader macrosystem levels, and interconnecting mesosystem levels. In its analysis of the cultural macrosystems, this study focuses on the ways in which student SOBAS and attrition may be impacted by law school faculty diversity.

Positive peer and faculty interactions foster students' sense of belonging. They can make complex environments feel more supportive and can shape student outcomes. Taught by faculty who are a demographic match, students may make additional efforts to stick with graduate degrees and remain in a certain labor sector. A mismatch can trigger stereotype threat or behaviors that confirm bias.⁶ It can damage student performance and exclude minorities from the legal profession.⁷ This same sense of belonging also predicts bar exam

- 3 Lynley H. Anderman, *Academic and Social Perceptions as Predictors of Change in Middle School Students' Sense of School Belonging*, 72 J. EXPERIMENTAL EDUC. 5 (2003); Raymond V. Padilla, Jesus Trevino, Kenny Gonzalez & Jane Trevino, *Developing Local Models of Minority Student Success in College*, 38 J. COLL. STUDENT DEV. 125 (1997); Robert W. Roeser, Carol Midgley & Timothy C. Urdan, *Perceptions of the School Psychological Environment and Early Adolescents' Psychological and Behavioral Functioning in School: The Mediating Role of Goals and Belonging*, 88 J. EDUC. PSYCH. 408 (1996); Dorainne J. Green, *Group-Based Inequalities in Relationships in Law School Predict Disparities in Belonging, Satisfaction, and Achievement in Law School*, J. EDUC. PSYCH. (forthcoming).
- 4 Leslie R.M. Hausmann, Janet Ward Schofield & Rochelle L. Woods, *Sense of Belonging as a Predictor of Intentions to Persist Among African American and White First-Year College Students*, 48 RSCH. HIGHER EDUC. 803 (2007); Tierra M. Freeman, Lynley H. Anderman & Jane M. Jensen, *Sense of Belonging in College Freshmen at the Classroom and Campus Levels*, 75 J. EXPERIMENTAL EDUC. 203 (2007); Anderman, *supra* note 3.
- 5 Jeffrey J. Minneti, *A Comprehensive Approach to Law School Access Admissions*, 18 U. MD. L.J. RACE, RELIGION, GENDER & CLASS 189 (2018); WILLMS, *supra* note 1.
- 6 Melissa J. Ferguson & John A. Bargh, *How Social Perception Can Automatically Influence Behavior*, 8 TRENDS COGNITIVE SCIS. 33 (2004); Mahzarin R. Banaji, Curtis Hardin & Alexander J. Rothman, *Implicit Stereotyping in Person Judgment*, 65 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 272 (1993); Mary C. Murphy & Sabrina Zirke, *Race and Belonging in School: How Anticipated and Experienced Belonging Affect Choice, Persistence, and Performance*, 117 TCHRS. COLL. REC. 1 (2015).
- 7 Walter R. Allen & Daniel Solorzano, *Affirmative Action, Educational Equity and Campus Racial Climate: A Case Study of the University of Michigan Law School*, 12 BERKELEY LA RAZA L.J. 237 (2000); Joseph G. Altonji & Rebecca M. Blank, *Race and Gender in the Labor Market*, in 3 HANDBOOK OF LABOR ECONOMICS 3143 (1999), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1573446399300390>.

passage, without which many minority law school graduates can be excluded from practicing law.

Law school culture also represents a barrier to women and minorities. The workload, the pedagogy, the curriculum, and the notoriously competitive and adversarial culture of legal education are unique and known to be detrimental to both students who are women and minorities.⁸ Understanding SOBAS in legal education has implications for diversity and representation, given that law graduates go on to hold some of the most powerful positions in U.S. society as leaders in governments, business, politics, and civil affairs.⁹ Creating a supporting environment in the law school setting and meaningfully shifting the outcomes for women and minorities will affect equality, fairness, and inclusion at many levels of society.

Ballakrishnen's research sheds light on the nuanced challenges minority law students face in navigating professional environments that aggressively court them, underlining a critical need for law schools to critically evaluate their diversity and inclusion efforts.¹⁰ When one further builds and draws insights from the rich legal profession diversity literature, it becomes clear that fostering a genuine sense of belonging extends beyond mere recruitment.¹¹ Law schools must endeavor to cultivate environments in which diversity is not just celebrated superficially but integrated into the very fabric of educational and professional development practices. Numerous research emphasizes that navigating the balance between being valued for diversity and achieving

- 8 Robert L. Nelson, Ioana Sendroiu, Ronit Dinovitzer & Meghan Dawe, *Perceiving Discrimination: Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation in the Legal Workplace*, 44 LAW & SOC. INQUIRY 1051 (2019); ANDREW J. ELLIOT, CAROL S. DWECK & DAVID S. YEAGER, HANDBOOK OF COMPETENCE AND MOTIVATION: THEORY AND APPLICATION (2d ed. 2017); Susan Sturm & Lani Guinier, *The Law School Matrix: Reforming Legal Education in a Culture of Competition and Conformity*, 60 VAND. L. REV. 515 (2007); Sylvia Hurtado, Adriana Ruiz Alvarado & Chelsea Guillermo-Wann, *Creating Inclusive Environments: The Mediating Effect of Faculty and Staff Validation on the Relationship of Discrimination/Bias to Students' Sense of Belonging*, 1 J. COMMITTED TO SOC. CHANGE ON RACE & ETHNICITY 59 (2015); Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson, Robert Crosnoe & Glen H. Elder, Jr., *Students' Attachment and Academic Engagement: The Role of Race and Ethnicity*, 74 SOCIO. EDUC. 318 (2001).
- 9 William M. Sullivan, *After Ten Years: The Carnegie Report and Contemporary Legal Education*, 14 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 331 (2018); RICHARD L. ABEL & PHILIP SIMON COLEMAN LEWIS, LAWYERS IN SOCIETY: COMPARATIVE THEORIES (1989).
- 10 Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen, *Rethinking Inclusion: Ideal Minorities, Inclusion Cultures, and Identity Capitals in the Legal Profession*, 48 LAW & SOC. INQ. 1157 (2023).
- 11 Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen, *Law School as Straight Space*, 91 FORDHAM L. REV. 1113 (2023); Mekka A. Smith & Nancy Leong, *Identity Capitalists: The Powerful Insiders Who Exploit Diversity to Maintain Inequality*, 93 HARV. EDUC. REV. 271 (2023); Atinuke O. Adediran, *The Journey: Moving Racial Diversification Forward from Mere Commitment to Shared Value in Elite Law Firms*, 25 INT'L J. LEGAL PRO. 67 (2018); DIVERSITY IN PRACTICE: RACE, GENDER, AND CLASS IN LEGAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAREERS (Spencer Headworth, Robert L. Nelson, Ronit Dinovitzer & David B. Wilkins eds., 2016); Russell G. Pearce, Eli Wald & Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen, *Difference Blindness vs. Bias Awareness: Why Law Firms with the Best of Intentions Have Failed to Create Diverse Partnerships*, 83 FORDHAM L. REV. 2407 (2015).

genuine inclusion is complex.¹² This underscores the urgent need for law schools to move beyond superficial diversity efforts. By fostering meaningful peer and faculty interactions and ensuring that faculty diversity reflects the student body, law schools can create a nurturing environment that genuinely supports all students. This approach not only enhances SOBAS but also addresses the broader implications for diversity and representation in legal education, impacting equality, fairness, and inclusion at many societal levels.¹³

B. Sense of social identity

Very often, removing barriers to inclusion requires both reducing bias and mitigating the ways in which women and minorities perceive themselves, especially in professions such as law. Under the weight of stereotypes, including the idea that they are less competent in the field than white men and the absence of people like themselves, underrepresented individuals can remain convinced that they do not belong.¹⁴ In these contexts, women and other underrepresented groups are more likely to experience identity threat.¹⁵

The uncertainties triggered by social identity threat can reduce women's and minorities' sense of trust and belonging and introduce the notion that they will not be welcomed or supported in the legal profession both at the entry level and at the senior level.¹⁶ Under the stress of identity threat, women and minorities may also experience stereotype threat. As such, they may find themselves behaving in ways that confirm gender and racial stereotypes.¹⁷

12 Ballakrishnen, *supra* note 11.

13 Paola Cecchi-Dimeglio, *Designing Equality in the Legal Profession: A Nudging Approach*, 24 HARV. NEGOT. L. REV. 24 (2019); Deborah Rhode, *Leadership in Law*, 69 STAN. L. REV. 1603 (2017); DIVERSITY IN PRACTICE, *supra* note 11; David B. Wilkins & G. Mitu Gulati, *Why Are There So Few Black Lawyers in Corporate Law Firms? An Institutional Analysis*, 84 CALIF. L. REV. 493 (1996).

14 Sapna Cheryan, *Understanding the Paradox in Math-Related Fields: Why Do Some Gender Gaps Remain While Others Do Not?*, 66 SEX ROLES 184 (2012); Mary Ann Cejka & Alice H. Eagly, *Gender-Stereotypic Images of Occupations Correspond to the Sex Segregation of Employment*, 25 PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. BULL. 413 (1999).

15 Mary C. Murphy, Claude M. Steele & James J. Gross, *Signaling Threat: How Situational Cues Affect Women in Math, Science, and Engineering Settings*, 18 PSYCH. SC. 879 (2007); Claude M. Steele, Steven J. Spencer & Joshua Aronson, *Contending with Group Image: The Psychology of Stereotype and Social Identity Threat*, in 34 ADVANCES IN EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 379 (2002); Claude M. Steele, *A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance*, 52 AM. PSYCH. 613 (1997).

16 Mary G. Findling et al., *Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of Native Americans*, 54 HEALTH SERVS. RSCH. 1431 (2019); Murphy & Zirkel, *supra* note 6; Priya Mariana Shimpi & Sabrina Zirkel, *One Hundred and Fifty Years of "The Chinese Question": An Intergroup Relations Perspective on Immigration and Globalization*, 68 J. SOC. ISSUES 534 (2012); Estela Godínez Ballón, *School Connections: US Mexican Youth, Peers, and School Achievement*, 107 TCHRS. COLL. REC. 2451 (2005); Tabbye M. Chavous, *The Relationships Among Racial Identity, Perceived Ethnic Fit, and Organizational Involvement for African American Students at a Predominantly White University*, 26 J. BLACK PSYCH. 79 (2000).

17 Elizabeth A. Pascoe & Laura Smart Richman, *Perceived Discrimination and Health: A Meta-Analytic Review*, 135 PSYCH. BULL. 531 (2009); Claude M. Steele & Joshua A. Aronson, *Stereotype Threat*

Identity threat has been so entrenched that mitigating its effects can seem insurmountable.¹⁸

Scholars have long debated the persistence of professional and social hierarchies in the legal profession, despite significant developments aimed at increasing diversity and inclusion. The critique on how diversity efforts can sometimes perpetuate inequality rather than foster genuine inclusion, has been underscored.¹⁹ Empirical evidence focusing on the intersection of race and gender, as well as the systemic barriers and the need for a cultural fit within professional environments, provides a substantial basis for this discussion.²⁰ Moreover, the examination of diversity programs and the disparities related to class within professional settings highlight the complexity of achieving true inclusion.²¹ The landscape of professional success and inclusion, shaped by systemic barriers and the performative nature of diversity initiatives, is further elucidated through a comprehensive analysis.²² This body of work collectively emphasizes the necessity for law schools and firms to move beyond superficial diversity efforts and to recognize the multifaceted nature of identity and its potential for fostering systemic change.

Further expanding on this, the research on professional work underscores the significance of merit-adjacent factors, such as the ability to appease colleagues and clients, that play a crucial role in professional success beyond formal schooling and credentials.²³ This emphasis on invisible resources, including class indicators and performative affect, points to a nuanced landscape where access to professional spaces does not guarantee equitable

Does Not Live by Steele and Aronson (1995) Alone, 59 AM. PSYCH. 47 (2004); Steele, *supra* note 15.

- 18 MICHAEL INZLICHT & TONI SCHMADER, STEREOTYPE THREAT: THEORY, PROCESS, AND APPLICATION (2011), <https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199732449.001.0001/acprof-9780199732449>; Toni Schmader, Michael Johns & Chad Forbes, *An Integrated Process Model of Stereotype Threat Effects on Performance*, 115 PSYCH. REV. 336 (2008).
- 19 NANCY LEONG, IDENTITY CAPITALISTS: THE POWERFUL INSIDERS WHO EXPLOIT DIVERSITY TO MAINTAIN INEQUALITY (2021).
- 20 TSEDALE M. MELAKU, YOU DON'T LOOK LIKE A LAWYER: BLACK WOMEN AND SYSTEMIC GENDERED RACISM (2019); CYNTHIA FUCHS EPSTEIN, WOMEN IN LAW (2d ed. 1993).
- 21 Meera E. Deo, *Why BIPOC Fails*, 107 VA. L. REV. 115 (2021); Frank Dobbin & Alexandra Kalev, *Why Doesn't Diversity Training Work? The Challenge for Industry and Academia*, 10 ANTHROPOLOGY NOW 48 (2018); Frank Dobbin, Alexandra Kalev & Erin Kelly, *Diversity Management in Corporate America*, 6 CONTEXTS 21 (2007); Frank Dobbin, John R. Sutton, John W. Meyer & Richard Scott, *Equal Opportunity Law and the Construction of Internal Labor Markets*, 99 AM. J. SOCIO. 396 (1993); Daniel Laurison & Sam Friedman, *The Class Pay Gap in Higher Professional and Managerial Occupations*, 81 AM. SOCIO. REV. 668 (2016).
- 22 LAUREN A. RIVERA, PEDIGREE: HOW ELITE STUDENTS GET ELITE JOBS (2016); Carroll Seron, Susan S. Silbey, Erin Cech & Brian Rubineau, *Persistence Is Cultural: Professional Socialization and the Reproduction of Sex Segregation*, 43 WORK & OCCUPATIONS 37 (2016); Wilkins & Gulati, *supra* note 13.
- 23 Frank W. Munger & Carroll Seron, *Race, Law, and Inequality, 50 Years After the Civil Rights Era*, 13 ANN. REV. L. & SOC. SCI. 331 (2017); DIVERSITY IN PRACTICE, *supra* note 11.

opportunities for all entrants.²⁴ The performative aspect of diversity reveals a disconnect between the ostensible commitment to equality and the reality of ingrained social hierarchies within the legal profession.²⁵ The challenge, then, lies in addressing this decoupling of structure and reward by recognizing and valorizing the diverse forms of capital that minority legal professionals bring to the table. In doing so, the legal profession can begin to dismantle the deceptive autonomy suggested by Bourdieu, moving toward a more equitable and genuinely inclusive environment that acknowledges the value of identity capital and its potential to transform the landscape of legal practice.²⁶

In response to threat or the likelihood of threat, individuals become more keenly observant, and in professional settings they are more inclined to look for indications that their identity is being attacked or undervalued.²⁷ In this state of heightened awareness, small, pervasive actions or conditions within an organization or institution, such as a predominance of men in leadership roles, pervasive indications of masculinity, and gendered jokes or remarks can exacerbate identity threat.²⁸ Additional factors originating outside of an organization's environment can increase women's and minorities' apprehensions around being seen as competent and valued in the field of law. These factors can include videos or images of women or minorities in adverse, disempowered, stereotypical conditions or settings.²⁹

For instance, research found that, in the courtroom during oral arguments, justices who are women are roughly three times as often as their counterparts

- 24 Lauren A. Rivera, *Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms*, 77 AM. SOCIO. REV. 999 (2012)
- 25 Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen & Sarah B. Lawsky, *Law, Legal Socializations, and Epistemic Injustice*, 47 LAW & SOC. INQUIRY 1026 (2022); Paola Cecchi Dimeglio, *Is the Mansfield Rule Moving the Needle for Women and Minorities?*, 9 J. PROS. & ORG. 246 (2022); Esteban Lafuente & Yancy Vaillant, *Balance Rather than Critical Mass or Tokenism: Gender Diversity, Leadership and Performance in Financial Firms*, 40 INT'L J. MANPOWER 894 (2019); 24 {\scaps Harvard Negotiation Law Review} 24 (2019) Paola Cecchi Dimeglio, *Why the 30 Percent Mansfield Rule Can't Work: A Supply-Demand Empirical Analysis of Leadership in the Legal Profession*, 91 FORDHAM L. REV. 1162 (2023).
- 26 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Forms of Capital*, in APPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS 201 (2014).
- 27 Cheryl R. Kaiser, S. Brooke Vick & Brenda Major, *Prejudice Expectations Moderate Preconscious Attention to Cues That Are Threatening to Social Identity*, 17 PSYCH. SCI. 332 (2006); GORDON W. ALLPORT, *THE NATURE OF PREJUDICE* (unabridged, 25th anniversary ed. 1979).
- 28 Cheryan, *supra* note 14; Elizabeth Hirsh & Christopher J. Lyons, *Perceiving Discrimination on the Job: Legal Consciousness, Workplace Context, and the Construction of Race Discrimination*, 44 LAW & SOC'Y REV. 269 (2010); Christine Logel et al., *Interacting with Sexist Men Triggers Social Identity Threat Among Female Engineers*, 96 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 1089 (2009).
- 29 Robert J. Rydell, Katie J. Van Loo & Kathryn L. Boucher, *Stereotype Threat and Executive Functions: Which Functions Mediate Different Threat-Related Outcomes?*, 40 PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. BULL. 377 (2014); Paul G. Davies, Steven J. Spencer, Diane M. Quinn & Rebecca Gerhardtstein, *Consuming Images: How Television Commercials that Elicit Stereotype Threat Can Restrain Women Academically and Professionally*, 28 PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. BULL. 1615 (2002).

who are men to be interrupted by justices who are men.³⁰ In light of this research, Justice Sonia Sotomayor announced a break with tradition and a change to Supreme Court rules for oral argument.

According to gender research, counterfactors can be introduced to reduce some of the damage that has resulted from social identity threat. Identity safety cues emphasize that an individual's identity is valued in a particular setting and can begin to reduce some of the damage that has resulted from identity threat.³¹ Specifically, identity safety cues transmit that a person's identity will not be a factor that prevents wanted outcomes and that individuals can surmount any barriers associated with their identities.³²

Identity safety cues can be installed within organizations through diversity actions that result in a high representation of women and minorities.³³ Researchers have also affirmed that successful role models from similar identity groups (women, minorities) can serve as identity safety cues.³⁴ It has been observed that short exposure to a woman as a professional role model while in law school bolstered women's and minorities' sense of belonging in law school and the legal profession.³⁵ Identity safety cues may also be external and not integrated into the faculty or the setting.³⁶

30 Tonja Jacobi & Dylan Schweers, *Justice, Interrupted: The Effect of Gender, Ideology, and Seniority at Supreme Court Oral Arguments*, 103 VA. L. REV. 1379 (2017).

31 Paul G. Davies, Steven J. Spencer & Claude M. Steele, *Clearing the Air: Identity Safety Moderates the Effects of Stereotype Threat on Women's Leadership Aspirations*, 88 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 276 (2005); Carol T. Miller & Cheryl R. Kaiser, *A Theoretical Perspective on Coping With Stigma*, 57 J. SOC. ISSUES 73 (2001).

32 David S. Yeager et al., *A National Experiment Reveals Where a Growth Mindset Improves Achievement*, 573 NATURE 364 (2019); David Paunesku et al., *Mind-Set Interventions Are a Scalable Treatment for Academic Underachievement*, 26 PSYCH. SCI. 784 (2015); Mary C. Murphy & Valerie Jones Taylor, *The Role of Situational Cues in Signaling and Maintaining Stereotype Threat*, in STEREOTYPE THREAT: THEORY, PROCESS, AND APPLICATION 17 (2012); Gregory M. Walton & Geoffrey L. Cohen, *A Question of Belonging: Race, Social Fit, and Achievement*, 92 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 82 (2007).

33 Derek R. Avery et al., *Examining the Draw of Diversity: How Diversity Climate Perceptions Affect Job-Pursuit Intentions*, 52 HUM. RES. MGMT. 175 (2013); Derek R. Avery & Patrick F. Mckay, *Target Practice: An Organizational Impression Management Approach to Attracting Minority and Female Job Applicants*, PERS. PSYCH. 157 (2006).{\scaps Personnel Psychology} 157 (2006).

34 Eric P. Bettinger & Bridget Terry Long, *Do Faculty Serve as Role Models? The Impact of Instructor Gender on Female Students*, 95 AM. ECON. REV. 152 (2005).

35 Jane G. Stout, Nilanjana Dasgupta, Matthew Hunsinger & Melissa A. McManus, *STEMing the Tide: Using Ingroup Experts to Inoculate Women's Self-Concept in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)*, 100 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 255 (2011).

36 Aneceta Rattan et al., *Meta-Lay Theories of Scientific Potential Drive Underrepresented Students' Sense of Belonging to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)*, 115 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 54 (2018); Aneceta Rattan & Nalini Ambady, *How "It Gets Better": Effectively Communicating Support to Targets of Prejudice*, 40 PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. BULL. 555 (2014).

C. Impact of “Faculty/Student demographic” match

There is a dearth of research demonstrating the importance of examining the makeup of academic staff at graduate schools and their capacity to shape choices and outcomes for students who are women and minorities. In the past twenty years, a growing body of research has shown that women and minorities at law schools can feel alienated, and their graduation rates fall below those of white men. This research also aims to find solutions that reduce the severity of this phenomenon.³⁷ Compounding the challenge, first-time bar passage hit a thirty-four-year low (MBE score 139.5) in 2018, according to the National Conference of Bar Examiners.³⁸ Given the disparity in bar passage rates, large numbers of graduates—many of color—are unable to practice law.

In 1999, the gap between white and Hispanic test-takers was 20%, and 30% between white and Black test-takers. Recent data show no narrowing of these gaps.³⁹ When bar exam takers fail, a school’s enrollment or accreditation may suffer. To defend against this kind of exposure, schools rely on LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs to predict bar passage and shape admissions.⁴⁰ These metrics are lower for students from underrepresented groups. Defensive reliance on LSAT scores creates less diverse 1Ls and limits diversity in the profession. Such exclusion leads to underrepresentation of women and minorities in the legal profession, especially in high-paying, highly visible roles.

The call for increased diversity in the legal profession is often accompanied by the assertion that among white-collar professions, law is the least inclusive.⁴¹

37 Sturm & Guinier, *supra* note 8; Lani Guinier, Michelle Fine & Jane Balin, *Becoming Gentlemen: Women’s Experiences at One Ivy League Law School*, 143 U. PA. L. REV. 1 (1994).

38 Stephanie Francis Ward, Average National Multistate Bar Exam Score Sinks to Lowest Level Since ’84, A.B.A. J. (Sept. 17, 2018, 3:58 PM), https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/average_national_multistate_bar_exam_score_sinks_to_lowest_level_since_8.

39 Aaron N. Taylor, Jason M. Scott & Josh Jackson, *It’s Not Where You Start, It’s How You Finish: Predicting Law School and Bar Success* (AccessLex Inst., Research Paper No. 21-03, 2021), <https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=3827402>; Alexia Brunet Marks & Scott A. Moss, *What Predicts Law Student Success? A Longitudinal Study Correlating Law Student Applicant Data and Law School Outcomes*, 13 J. EMPIRICAL LEGAL STUD. 205 (2016); Aaron N. Taylor, *Diversity as a Law School Survival Strategy*, 59 ST. LOUIS U. L.J. 321 (2015).

40 Amy N. Farley et al., Law Student Success and Supports: Examining Bar Passage and Factors That Contribute to Student Performance (May 31, 2018) (unpublished manuscript), <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3237546>; Brunet Marks & Moss, *supra* note 39; Kristen Holmquist, Marjorie Shultz, Sheldon Zedeck & David Oppenheimer, *Measuring Merit: The Shultz-Zedeck Research on Law School Admissions*, 63 J. LEGAL EDUC. 565 (2014); Phoebe A. Haddon & Deborah Waire Post, *Misuse and Abuse of the LSAT: Making the Case for Alternative Evaluative Efforts and a Redefinition of Merit*, 80 ST. JOHN’S L. REV. 41 (2006); Vernellia R. Randall, *The Misuse of the LSAT: Discrimination Against Blacks and Other Minorities in Law School Admissions*, 80 ST. JOHN’S L. REV. 107 (2006).

41 Deborah L. Rhode, *Diversity and Gender Equity in Legal Practice*, 82 U. CIN. L. REV. 31 (2018); Deborah L. Rhode, *Law Is the Least Diverse Profession in the Nation. And Lawyers Aren’t Doing Enough to Change That.*, WASH. POST (May 27, 2015, 8:25 AM), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/>

For the first time in 2016, women became the majority in law schools. However, as of 2024, only 41% of attorneys are women, up from 36% in 2014. While the percentage of women in the legal profession has grown over the past decade, it still remains below parity.⁴² Thus, despite two decades of steady growth, there is a lag in the representation of women in the legal field. Among general counsels at Fortune 500 corporations and equity partners at major law firms, respectively, only 24% and 22% are women.⁴³ Impacted by factors of race and gender, statistics for women of color indicate even greater exclusion.

Research substantiates an increase in diversity in the legal profession in recent years. This growth is primarily attributed to increased numbers of Asian associates in the legal workforce.⁴⁴ A similar uptick is far from evident for Hispanics and African Americans, who, from 2007 to 2017, have seen respective growth rates of 3.2% to 4.1% and 3.1% to 3.9%.⁴⁵ These disparities are greater at leadership levels at major U.S. law firms, where minorities hold just 7.5% of partner positions and 5.6% of equity partner positions.⁴⁶ Minority women held only 1.5% of partner positions at major U.S. law firms.⁴⁷

Across the in-house legal market, Black/African American women comprise 10.5% of Fortune 500 general counsels; Hispanic women are 5.7%. While this underrepresentation of women and diverse individuals in the legal sector is not limited to the United States, several factors have renewed it as a critical issue here.

The goal of increasing the number of minorities available to be hired in the legal profession is ultimately connected to faculty-student demographic match. Growing the minority law student population without making the effort to secure a demographic match on the faculty side may not optimize the desired outcome, as measured by student persistence and J.D.s awarded. The effort to increase minority law school admissions and enrollment without creating a faculty population that provides the benefits of faculty-student

posteverything/wp/2015/05/27/law-is-the-least-diverse-profession-in-the-nation-and-lawyers-arent-doing-enough-to-change-that/.

42 *JD Enrollment and Ethnicity 2019*, A.B.A. REQUIRED DISCLOSURES, <http://abarequireddisclosures.org/Disclosure509> (under “compilations” heading, select “2019” in year field and select “JD Enrollemnt and Ethnicity” in section field, then click “generate report”); A.B.A., ABA NATIONAL LAWYER POPULATION SURVEY, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (2024), [HTTPS://WWW.AMERICANBAR.ORG/NEWS/PROFILE-LEGAL-PROFESSION/DEMOGRAPHICS/](https://www.americanbar.org/news/profile-legal-profession/demographics/)

43 *Women in the Legal Profession*, A.B.A. PROFILE LEGAL PRO., <https://www.abalegalprofile.com/women.php#anchor2> (last visited Jan. 2, 2023); *Representation of Women and Minority Equity Partners Among Partners Little Changed in Recent Years*, NALP BULL. (Apr. 2019), <https://www.nalp.org/0419research>.

44 AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, *supra* note 42.

45 *Id.*

46 *Id.*

47 *Id.*

demographic match may shed some light on the persistently slow growth of minority law school graduates.

Overall, the increase in diversity among law school students, graduates, and faculty has been slow. In 2011, minorities comprised only 28% of the 1L students. That figure rose to 31% in 2019.⁴⁸ In 2011, 24% of J.D.s awarded went to racial minorities. That figure was 31% in 2019. This growth contrasts with that in broader U.S. populations, of which 40% of residents are ethnic or racial minorities and 50.8% women, per U.S. Census data (2019).

On the faculty side, full-time law professors were 80% white and 55% men in 2018. ABA data from 2013 show that 83% of tenured law school faculty were white and 57% were men.⁴⁹ Seven percent were women of color. J.D. completion and bar passage remain barriers to the legal profession for women and minorities.

Given these disparate figures, a picture begins to emerge that suggests fewer opportunities to benefit from faculty-student demographic match. Psychological safety, reduced potential for bias, access to resources and role models, and more information comprise these benefits. The long-range effects shape student choices and academic performance during law school and impact graduation rates. Bar passage and access to quality employment in the legal profession are also affected by demographic match.

Integral to the mechanism whereby demographic match supports student outcomes, diverse faculty reduces stereotype threat and implicit bias, which may affect grading.⁵⁰ Some research showed that women and minorities perform better in classes taught by diverse faculty.⁵¹ Such faculty serve as models and mentors.⁵² They provide research opportunities, recommendations, networking, and connections to quality employment. Diverse faculty and peers help prepare students to succeed as professionals.

Law school grades may predict bar exam passage. Studies also connect success with demographics. Data show that African Americans have concerningly lower pass rates than white test-takers. This gap narrows when

48 AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, *supra* note 42.

49 *Id.*

50 Bettina J. Casad & William J. Bryant, *Addressing Stereotype Threat is Critical to Diversity and Inclusion in Organizational Psychology*, 7 FRONTIERS PSYCH. 8 (2016).

51 Bettinger & Long, *supra* note 34; Lani Guinier, Michelle Fine & Jane Balin, *supra* note 37; Florian Hoffmann & Philip Oreopoulos, *A Professor Like Me: The Influence of Instructor Gender on College Achievement*, 44 J. HUM. RES. 479 (2009).⁴⁴ {\scaps The Journal of human resources} 479 (2009).

52 Lillian Turner de Tormes Eby et al., *An Interdisciplinary Meta-Analysis of the Potential Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Protege Perceptions of Mentoring*, 139 PSYCH. BULL. 441 (2013); George F. Dreher & Taylor H. Cox Jr., *Race, Gender, and Opportunity: A Study of Compensation Attainment and the Establishment of Mentoring Relationships*, 81 J. APPLIED PSYCH. 297 (1996).gender, and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships}, 81 {\scaps Journal of Applied Psychology} 297 (1996).

researchers control for prior achievement; nonetheless, stereotype threat impacts test-takers who are women and minorities.

In the legal profession, the bar exam is also a factor and barrier. Passage falls below 60% in some areas and rises above 85% in others. About 10% of law school graduates (150,000) have taken, but not passed, the bar exam. Minority graduates are at a greater risk of bar exam failure.⁵³

A body of research in education and labor economy that began with a focus on K-12, but is expanding to examine postsecondary and graduate school settings, confirms the impact of demographic match on student outcomes. Mismatch can pair students with instructors who harbor lower expectations of student behavior or aptitude.⁵⁴ While the exact details are not known, a similar process plays out at postsecondary institutions. The bulk of the research is limited to the first year of the undergraduate experience.⁵⁵ Younger, inexperienced, information-poor, or socioeconomically disadvantaged students are more likely to be adversely impacted by demographic mismatch. In contrast, demographic match provides stronger role models, facilitates access to information, develops a stronger sense of belonging, and decreases stereotype threat. Diverse faculty beneficially influences students' short- and long-term outcomes.

In the law school setting, these outcomes are ultimately connected to the number of students completing law school. Given the impact of diverse faculty on student performance, bar passage, and quality employment, increasing the number of diverse faculty is essential to creating racial and gender equity in the profession.⁵⁶

Higher education strives to implement beneficial diversity at multiple levels; nonetheless, students from underrepresented groups experience tacit and obvious exclusion, which undermines their sense of belonging.⁵⁷ In the law school environment, a sense of alienation and isolation persists among minority students.⁵⁸ For law schools, admitting, retaining, and graduating

53 AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, *supra* note 42.

54 Seth Gershenson, Stephen B. Holt & Nicholas W. Papageorge, *Who Believes in Me? The Effect of Student-Teacher Demographic Match on Teacher Expectations*, 52 ECO EDU REV. 209 (2016).

55 H. Korpershoek, E.T. Canrinus, M. Fokkens-Bruinsma & H. de Boer, *The Relationships Between School Belonging and Students' Motivational, Social-Emotional, Behavioural, and Academic Outcomes in Secondary Education: A Meta-Analytic Review*, 35 RSCH. PAPERS EDUC. 641 (2020).

56 Eric H. Holder, *The Importance of Diversity in the Legal Profession*, 23 CARDOZO L. REV. 2241 (2002).

57 Hurtado, Alvarado & Guillermo-Wann, *supra* note 8; Thomas F. Nelson Laird, *College Students' Experiences with Diversity and Their Effects on Academic Self-Confidence, Social Agency, and Disposition Toward Critical Thinking*, 46 RSCH. HIGHER EDUC. 365 (2005); Patricia Gurin, Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda & Gretchen E. Lopez, *The Benefits of Diversity in Education for Democratic Citizenship*, 60 J. SOC. ISSUES 17 (2004); GARY ORFIELD & DEAN WHITLA, DIVERSITY AND LEGAL EDUCATION: STUDENT EXPERIENCES IN LEADING LAW SCHOOLS (2001), <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED456197>.

58 Doug Williams, *Do Racial Preferences Affect Minority Learning in Law Schools?*, 10 J. EMPIRICAL LEGAL

more inclusive classes of students, and thereby future lawyers, requires fostering SOBAS.⁵⁹

Methodology

The deviation of law school faculty demographics, either above or below average, based on the percentage of either women or diverse faculty, is calculated to establish a profile of university subgroups and determine their impact on student attrition, attrition rate, the percentage of J.D.s awarded, and bar success rates, all of which are driven by the sense of belonging.

A model referred to as a 3-by-2 model is used for faculty demographics. Law school faculty demographics are divided into two subcategories: female faculty demographics and diverse faculty demographics. Law school faculty demographics are then categorized as either above (more women and/or more minorities) or below (fewer women and/or fewer minorities) relative to average faculty body at other law schools. I performed three types of analysis of faculty demographics (all including full-time and part-time faculty) and a separate analysis for full- and part-time to see if differences exist for each category.

The attrition, attrition rate, the percentage of J.D.s awarded, and bar success rates of students reflected SOBAS, based on the presence of more women and/or more diverse faculty (including a combined analysis (both full-time and part-time) as well as separate analyses for full-time and part-time faculty). A 2-by-4-by-6-by-12 analysis model is used for assessing the impact on student categories. First, each category is analyzed by gender (women and men), then by population (white Caucasian and minority), and then by both gender and population (white Caucasian and minority women and white Caucasian and minority men). The analysis then continued by looking at any impact on race (American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN), Asian (A), Black/African American (B/AA), Hispanic/Latinx (H/L), Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander (NH/OPI), two or more races/other (2+R), and unknown race (UR) before examining each race by gender (AI/AN, A, B/AA, H/L, NH/OPI, 2+R women and AI/AN, A, B/AA, H/L, NH/OPI, and 2+R men).

Descriptive Data

The data set contains a sample of ABA-accredited U.S. law schools. ABA mandatory disclosures are for the period 2013 to 2019; consequently, the analysis focused on data from this period. Law schools that merged or closed during the data period were excluded from the analysis. The sample of approximately 210 schools that are included has been used to facilitate the comparative analyses outlined below. Data selected are derived from the primary sources: legal lex data (information about student demographics,

STUD. 171 (2013); Kevin R. Johnson, *The Importance of Student and Faculty Diversity in Law Schools: One Dean's Perspective*, 96 IOWA L. REV. 1549 (2011); Carole Silver, Amy Garver & Lindsay Watkins, *Unpacking the Apprenticeship of Professional Identity and Purpose: Insights from the Law School Survey of Student Engagement*, 17 LEGAL WRITING 373 (2011).

59 DIVERSITY IN PRACTICE, *supra* note 11.

tuition, and fees, living expenses, financial aid, and graduation) paired with information from the ABA 509 disclosures (information regarding enrollment, student demographics, tuition, and fees, living expenses, financial aid, and graduation) and accounting for differences in school sizes.⁶⁰

SI Appendix Table S1 shows the faculty demographics repartition by categories (full-time or part-time or both) and by gender (men and/or women) and by ethnicity (white Caucasian and/or minorities)

Table S1: Faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicity

Table 1: Faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicities (FT/PT)

SI Appendix Table S1 shows the faculty demographics repartition by categories (full time or part time or all included) and by gender (men and/or women) and by ethnicities (white Caucasian and/or minorities)

Period	Race	Gender	N*	Percentage*
All			101 [71, 158]	
		Men	63 [42, 100]	60% [55, 65]
		Women	43 [27, 62]	39% [34, 44]
	White		87 [55, 139]	87% [82, 90]
	Minorities		14 [8, 25]	13% [10, 17]
Full time			44 [30, 57]	
		Men	23 [16, 31]	54% [48, 61]
		Women	20 [13, 26]	45% [39, 51]
	White		34 [23, 47]	82% [77, 87]
	Minorities		8 [4, 13]	17% [12, 22]
Part time			61 [38, 101]	
		Men	41 [24, 65]	64% [57, 71]
		Women	22 [12, 36]	34% [28, 41]
	White		53 [30, 91]	89% [83, 93]
	Minorities		6 [3, 14]	10% [6, 15]

* = Median [1st Qu., 3rd Qu.]; rounded to the nearest whole number.

SI Appendix Table S2 shows the percentage of the faculty demographics repartition by categories (full-time or part-time or both) and by gender (men and/or women) and by ethnicity (white Caucasian and/or minorities)

60 The analysis is accounting for differences in school sizes. It considers the Top 50 law schools. As these schools are typically on the larger side, they have a larger number of faculty and therefore presumably a larger number of female and minority faculty than smaller schools, even if this is not the case in terms of proportion.

Table S2: Percentage of faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicity

Table 2: Percentage of faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicities (FT/PT)

SI Appendix Table S2 shows the percentile of the faculty demographics repartition by categories (full time or part time or all included) and by gender (men and/or women) and by ethnicities (white Caucasian and/or minorities)

	More/Less [...] * than the average in the faculty body	N (Percent%)
All	Fewer women	113 (54%)
	More women	98 (46%)
Full time	Fewer women	104 (49%)
	More women	107 (51%)
Part time	Fewer women	127 (60%)
	More women	84 (40%)
<hr/>		
All	Fewer minorities	135 (64%)
	More minorities	76 (36%)
Full time	Fewer minorities	132 (63%)
	More minorities	79 (37%)
Part time	Fewer minorities	136 (64%)
	More minorities	75 (36%)

[...]* = should be context dependent replaced by either women or minorities

Results

Student attrition, attrition rate, and number of J.D.s awarded are investigated via two lenses: (1) when there are more women in the faculty body than the average (including an overall analysis examining full-time and part-time faculty together as well as analyses separated into full-time and part-time faculty) and (2) when the faculty minority population is higher than the average (including an overall analysis examining full-time and part-time faculty together as well as analyses separated into full-time and part-time faculty).

The investigation reveals nuanced impacts of faculty composition on student outcomes within the realm of legal education, dissecting the roles of gender and racial diversity among faculty members. These findings not only enrich our understanding of attrition rate and number of J.D.s but also offer insights into the broader discourse on diversity, equity, and inclusion in legal academia.

A. The attrition

1. The Impact of More Women in the Faculty Body on Student Attrition

The presence of more women in the faculty body significantly influences student attrition rates, providing a compelling argument for the benefits of gender diversity within legal education. The findings, represented in Table S3, reveal a marked decrease in attrition rates across various student demographics when there are more women than the average in the faculty. Specifically, for male students, attrition rates decrease significantly from -8.8% to -4.3%, while for female students the reduction is from -10.2% to -6.5%. This trend underscores the positive impact of female faculty on reducing the likelihood of student dropout, suggesting that female faculty members play a crucial role in enhancing student engagement and success.

The benefits of increased female faculty presence are consistent across both full-time and part-time faculty scenarios, pointing to the robustness of gender diversity's positive effects. For full-time female faculty, attrition rates for men improve from -9% to -4.4%, and for women from -11.2% to -6.5%. In the context of part-time faculty, the attrition rates for male students decrease from -8.5% to -4.3%, and for female students from -10% to -6.6%. These statistics clearly demonstrate that the positive influence of female faculty on reducing student attrition is not contingent on their employment status, highlighting the universal need for more female representation in all faculty roles.

Moreover, the analysis extends to racial demographics, with both white Caucasian and minority students exhibiting lower attrition rates in environments with a higher proportion of female faculty. White Caucasian students see a reduction in attrition from -13.8% to -5%, and minority students from -4% to -2.7%. This indicates that female faculty members contribute to a more inclusive and supportive academic environment that benefits all students, irrespective of their gender or race.

The detailed breakdown of attrition rates by specific racial and gender groups further illustrates the impact of female faculty. White Caucasian men experience a decrease in attrition from -7.3% to -2%, and white Caucasian women from -5.5% to -2.8%. Among minority groups, Black/African American (B/AA) students' attrition rates decrease from -1.5% to -0.7%, and Hispanic/Latinx (H/L) students from -0.8% to -0.5%. These reductions highlight the nuanced ways in which female faculty presence can mitigate various forms of social identity threat and enhance the educational experience for diverse student populations.

Overall, the extensive data underscores the pivotal role that women faculty members play in reducing attrition rates among law students. These faculty members act as essential role models for students of all genders, breaking down stereotypes and overcoming the social and psychological hurdles that often lead to attrition. Additionally, the presence of women faculty contributes significantly to cultivating a learning atmosphere that embraces diversity and inclusion, essential for fostering a supportive and encouraging academic community. This influence spans various faculty roles and student groups, illustrating that enhancing female representation in the faculty is crucial not only for achieving gender equity but also as a strategic approach

for law schools aiming to boost student retention and success. By creating an environment that respects and upholds diverse student identities, law schools equip students more effectively to face the legal profession's demands, thereby fostering a more just and varied legal field.

2. The Impact of Minority Faculty Population on Student Attrition

The examination of the influence of a higher-than-average minority faculty population on student attrition reveals significant benefits across various student demographics, underscoring the essential role that racial diversity in faculty plays in fostering an inclusive educational setting. The data presented in Table S4 demonstrated that the overall attrition rates for both male and female students decrease markedly when the faculty body comprises more minorities than the average. Specifically, the attrition rates for male students decrease from -7.6% to -4.3%, and for female students, a reduction from -9.7% to -6.5% is observed. This trend suggests that minority faculty presence not only contributes to a reduction in dropout rates but also enhances the overall student engagement and success across genders.

This positive effect of minority faculty presence extends across employment statuses, with both full-time and part-time minority faculty members making a substantial impact. For instance, the attrition rates for male students decrease to -4.3% from -8.2% with more part-time minority faculty, and female students see their attrition rates reduce to -6.5% from -9.7%. These figures highlight the universal benefits of faculty racial diversity, regardless of the contractual nature of the faculty positions.

Furthermore, when examining the impact on different racial demographics, the presence of more minorities in the faculty leads to significantly lower attrition rates among white Caucasian students, from -12% to -5.2%, demonstrating that the benefits of minority faculty are not confined to minority students alone but extend to the entire student body. This reduction is even more pronounced when focusing on full-time minority faculty, with attrition rates for white Caucasian students decreasing further from -11.8% to -7.2%.

Additionally, the analysis delves into the specific impacts on various racial and gender student groups, illustrating nuanced benefits. White Caucasian men see their attrition rates lower from -6.4% to -2%, and white Caucasian women from -5.3% to -3.4%. Among minority groups, the attrition for Black/African American (B/AA) students drops from -1.5% to -0.7%, and Hispanic/Latinx (H/L) students from -0.8% to -0.5%. These results emphasize how minority faculty contribute to diminishing perceptions of social identity threats and foster a stronger sense of inclusion and academic involvement among students from diverse backgrounds.

The persistent decline in attrition across diverse faculty employment structures and student backgrounds underscores the essential need for increasing minority faculty representation within law schools. Such a strategy extends beyond fostering equity; it actively enhances student retention and success by cultivating an environment in which students encounter role

models who mirror their own identities. This inclusive setting enables law schools to more effectively prepare students to tackle the complexities of the legal profession, contributing significantly to a more just and inclusive legal community.

This detailed analysis not only illustrates the tangible effects of greater minority faculty representation in diminishing student attrition but also resonates with the principles of social identity and inclusion emphasized in diversity and belonging literature. The integration of minority faculty fosters a learning atmosphere that students perceive as more inclusive and supportive, which diminishes social identity threats and bolsters their sense of belonging. Such an environment promotes enhanced academic engagement and success, crucial for lowering attrition.

B. The attrition rates

The attrition rate (e.g., J.D. global attrition rate) represents either a gain or a loss in the delta population (in this particular population group) from the initial class. The delta is expressed as a percentage. If the attrition rate showed a positive result, it implies that the universities reported a higher number of students (in this population group) at the end of the cycle than at the beginning of the class (y-3 or y-4). However, if the attrition rate showed a negative result, it implies that the universities reported a lower number of students (in this population group) at the end of the cycle than at the beginning of the class (y-3 or y-4).

1. The Impact of More Women in the Faculty Body on Student Attrition Rates

The data presented in Table S5 vividly illustrate the significant impact that increased female representation within faculty has on reducing student attrition rates. This effect is not limited to one particular student demographic but spans across gender and racial boundaries, highlighting the universal benefits of such diversity. Delving deeper into the analysis of the data reveals that the presence of more women in faculty positions correlates with significant improvements in student retention metrics. For instance, male students benefit substantially from increased female faculty presence, with their attrition rates falling sharply from -11% in environments with less female representation to just -3.9% where women are more prevalent. This improvement is more pronounced in settings with part-time female faculty, where male attrition rates drop to 4.3%. Female students also see a noteworthy reduction in attrition rates, from -12.3% to -5.5%, with even lower rates (-5.8%) observed when part-time female faculty are considered. This trend highlights the role of female faculty as role models and mentors, particularly influential for female students navigating the academic landscape.

These trends hold true regardless of the employment status of the faculty, indicating that the positive effects of having more female faculty members affect both full-time and part-time roles. Such findings suggest that the mere presence of more women in teaching positions correlates strongly

with improved student retention rates, a key success indicator for academic programs.

When analyzing the impact on racial demographics, the benefits of female faculty diversity extend to both white Caucasian and minority students. White Caucasian students see their attrition rates decrease from -13.8% to -5%, while minority students experience a reduction from -4% to -2.7%. This trend holds consistent across full-time and part-time faculty scenarios, with minority students experiencing attrition rates as low as -3.1% with part-time female faculty. The effects are also significant when looking at specific minority groups. For example, African American students' attrition rates drop from -3.9% to as low as 1.5% when more women are part of the faculty. Hispanic/Latinx students see an even greater benefit, with their attrition rates improving dramatically from a negative rate to as high as 7.1% in environments rich with female faculty diversity.

These findings illustrate the profound impact that female faculty can have on enhancing student experiences and outcomes, particularly through the lens of diversity and inclusion. The broad spectrum of improvements across different student groups reinforces the necessity for academic institutions to invest in diverse faculty recruitment strategies that not only balance gender representation but also foster an academic environment in which all students can thrive. Such strategic diversity initiatives are crucial not just for improving retention rates but also for enriching the educational experience for every student, promoting a deeper sense of belonging and engagement within the student body.

2. The Impact of Minority Faculty Population on Student Attrition Rates

Table S6 highlights the significant positive impact that a higher representation of minority faculty has on reducing student attrition rates across various demographic categories. The presence of more minority faculty members is associated with notable decreases in attrition rates for both genders. For male students, attrition rates decrease from -8.5% to -3.5%, and for female students, the reduction is from -10.9% to -6.3%. These improvements are even more significant when considering full-time minority faculty, with male students' attrition rates dropping to -5.2% and female students to -7%. The influence extends to students of all races, with white Caucasian students seeing their attrition rates reduced from -9.6% to -4.2%, and minority students benefiting from a reduction from -8.5% to -2.6%. These effects are accentuated with part-time minority faculty, where white Caucasians' attrition rates improve to -3.8% and minorities' to -2.6%.

Focused analysis on individual racial groups reveals even more pronounced benefits. African American and Hispanic/Latinx students show a remarkable improvement in their attrition rates, with Hispanic/Latinx men, for instance, seeing an increase from negative rates to as high as 8.1%. This suggests that

minority faculty can significantly alter the educational landscape for students typically underrepresented in higher education.

These findings underscore the essential role that minority faculty play in enhancing the educational outcomes for all students, not just those from minority backgrounds. The broad improvement across different student demographics suggests that minority faculty members provide critical support, mentorship, and representation that help mitigate the challenges faced by students in navigating the academic environment. These findings hold significant implications for policy and practice in higher education. They advocate for the intentional recruitment and retention of minority faculty to not only reflect the demographic makeup of the student body but also to enhance the educational experience and success rates of all students. This approach aligns with broader educational theories that stress the importance of diversity and representation in creating supportive and inclusive academic environments. Such environments not only improve student retention but also prepare a more diverse student body to succeed professionally and personally after graduation, thereby enriching the societal fabric in meaningful ways.

C. J.D.s awarded

1. The Impact of More Women in the Faculty Body on J.D.s awarded

Table S7 illustrates a significant correlation between the increased representation of women in faculty positions and the uplift in J.D. degrees awarded to students across both gender and racial demographics. This suggests that female faculty members play a pivotal role in fostering an academic environment that supports the success of all students. Notably, male students benefited markedly with the presence of more female faculty, with the number of J.D. degrees awarded rising from 66.8 to 91.6, a substantial increase of 24.8 degrees. Similarly, female students saw an even more pronounced improvement, with degrees awarded escalating from 63.1 to 94.7, demonstrating a rise of 31.6 degrees.

This trend is echoed across racial categories, with white Caucasian students noting an increase in degrees from 98 to 122.8, reflecting a notable enhancement of 24.8 degrees. Minority students saw their degrees nearly double, with a significant rise from 27 to 55.2, showcasing a marked improvement in outcomes by 28.2 degrees. Furthermore, specific racial and gender groups also witnessed significant benefits. White Caucasian men experienced an increase in degrees awarded from 52.7 to 60.1. Although more modest relative to others, this increment underscores the positive impact of increased female faculty presence. White Caucasian women saw their degrees rise from 42.6 to 58.9, highlighting a substantial gain and the beneficial influence of female mentors.

Minority men saw their degrees awarded grow from 11.9 to 22.9, nearly doubling, which illustrates significant progress in educational attainment. Minority women experienced a remarkable increase from 15.1 to 32, more than doubling their output, which might suggest particularly strong mentorship ties with female faculty members that resonate across shared experiences of

navigating academic and professional landscapes as minorities. These findings are robust across both full-time and part-time faculty scenarios, indicating that the impact of gender diversity in faculty is profound and not contingent on employment status.

The demonstrated effectiveness of female faculty in elevating student success highlights the complexity of the roles they fulfill. Beyond teaching, they offer mentorship and serve as role models, addressing the unique challenges faced by groups traditionally underrepresented in legal education. This underscores the imperative for law schools to develop focused strategies for recruiting and retaining female faculty. Additionally, it points to the importance of providing these educators with continuous professional development to sustain their impact. By committing to these strategic initiatives, law schools can cultivate an educational atmosphere that is not only inclusive but also supportive and equitable, thereby enhancing the sense of community and advancing the academic and professional paths of all students.

2. The Impact of Minority Faculty Population on J.D.s awarded

The data presented in Table S8 reveal the positive impacts of increased minority faculty presence on J.D. degrees awarded across various demographic groups, suggesting that a diverse faculty body not only enriches the educational environment but significantly boosts academic success. Notably, both male and female students experience substantial increases in degrees awarded, with men's numbers rising from 68.5 to 93.6 and women's from 67.4 to 102.9. This enhancement is consistently observed across both full-time and part-time faculty roles, emphasizing the critical importance of sustaining diversity at all levels of academic employment.

The increase in J.D. degrees is particularly significant among minority students, whose numbers nearly triple from 27.1 to 73.1, contrasting with white Caucasian students, who also see an increase, albeit less dramatically, from 98 to 122.8. This disparity underscores the transformative impact that faculty diversity can have, particularly on minority student populations, by potentially providing relatable mentors and role models who can directly influence and enhance the academic and social environment.

Further analysis shows significant improvements across specific racial and gender groups. Minority men see their degrees awarded increase from 11.9 to 30.4, highlighting how increased minority representation in the faculty can significantly affect male minority students by potentially mitigating racial and gender biases. Minority women benefit even more, with their degrees awarded more than doubling from 15.1 to 42.7, suggesting that the presence of minority faculty is crucial in supporting minority female students against the dual challenges of racial and gender biases.

The positive impact of minority faculty is evident in both full-time and part-time structures, indicating that the influence of representation transcends traditional academic employment boundaries. For instance, part-time minority

faculty significantly enhance degree outcomes for men, increasing from 69.3 to 88.7, and for women, from 67.9 to 99.5.

This discussion underscores the profound benefits of enhancing both gender and racial diversity among faculty. Such diversity not only correlates with improved academic performance, particularly for underrepresented groups, but also cultivates a deep sense of community and belonging, essential for fostering student engagement and resilience.

Therefore, it is imperative for institutions to not only strive for diversity in hiring but also to support and retain diverse faculty members. This commitment will ensure the sustainability of these benefits and support a holistic educational experience. These strategies should extend beyond individual institutions and inspire broader policy changes within the education sector, promoting a comprehensive commitment to diversity and inclusion. This approach not only advances fairness and opportunities for all students but also equips them more robustly for diverse professional landscapes, thereby enhancing societal progress as a whole.

D. Bar passage

The findings from Tables S9 and S10 offer compelling evidence of the positive impact that increased faculty diversity—particularly the inclusion of more women and minorities—has on law students' bar passage rates. The analysis reveals that schools with a higher proportion of female faculty members see a significant improvement in the average first-time bar passage rate difference, which jumps from a slight negative average of -1.1% up to 5.5%. This suggests that female faculty may provide unique perspectives or pedagogical approaches that effectively prepare students for the bar. Furthermore, the overall first-time bar passage rates increase from 77.4% to 82.2% in the presence of more female faculty, emphasizing the broad impact of gender diversity on academic success.

Additionally, the number of students passing the bar on their first attempt significantly increases from eighty-five to 126.9 with more female faculty. This rise is observed consistently across full-time and part-time teaching staff, indicating that the presence of female faculty is beneficial regardless of their employment status. The rate of first-time passers also reflects this trend, increasing from 67.8% to 71.8%. These findings suggest that female faculty not only enhance students' learning experiences but also contribute to a supportive environment that encourages higher academic and professional achievements.

The influence of minority faculty on bar passage rates is similarly positive. Schools with a greater number of minority faculty members see an improvement in the first-time bar passage rate difference from 1.3% to 5.5%, with the effect magnifying to 6.5% under full-time minority faculty. The increase in actual passage rates to 82.5% from 77.5% further demonstrates that minority faculty members play a crucial role in student preparation and success. The specific data on first-time passers also strengthens this argument, with the number

increasing from 89.7 to 129.5, suggesting that minority faculty presence positively affects students' ability to pass the bar on their first try.

These findings underscore the significant benefits of fostering diversity within law school faculties, not just from a social justice perspective but also for the tangible academic advantages it provides to students. The presence of more diverse faculty members likely offers a range of mentorship opportunities and relatable role models for all students, particularly for those from minority backgrounds who may otherwise lack representation in legal education. This comprehensive support system, reflective of a diverse faculty body, not only aids in reducing potential barriers related to social identity and stereotypes but also enhances overall student confidence and competence in tackling the rigorous demands of the bar exam.

Discussion

Ongoing efforts to increase representation of women and minorities in the legal profession at all levels is slowed by the number of eligible candidates in the pipeline. Even a commitment to including 30% women and minorities in the candidate pool cannot make up for the reduced number of bar-passed women and minority lawyers and their attrition rate leaving the profession.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts in the legal profession have to consider the big picture and full length of the pipeline. Unless attention is paid to the law school experience, the factors contributing to academic success, and resulting bar passage rates, goals of hiring more women and minorities are not connected to the factors that make more underrepresented candidates available to be hired.

Given that SOBAS among law students drives student success, prevents dropout and attrition, increases student overall quality and opportunity, and increases bar passage, it becomes clear that DEI in the legal profession begins with a more representative faculty.

Faculty diversity builds students' sense of belonging. In the law school setting, as elsewhere, sense of belonging imparts a feeling of connection within the community. This primarily social component is connected to students' sense of support and importance to others. Students' interactions with peers and family⁶¹ are an important piece of their sense of being significant and supported; however, in the campus setting, relationships between students and faculty, students and students, and students' sense of classroom safety and comfort⁶² are seen as key drivers of their sense of belonging.

Investing in students' sense of belonging pays a dividend of increased persistence and higher numbers of J.D.s awarded. The desire to belong is a shared and common human need. The level and type of need varies from setting to setting and is partly determined by social identity. By responding

61 Hausmann, Schofield & Woods, *supra* note 4.

62 Esau Tovar & Merril A. Simon, *Factorial Structure and Invariance Analysis of the Sense of Belonging Scales*, 43 MEASUREMENT & EVALUATION COUNSELING & DEV. 199 (2010).

to the specific needs of their students, law schools shape the campus environment in ways that advantage all students and create positive outcomes for underrepresented law students. The actions and decisions of campus leadership help determine students' perceptions of their importance to others and support goals of increased student engagement and achievement.⁶³ Law schools that responsively integrate these elements of belonging into their policies and services become better positioned to realize institutional goals related to inclusion and student success.

The American Association of Colleges and Universities recommends prioritizing inclusion across functions. Colleges that took this approach confirmed the importance of supporting students' sense of belonging.⁶⁴ Efforts at inclusion in the admissions processes and student population should be matched by inclusion among faculty and staff. In fact, the reported sense of belonging among minority students may serve as a gauge of the institution's success at implementing the classroom and support service elements that bolster students' sense of belonging and foster inclusive excellence.⁶⁵ The pipeline from minority students admitted to minority students who are awarded J.D.s, pass the bar exam, and are available to be hired and promoted across the legal profession is shaped by the social effects of faculty demographic match and students' sense of belonging.

This study confirms that students' sense of belonging shapes their decisions to either persist or leave law school.⁶⁶ It reaffirms the link between academic achievement and the sense of belonging and firmly establishes the application to the law school environment. The benefits of student-faculty demographic match observed in secondary and postsecondary contexts, through decades of research, apply to the law school setting. As they struggle to meaningfully improve outcomes for women and minorities in law school and in the legal profession, leaders and administrators can embed into their schools' policies and services options and behaviors that foster a sense of belonging. Faculty interventions that support students' need to feel important to others can represent one such policy or service. They also provide a snapshot of students' sense of belonging.⁶⁷ Faculty availability to discuss students' problems impacts

63 TERRELL L. STRAYHORN, COLLEGE STUDENTS' SENSE OF BELONGING: A KEY TO EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS FOR ALL STUDENTS (2012).

64 Tovar & Simon, *supra* note 62.

65 STRAYHORN, *supra* note 63.

66 Jeff Allen, Steven B. Robbins, Alex Casillas & In-Sue Oh, *Third-year College Retention and Transfer: Effects of Academic Performance, Motivation, and Social Connectedness*, 49 RSCH. HIGHER EDUC. 647 (2008); Hausmann, Schofield & Woods, *supra* note 4; John M. Braxton, Jeffrey F. Milem & Anna Shaw Sullivan, *The Influence of Active Learning on the College Student Departure Process: Toward a Revision of Tinto's Theory*, 71 J. HIGHER EDUC. 569 (2000).

67 2 ERNEST T. PASCARELLA, HOW COLLEGE AFFECTS STUDENT: A THIRD DECADE OF RESEARCH (1st ed. 2005).

the latter's decision to persist in law school and increases the number of J.D.s awarded.

In addition to one-on-one interactions with faculty, classroom learning experiences also determine students' sense of belonging. Here also, strategic behaviors on the part of faculty exert significant influence. Through the manner in which they interact with students, faculty can transmit that they care about them.⁶⁸ This faculty behavior establishes students' sense of importance to others and is a factor in students' willingness to speak in the classroom. Faculty can be trained and directed to apply these behavioral strategies. When instructors partner with students and draw them into the learning process, it empowers students, increases their sense of competence, develops their motivation, and makes them feel that their participation matters.⁶⁹ When installed in law schools' policy and pedagogic strategy, these actions become integral to students' sense of belonging. They have a ripple effect that is felt more immediately in the form of academic achievement and persistence through to J.D.s awarded, and further into the future in the form of bar passage and the number of women and minorities hired in the legal profession and available to be hired or promoted into leadership roles.

This sense of belonging cascades along the path from law school recruitment and admission to high-level leadership roles in the legal profession. Further, this sense can be fostered by faculty choices and strategies. Law schools can better foster inclusion by recognizing and rewarding these supportive interventions. Their frequency of use and outcomes can be embedded into faculty evaluations. Questions about their use of specific actions and interventions would allow faculty to reflect on their contributions to this important dynamic. It should remind them of the important role they play in student success, bar passage, and the broad, shared goal of improving outcomes for women and minorities in the legal profession.

In addition to designing and prescribing strategic faculty behaviors, law schools must consider the importance of student-faculty demographic match. It is a core and indispensable driver of students' sense of belonging and other elements that support student achievement in and beyond law school. Through the presence of demographically matched faculty, women and minority students encounter identity cues and experience a greater sense of social safety. Through the availability of female and minority role models, students are offered evidence that bias can be overcome. It helps alleviate identity threat and fosters the essential sense of belonging. In this way, demographic match can build trust and reduce the negative effects associated with encountering gender and racial bias.

68 Scott A. Myers, *The Relationship Between Perceived Instructor Credibility and College Student In-Class and Out-of-Class Communication*, 17 COMMUN REPS. 129 (2004).

69 Marian L. Houser & Ann Bainbridge Frymier, *The Role of Student Characteristics and Teacher Behaviors in Students' Learner Empowerment*, 58 COMMUN EDUC. 35 (2009).⁵⁸ {\scaps Communication education} 35 (2009)

Students who are engaging and purchasing the complex service/product of a legal education have a reasonable right to proportionally encounter a demographic match among the faculty and staff. The psychological importance and the documented connection to the quality of law school and post-law school experiences should make faculty demographic match a prioritized DEI initiative. Without configuring the law school experience to equally serve all students, advocates of inclusion and equity will struggle to build the critical mass of women and minorities needed to shift the numbers in the profession.

Undertaking the effort to create a faculty that demographically matches its student populations, law schools will almost passively trigger changes that have eluded the legal profession.

Future Research Directions

While the current study provides substantial insights into the impact of faculty diversity on law student outcomes, it also presents several avenues for further investigation. The exploration of faculty diversity encompasses complex dynamics that merit deeper examination across various contexts. Firstly, future research could expand the demographic scope to include other underrepresented groups in legal academia, such as LGBTQ+ faculty members, and assess how their representation influences student success metrics. This expansion would provide a more comprehensive understanding of diversity and its implications within law schools. Additionally, longitudinal studies would be valuable to track the long-term effects of faculty diversity on student outcomes, particularly looking at career success postgraduation. Such studies could help in understanding whether the initial benefits observed in law school persist into professional practice and contribute to broader changes in the legal profession. Another important area for future research involves investigating the mechanisms through which faculty diversity affects student outcomes. While this study indicates positive correlations, understanding the underlying processes—such as mentorship styles, curriculum changes, and classroom dynamics—could provide actionable insights for law schools aiming to optimize their educational strategies. Finally, comparative studies across different law schools with varying levels of diversity could shed light on the contextual factors that enhance or inhibit the benefits of a diverse faculty. Such comparative analysis could lead to more tailored diversity policies that consider specific institutional characteristics and student demographics.

REFERENCES

APPENDIX

List of tables:

Table 1: Faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicities (FT/PT)

Table 2: Percentage of faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicities (FT/PT)

Table 3: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (student attrition)

Table 4: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (student attrition)

Table 5: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (attrition rate)

Table 6: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (attrition rate)

Table 7: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (J.D.s awarded)

Table 8: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (J.D.s awarded)

Table 9: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (bar passage)

Table 10: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (bar passage)

APPENDIX

Mathematical modeling:

Attrition is identified as the delta between the number of 1L students enrolled and the number of students of the same incoming class receiving a J.D. at $N+3$. Let's define $\overline{D}(y)$ as the student population having a degree awarded (degree awarded student population) during the academic year y and $\overline{N}(y)$ the first-year enrolled student (1L population/new students) during the academic year y . The delta $\overline{\Delta S}(y)$ between the number of students (1L student population) enrolled in (year $y-3$) and the number of degrees awarded to students (Degree awarded student population) per universities during the academic year y is defined as follow: $\overline{\Delta S}(y) = \overline{D}(y) - \overline{N}(y-3)$. The attrition rate $\overline{\rho S}(y)$ is defined as the delta $\overline{\Delta S}(y)$ between the number of students enrolled (1L student population) and the number of degrees awarded to students divided per the initial number of students enrolled (1L student population) per universities during the academic year y . The equation is defined as follows: $\overline{\rho S}(y) = \frac{\overline{\Delta S}(y)}{\overline{N}(y-3)} \times 100$. The bar passage per school is

analyzed by overall characteristics and not by student race and gender. The following variables are used: average first-time bar passage rate difference, average first-time bar passage rate, first-time passers and first-time passers rate.

Table 1: Faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicities (FT/PT)

SI Appendix Table S1 shows the faculty demographics repartition by categories (full time or part time or all included) and by gender (men and/or women) and by ethnicities (white Caucasian and/or minorities)

Period	Race	Gender	N*	Percentage*
All			101 [71, 158]	
		Men	63 [42, 100]	60% [55, 65]
		Women	43 [27, 62]	39% [34, 44]
	White		87 [55, 139]	87% [82, 90]
	Minorities		14 [8, 25]	13% [10, 17]
Full time			44 [30, 57]	
		Men	23 [16, 31]	54% [48, 61]
		Women	20 [13, 26]	45% [39, 51]
	White		34 [23, 47]	82% [77, 87]
	Minorities		8 [4, 13]	17% [12, 22]
Part time			61 [38, 101]	
		Men	41 [24, 65]	64% [57, 71]
		Women	22 [12, 36]	34% [28, 41]
	White		53 [30, 91]	89% [83, 93]
	Minorities		6 [3, 14]	10% [6, 15]

* = Median [1st Qu., 3rd Qu.]; rounded to the nearest whole number.

Table 2: Percentage of faculty demographics repartition by categories and by gender and by ethnicities (FT/PT)

SI Appendix Table S2 shows the percentile of the faculty demographics repartition by categories (full time or part time or all included) and by gender (men and/or women) and by ethnicities (white Caucasian and/or minorities)

	More/Less [...] * than the average in the faculty body	N (Percent%)
All	Fewer women	113 (54%)
	More women	98 (46%)
Full time	Fewer women	104 (49%)
	More women	107 (51%)
Part time	Fewer women	127 (60%)
	More women	84 (40%)
<hr/>		
All	Fewer minorities	135 (64%)
	More minorities	76 (36%)
Full time	Fewer minorities	132 (63%)
	More minorities	79 (37%)
Part time	Fewer minorities	136 (64%)
	More minorities	75 (36%)

[...]* = should be context dependent replaced by either women or minorities

Table 3: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (student attrition)

Race	Gender	More women than the average	More women than the average	More women than the average
		in the faculty body	in the faculty body (FT)	in the faculty body (PT)
	Men	-4.3 [-12.8;2.5] vs -8.8 [-16.7;-3.8]***	-4.4 [-13.7;1.1] vs -9 [-15.8;-3.9]***	-4.3 [-12.7;2.4] vs -8.5 [-16.7;-3.6]***
	Women	-6.5 [-15.3;0.7] vs -10.2 [-17.7;-5.7]***	-6.5 [-14.9;0.5] vs -11.2 [-18.3;-5.7]***	-6.6 [-15;0.2] vs -10 [-17.8;-5]**
White Caucasian		-5 [-17.2;2] vs -13.8 [-25.7;-7.8]***	-7.5 [-17.8;0.6] vs -13.1 [-23;-6.2]***	-5.2 [-17.5;0.8] vs -12.7 [-23.3;-5]***
Minorities		-2.7 [-8.5;1.3] vs -4 [-12.5;-1.3]**	-2.6 [-9.1;0.6] vs -4.4 [-9.7;-1.5]**	-2.6 [-8.5;0.8] vs -3.9 [-10.9;-1.1]**
White Caucasian	Men	-2 [-9.8;1.7] vs -7.3 [-12.8;-3.3]***	-2.8 [-10.3;1.5] vs -7 [-12.3;-2.2]***	-2 [-10.1;1.6] vs -6.8 [-12.2;-2.2]***
	Women	-2.8 [-8.5;1.3] vs -5.5 [-9.8;-3]***	-4 [-8.5;-0.3] vs -5.5 [-9.8;-2.8]**	-3.8 [-8.4;0.1] vs -5.2 [-9.9;-2.6]**
Minorities	Men	-1.2 [-4.2;1.2] vs -2 [-4.2;-0.7]***	-1.2 [-4.2;0.8] vs -2.1 [-4.2;-0.5]*	-1.3 [-3.8;1.2] vs -2 [-4.7;-0.5]**
	Women	-1.5 [-5;0.5] vs -2.3 [-4.7;-0.5]	-1.4 [-5.2;0.6] vs -2.4 [-4.5;-0.8]	-1.5 [-4.9;0.1] vs -2.3 [-5.2;0]
American Indian/ Alaska Native		-0.2 [-0.5;0.2] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0]	-0.2 [-0.7;0] vs -0.2 [-0.5;0.2]	-0.2 [-0.5;0.2] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0]
Asian		-1.5 [-2.8;0.2] vs -0.8 [-2.8;-0.2]	-1.2 [-3;0.2] vs -0.9 [-2;-0.3]	-1.2 [-2.8;0.2] vs -1.2 [-2.9;0.2]
Black/ African American		-0.7 [-1.8;0.2] vs -1.5 [-3.5;-0.2]**	-0.7 [-1.8;0.2] vs -1.7 [-3.6;-0.2]**	-0.7 [-1.8;0.3] vs -1.5 [-4.2;-0.2]***
Hispanic/ Latinx		-0.5 [-2;1.3] vs -0.8 [-3.7;0.2]**	-0.5 [-2.4;1.2] vs -0.8 [-3.4;0.2]	-0.6 [-2.1;1] vs -0.8 [-3.5;0.3]
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander		0 [-0.2;0.2] vs 0 [-0.2;0]	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [-0.2;0]	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [-0.2;0]
Two or more races		-0.2 [-1.3;0.7] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.5]	-0.2 [-1.3;0.8] vs -0.4 [-1.4;0.3]*	-0.3 [-1.7;0.7] vs -0.2 [-1.3;0.7]

Unknown race		-1.3 [-4;-0.2] vs -1.3 [-3.7;-0.3]	-1.3 [-3.8;-0.2] vs -1.3 [-3.2;-0.3]	-1.5 [-4.4;-0.2] vs -1.3 [-3;-0.3]
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Men	0 [-0.3;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]	0 [-0.3;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]	0 [-0.3;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]
	Women	0 [-0.3;0] vs -0.2 [-0.5;0]**	-0.2 [-0.5;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]	0 [-0.3;0] vs -0.2 [-0.5;0]*
Asian	Men	-0.5 [-1.3;0.3] vs -0.5 [-1.2;-0.2]	-0.5 [-1.5;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.2;-0.1]	-0.4 [-1.2;0.3] vs -0.7 [-1.3;0]
	Women	-0.8 [-2;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.5;0]	-0.8 [-2.2;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.2;-0.2]	-0.6 [-2;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.7;-0.1]
Black/ African American	Men	-0.3 [-0.8;0.5] vs -0.7 [-1.3;-0.2]**	-0.3 [-1.2;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.3;0]	-0.3 [-0.8;0.4] vs -0.5 [-1.3;0]**
	Women	-0.5 [-1.8;0.3] vs -0.7 [-2.2;0]	-0.5 [-1.5;0.3] vs -0.8 [-2.2;0]*	-0.3 [-1.3;0.5] vs -0.8 [-2.2;0]***
Hispanic/ Latinx	Men	0 [-1;0.8] vs -0.5 [-1.7;0.3]***	-0.2 [-1;0.8] vs -0.3 [-1.5;0.3]*	0 [-1;0.7] vs -0.5 [-1.5;0.3]**
	Women	-0.3 [-1.3;1] vs -0.4 [-1.8;0.3]	-0.4 [-1.5;0.8] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.3]	-0.4 [-1.3;0.8] vs -0.3 [-1.7;0.4]
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander	Men	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]
	Women	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [-0.1;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]
Two or more races	Men	0 [-0.8;0.5] vs -0.3 [-0.8;0]*	-0.2 [-0.7;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.8;0]	-0.2 [-0.8;0.3] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0.2]
	Women	0 [-1;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.8;0]	0 [-0.8;0.6] vs -0.2 [-0.8;0]*	-0.1 [-1;0.3] vs -0.1 [-0.7;0.3]
Unknown race	Men	-0.7 [-1.8;0] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]	-0.7 [-2;0] vs -0.7 [-1.7;0]	-0.8 [-1.8;0] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]
	Women	-0.8 [-1.7;0] vs -0.5 [-1.7;0]	-0.6 [-1.7;0.2] vs -0.6 [-1.7;0]	-0.8 [-1.8;0] vs -0.5 [-1.7;0]

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

Table 4: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (student attrition)

Race	Gender	More minorities than the average in the faculty body	More minorities than the average in the faculty body (FT)	More minorities than the average in the faculty body (PT)
	Men	-4.3 [-17;2.9] vs -7.6 [-13.4;-3]*	-5.5 [-17.6;2.8] vs -7.1 [-13.2;-2.8]	-4.3 [-16.7;3] vs -8.2 [-13.7;-3.2]**
	Women	-6.8 [-22.7;0.6] vs -9.5 [-16.4;-5]	-6.8 [-24;0.5] vs -9.2 [-16.3;-4.8]	-6.5 [-18.2;0.7] vs -9.7 [-17;-5]*
White Caucasian		-5.2 [-19.2;0.8] vs -12 [-22.5;-4.8]***	-7.2 [-19.5;0.8] vs -11.8 [-21.5;-4.7]**	-5 [-17.2;1] vs -12 [-22.7;-5]***
Minorities		-3.2 [-15.6;2.9] vs -3.8 [-7.4;-0.8]	-3.3 [-17;1.6] vs -3.7 [-7.3;-0.5]	-2.2 [-12.7;3] vs -3.8 [-8.5;-1]
White Caucasian	Men	-2 [-10.8;1.6] vs -6.4 [-11.1;-2]**	-2.4 [-11;1.6] vs -6.3 [-10.6;-2]**	-2 [-10.2;1.7] vs -6.7 [-11.3;-2]***
	Women	-3.4 [-8.6;0] vs -5.3 [-9.8;-2.7]**	-3.8 [-8.8;0] vs -5.2 [-9.5;-2.7]**	-3.2 [-8.2;0] vs -5.3 [-9.8;-2.7]***
Minorities	Men	-1.4 [-6.2;1.7] vs -1.7 [-3.5;-0.3]	-1.8 [-6.8;1.5] vs -1.5 [-3;-0.1]	-1.2 [-5;1.7] vs -1.7 [-3.8;-0.5]
	Women	-1.7 [-8.5;1.2] vs -1.7 [-4.2;-0.5]	-1.9 [-9.5;1] vs -1.7 [-4;-0.3]	-1.5 [-7.2;1.3] vs -2 [-4.5;-0.5]
American Indian/Alaska Native		-0.2 [-0.6;0.2] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0]	-0.2 [-0.5;0] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0]	-0.2 [-0.5;0.2] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0]
Asian		-1.7 [-3.7;0.1] vs -0.9 [-2;-0.1]	-1.7 [-3.7;0.1] vs -1 [-2;0]	-1.3 [-3;0.3] vs -1.2 [-2.8;-0.3]
Black/African American		-0.7 [-2.2;0.2] vs -1.2 [-3.2;-0.1]	-1 [-3.4;0.2] vs -1.1 [-2.9;-0.2]	-0.8 [-2.5;0.2] vs -1.2 [-3.2;0]
Hispanic/Latinx		-0.9 [-4;1.9] vs -0.7 [-2.2;0.3]	-1 [-4;1.3] vs -0.7 [-2;0.3]	-0.7 [-2.7;1.7] vs -0.8 [-3;0.3]
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander		0 [-0.2;0.2] vs 0 [-0.2;0]	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [-0.2;0]	0 [-0.2;0.2] vs 0 [-0.2;0]
Two or more races		-0.2 [-2.1;0.8] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.7]	-0.2 [-1.5;0.7] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.7]	-0.2 [-2.2;0.8] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.7]
Unknown race		-1.3 [-3.9;-0.2] vs -1.3 [-3.2;-0.3]	-1.3 [-3.7;-0.2] vs -1.3 [-3.7;-0.3]	-1.3 [-4;-0.2] vs -1.3 [-3.7;-0.3]

American Indian/ Alaska Native	Men	0 [-0.3;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]	0 [-0.3;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]	0 [-0.3;0] vs 0 [-0.3;0]*
	Women	0 [-0.3;0] vs -0.2 [-0.5;0]	-0.2 [-0.5;0] vs -0.2 [-0.5;0]	0 [-0.3;0] vs -0.2 [-0.5;0]
Asian	Men	-0.5 [-1.5;0.3] vs -0.5 [-1.2;-0.2]	-0.5 [-1.5;0.3] vs -0.5 [-1.2;-0.1]	-0.3 [-1.2;0.5] vs -0.7 [-1.3;-0.2]*
	Women	-1 [-3;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.2;0]	-0.8 [-2.5;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.3;0]	-0.8 [-2.5;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.7;-0.2]
Black/ African American	Men	-0.3 [-1;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.3;0]	-0.4 [-1.1;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.2;0]	-0.3 [-1;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.3;0]
	Women	-0.5 [-2.1;0.3] vs -0.7 [-1.9;0]	-0.5 [-2.2;0.3] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]	-0.5 [-2.2;0.3] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]
Hispanic/ Latinx	Men	0.1 [-2.1;1] vs -0.3 [-1;0.3]	-0.3 [-2.1;1.2] vs -0.3 [-1;0.3]	0.2 [-1.3;1] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.3]*
	Women	-0.5 [-3.4;1.1] vs -0.3 [-0.9;0.4]	-0.7 [-3.4;1] vs -0.3 [-0.9;0.5]	-0.3 [-1.5;1] vs -0.3 [-1.3;0.3]
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander	Men	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [0;0]
	Women	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [-0.2;0] vs 0 [0;0]
Two or more races	Men	-0.2 [-1;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0.2]	-0.2 [-0.8;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0.2]	0 [-0.8;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.7;0.2]
	Women	0 [-0.9;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.8;0]	0 [-0.6;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.8;0.2]	0 [-1;0.5] vs -0.2 [-0.8;0.2]
Unknown race	Men	-0.6 [-1.8;0] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]	-0.6 [-1.8;0] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]	-0.5 [-1.7;0] vs -0.7 [-1.8;0]
	Women	-0.6 [-1.7;0.1] vs -0.6 [-1.7;0]	-0.5 [-1.7;0] vs -0.7 [-1.7;0]	-0.7 [-1.7;0.2] vs -0.5 [-1.7;0]

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

**Table 5: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT)
(attrition rate)**

Race	Gender	More women than the average	More women than the average	More women than the average
		in the faculty body	in the faculty body (FT)	in the faculty body (PT)
	Men	-3.9% [-12.9;3.9] vs -11% [-21.7;- 3.4]***	-3.7% [-12.8;3] vs -12.3% [-21.5;- 4.7]***	-4.3% [-12.8;3.8] vs -9.8% [-21.2;- 2.6]***
	Women	-5.5% [-12.1;1.8] vs -12.3% [-21.4;- 7.3]***	-7% [-12.1;1.3] vs -14% [-21;-7.7]***	-5.8% [-13.2;1.1] vs -11% [-21;- 5.8]***
White Caucasian		-3.6% [-12.6;3.4] vs -11.9% [-21.8;- 4.7]***	-4.5% [-13.2;1] vs -12.4% [-20.5;- 4]***	-2.8% [-11.7;2.1] vs -11.5% [-21.5;- 4.2]***
Minorities		-2.6% [-11;6.2] vs -9.8% [-21.6;1.4]***	-2.5% [-10.8;5.9] vs -11.2% [-21.5;- 0.5]***	-3.1% [-11.5;6.4] vs -8.7% [-21.4;2.7]***
White Caucasian	Men	-2.1% [-14.2;4.1] vs -11.1% [-20.9;- 3.4]***	-3.4% [-14.1;3.8] vs -10.7% [-20.4;- 2.7]***	-1% [-11.4;4.4] vs -10.2% [-20.4;- 2.7]***
	Women	-4.5% [-12.2;3.6] vs -8.5% [-20;- 4]***	-5.1% [-12.3;2.3] vs -9.7% [-19.9;- 2.8]***	-4.5% [-12.1;3.1] vs -8.2% [-19.9;- 2.8]***
Minorities	Men	-2.8% [-12.1;10.2] vs -11.5% [-19.7;4.1]***	-1.1% [-12.5;8.3] vs -11.8% [-19.7;4.3]***	-3.9% [-12.1;10.6] vs -9.5% [-18.3;4.7]**
	Women	-2.7% [-10.8;5.9] vs -9.2% [-21.3;2.8]***	-2.3% [-11.4;6.1] vs -9.2% [-19.7;- 0.3]***	-2.7% [-11;5.4] vs -8% [-19.7;4.2]**
American Indian/ Alaska Native		0% [-16.7;16.7] vs 0% [-25;8.3]	0% [-20.6;16.7] vs 0% [-21.9;16.7]	0% [-16.7;16.7] vs 0% [-25;8.3]*
Asian		-1.8% [-10.3;17.5] vs -9.7% [-25;12.1]***	-2.8% [-12.9;16.9] vs -8.2% [-23.3;11.4]**	0.9% [-8.9;17.6] vs -9.4% [-23.5;11.4]***
Black/ African American		1.5% [-8.3;11.6] vs -3.9% [-20.8;13.8]**	1.3% [-9.1;11.4] vs -5.4% [-20.8;16.9]*	4.6% [-8.1;16.1] vs -3.6% [-19.6;10.4]**
Hispanic/ Latinx		7.1% [-2.9;26.7] vs 1.9% [-16;20.8]**	7% [-4.5;26.6] vs 1.5% [-13.5;17.1]*	6.5% [-3.6;26.1] vs 3.3% [-15.5;21.7]*

Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander		0% [-16.7;16.7] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [-16.7;6.2] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [-8.3;6.2] vs 0% [-16.7;0]
Two or more races		12.5% [-4.3;35.6] vs 0.3% [-13.3;33.3]	15.7% [-2.6;37.7] vs 0% [-16.7;25.5]**	12.3% [-8;37.6] vs 5.2% [-6.4;33.3]
Unknown race		-5.2% [-26.7;13.2] vs -13.1% [-31.1;9]	-5.4% [-30.5;16.7] vs -12.2% [-26.1;5.8]	-5.3% [-24.4;11.9] vs -13.5% [-30.7;11.1]
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Men	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [-25;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [-16.7;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [-16.7;0]
	Women	0% [-16.7;0] vs -16.7% [-27.8;0]**	-8.3% [-33.3;0] vs -0.1% [-16.7;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs -16.7% [-30.2;0]***
Asian	Men	-1.7% [-15.9;16.7] vs -16.7% [-33.3;8.3]***	-2.5% [-22.1;16.6] vs -13.9% [-30.6;7.4]**	-0.3% [-15.9;16.1] vs -16.7% [-31.3;8.8]***
	Women	0.3% [-12.4;18.1] vs -4.2% [-24.1;8.3]**	-2.4% [-17;19.5] vs 0% [-19.6;9.8]	0.8% [-10.9;18.1] vs -4.2% [-24.7;9.8]**
Black/ African American	Men	5.6% [-8.3;21.4] vs -6.2% [-20.8;16.7]***	1.3% [-11.9;20.4] vs -0.6% [-18;20.6]	4.9% [-9.7;21.3] vs -3.2% [-18.3;16.8]*
	Women	0% [-11.3;16.6] vs -4.4% [-22.4;13.9]*	0.5% [-11.3;15] vs -5% [-22.7;15.8]	2% [-10.7;20.9] vs -4.4% [-21.2;10.2]**
Hispanic/ Latinx	Men	8.9% [-4.8;32.9] vs 0% [-16.7;22.2]**	9.2% [-5;32.9] vs -3.2% [-16.7;19.9]***	8.1% [-5.3;35.1] vs 1.7% [-16.7;23.3]*
	Women	8.5% [-3.5;30.2] vs 3% [-22.2;25]**	6.1% [-10.3;28.5] vs 3.5% [-15.9;25]	8.4% [-5.9;27.8] vs 3.5% [-20;26.2]
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander	Men	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]
	Women	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [-6.2;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]

Two or more races	Men	7.5% [-8.3;33.3] vs 0% [-16.7;16.7]**	7.5% [-15.6;33.1] vs 0% [-16.7;16.7]**	5.2% [-15.3;37.2] vs 0% [-16.7;17.9]*
	Women	6.4% [-11.1;30.6] vs 0% [-16.7;25.5]	8.8% [-7;33.3] vs 0% [-16.7;18.3]***	2.6% [-13.9;26.5] vs 0% [-14.5;28.7]
Unknown race	Men	0% [-21.5;18.3] vs -4.4% [-33.3;11.4]*	0% [-22.2;19.8] vs -9.7% [-33.3;11.4]*	-0.9% [-21;16.8] vs -2.5% [-32.2;14.2]
	Women	-3% [-26.2;13.9] vs 0% [-29.2;10.4]	0% [-27.8;16.9] vs -5.8% [-28.3;3.4]*	-3.2% [-20.2;16] vs 0% [-37.5;9.7]

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

Table 6: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (attrition rate)

Race	Gender	More minorities than the average	More minorities than the average	More minorities than the average
		in the faculty body	in the faculty body (FT)	in the faculty body (PT)
	Men	-3.5% [-15.9;4.4] vs -8.5% [-18;- 2.5]**	-5.2% [-16.2;4.1] vs -8.2% [-18;-2]*	-3.6% [-15.6;3.4] vs -8.8% [-19.5;- 2.6]***
	Women	-6.3% [-14.2;1.9] vs -10.9% [-19.3;- 5.4]**	-7% [-17.2;1.7] vs -10.9% [-19.6;- 5.3]**	-5.4% [-14.2;1.8] vs -10.9% [-20;- 5.6]***
White Caucasian		-4.2% [-15.5;2.1] vs -9.6% [-18.1;- 2.9]**	-5.4% [-15.5;2.4] vs -9.6% [-18.1;- 3.1]**	-3.8% [-15.5;2.8] vs -9.6% [-18.3;- 3]**
Minorities		-3.6% [-14.5;5.8] vs -7.8% [-18.9;2.9]	-4.1% [-15.7;4.3] vs -8.1% [-18.9;4.1]	-2.6% [-12.7;5.6] vs -8.5% [-20.5;2.9]*
White Caucasian	Men	-3.1% [-17.3;5.6] vs -8.2% [-17.3;- 1.2]**	-2.8% [-17.3;4] vs -8.2% [-17.3;- 1.6]**	-2.2% [-17.1;4.5] vs -8.3% [-18.8;- 1.6]***
	Women	-4.6% [-15.8;2.9] vs -7.5% [-16.8;- 2.3]	-4.9% [-16.3;2.9] vs -7.3% [-17.1;- 2.4]	-4.5% [-15.6;3.3] vs -7.9% [-17.5;- 2.4]*
Minorities	Men	-2.8% [-14.1;7.8] vs -8% [-16.7;7.8]	-4.1% [-14.5;7.3] vs -8% [-16.4;8.4]	-1% [-13.1;8.5] vs -8.4% [-16.7;6.2]
	Women	-3.3% [-15.8;5.7] vs -6.4% [-17.8;3.7]	-3.9% [-16.4;5.3] vs -6.4% [-17.1;3.7]	-2.7% [-11.4;5.4] vs -6.5% [-19.1;4.3]
American Indian/ Alaska Native		0% [-17.9;16.7] vs 0% [-25;8.5]	0% [-17.9;16.7] vs 0% [-25;16.7]	0% [-16.7;16.7] vs 0% [-25;8.3]
Asian		-4.6% [-15.1;11.7] vs -4.5% [-21.1;17.9]	-4.6% [-16.6;11.7] vs -4.5% [-21.1;17.9]	-1.8% [-11.2;13.3] vs -6% [-21.5;16.7]
Black/ African American		-0.7% [-11.9;9.7] vs -0.2% [-17.4;14.5]	-1.1% [-12.4;11.4] vs 0% [-16.8;12.8]	-1.1% [-12.5;11.6] vs 0% [-18.3;12.9]
Hispanic/ Latinx		3.3% [-10.7;19.4] vs 4.6% [-10.1;24.4]	3.3% [-11;23.2] vs 5.1% [-9.5;22.5]	5.8% [-5.3;21.2] vs 3.9% [-12.1;22.7]

Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander		0% [-16.7;16.7] vs 0% [-2.8;0]	0% [-12.8;10.4] vs 0% [-16.7;0]	0% [-11.1;16.7] vs 0% [-16.7;0]
Two or more races		16.4% [-1;33.8] vs 3.8% [-10.8;34.4]	12.1% [-2.5;33.8] vs 6.4% [-14.7;34.4]	12.5% [-2.8;33.3] vs 4.4% [-10.4;35.5]
Unknown race		-6.2% [-33.9;12.2] vs -6.8% [-24.6;11.1]	-11.8% [-30.8;13] vs -5.4% [-25;10.6]	-5.4% [-31.2;12.3] vs -11.5% [-28.8;10.8]
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>				
American Indian/Alaska Native	Men	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [-16.7;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [-16.7;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [-20.8;0]
	Women	0% [-16.7;4.2] vs -13% [-28.1;0]**	0% [-28.1;0] vs -8.3% [-19.8;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs -11.4% [-29.2;0]
Asian	Men	-1.1% [-18.8;16.1] vs -13.2% [-31.3;11.2]**	-0.9% [-20.1;16.4] vs -12.4% [-31.3;8.3]**	0% [-15.6;18.8] vs -15.3% [-30.6;8.3]***
	Women	-4.8% [-16.8;12.2] vs 0% [-18.1;17.2]	-6.5% [-21.1;12.2] vs 0% [-16.7;16.7]	0% [-14.9;13.6] vs -1.7% [-19.2;16.7]
Black/African American	Men	2.9% [-11.3;20.8] vs -1.1% [-17.8;18.1]	0% [-11.9;17.9] vs 0% [-17.8;21]	1.6% [-8.3;20.8] vs -1.1% [-18.7;17.3]*
	Women	-0.5% [-11.3;11.5] vs -3% [-20.6;16.7]	0% [-11.3;14.3] vs -3.1% [-21.2;15.7]	-1.6% [-11.3;13.5] vs -0.8% [-20.4;16.7]
Hispanic/Latinx	Men	7.4% [-10.5;29] vs 1.7% [-12.9;26.5]	6.2% [-10.2;28.9] vs 1.7% [-15.6;26.5]	7.9% [-10.3;30.2] vs 1.1% [-14;26.4]
	Women	3.5% [-11.4;24.4] vs 5.5% [-14.6;29.2]	5.3% [-11.9;23.9] vs 4.6% [-14;29.2]	6.2% [-6.4;27.4] vs 3.6% [-16.7;25.9]
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander	Men	0% [-14.6;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [-16.7;0] vs 0% [0;0]
	Women	0% [-9.6;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]	0% [0;0] vs 0% [0;0]
Two or more races	Men	0.1% [-10.6;30.4] vs 0% [-16.7;22.9]	1.2% [-8.3;27.4] vs 0% [-16.7;25]	0% [-8.3;30] vs 0% [-16.7;22.2]
	Women	7.7% [0;28] vs 0% [-16.7;26.9]**	8.8% [0;28] vs 0% [-16.7;26]**	6.7% [-2.2;29.4] vs 0% [-16.7;25.9]

Unknown race	Men	-1.1% [-28.2;12.6] vs -1.8% [-27.7;16.4]	-0.7% [-22.2;17] vs -4.3% [-30.8;16]	-0.4% [-25;15.3] vs -1.9% [-30.5;16.2]
	Women	-1.5% [-30.2;13.7] vs 0% [-27.8;9.9]	0% [-27.4;16] vs -3.5% [-28.3;8.6]	0% [-26.2;19.3] vs -2.1% [-29.2;8.3]

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

Table 7: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (J.D.s awarded)

Race	Gender	More women than the average	More women than the average	More women than the average
		in the faculty body	in the faculty body (FT)	in the faculty body (PT)
	Men	91.6 [69.4;114.3] vs 66.8 [47;99.9]***	91.6 [71;113.9] vs 63.4 [46.1;98.9]***	85.9 [66.6;112.3] vs 69.1 [53.7;102]***
	Women	94.7 [80.3;124.3] vs 63.1 [46.7;109.9]***	94.6 [78.9;124.7] vs 65.7 [46.4;109]***	94.6 [74.4;123.5] vs 69.2 [49.8;114.9]***
White Caucasian		122.8 [93.2;147.4] vs 98 [68;137]***	122.6 [95.9;147.6] vs 96.2 [63.9;137.2]***	115.8 [91.2;146.8] vs 102.7 [71.6;141.1]*
Minorities		55.2 [35;83.1] vs 27 [17.3;62.6]***	55.1 [35.4;90] vs 25.6 [17.2;59.1]***	54.4 [31.5;77.7] vs 34.7 [18.1;69.1]***
White Caucasian	Men	60.1 [47.6;78.9] vs 52.7 [32.3;66.8]***	61.4 [50.4;79.1] vs 50.1 [32;65.6]***	59.3 [47.3;78.7] vs 53.9 [34.6;72.3]**
	Women	58.9 [45.1;71.6] vs 42.6 [32.6;63.6]***	58.8 [39.8;71.5] vs 43.4 [31.9;59.3]***	57.4 [42.1;73.5] vs 45.6 [32.8;65.6]***
Minorities	Men	22.9 [16.1;34.1] vs 11.9 [7;24.9]***	22.9 [15.5;32.9] vs 10 [6.4;23.9]***	22.6 [14.1;32.4] vs 15 [7.6;28.7]***
	Women	32 [18.7;51.3] vs 15.1 [8.8;33.9]***	31.9 [19.5;53.1] vs 14.9 [9;32.9]***	31.1 [17.7;46.7] vs 19.4 [9.4;38.2]***
American Indian/ Alaska Native		0.9 [0.4;1.7] vs 0.9 [0.4;1.6]	0.9 [0.4;1.8] vs 0.8 [0.4;1.4]	0.9 [0.4;1.9] vs 0.9 [0.4;1.5]
Asian		12.3 [5.5;24.6] vs 3.7 [2.1;9.6]***	10 [5.1;23.1] vs 3.5 [2;11.4]***	12.3 [4.6;22.7] vs 4.6 [2.2;11]***
Black/ African American		12.2 [7.8;18.4] vs 7.5 [4.5;16]**	12.3 [7.5;19.1] vs 7.7 [4.4;15.4]***	11.4 [6.4;16] vs 9.1 [4.8;17.6]
Hispanic/ Latinx		18.2 [9.1;25.8] vs 7.5 [4.1;23]***	18 [8.8;27.1] vs 6.9 [3.8;20.9]***	16.7 [8.4;23.1] vs 9.6 [4.5;23.8]***

Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander		0.1 [0;0.4] vs 0.1 [0;0.3]**	0.1 [0;0.4] vs 0.1 [0;0.3]**	0.1 [0;0.4] vs 0.1 [0;0.4]
Two or more races		5.4 [2.9;8.8] vs 2.7 [1.3;4.6]***	4.9 [2.9;8.6] vs 2.5 [1.1;5.5]***	5.1 [2.3;8.6] vs 2.9 [1.4;5.8]***
Unknown race		8 [3.6;14.1] vs 3.6 [1.3;6.9]***	7.1 [3.4;12.7] vs 3.3 [1.1;7.3]***	7.6 [3.6;13.5] vs 3.9 [1.3;8.8]***
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Men	0.3 [0;0.7] vs 0.2 [0;0.6]	0.3 [0;0.7] vs 0.1 [0;0.4]*	0.3 [0;0.7] vs 0.2 [0;0.6]
	Women	0.3 [0;0.9] vs 0.3 [0;0.7]	0.3 [0;0.9] vs 0.3 [0;0.7]	0.3 [0;0.9] vs 0.3 [0;0.7]
Asian	Men	5.4 [2.6;9.9] vs 1.6 [0.6;3.4]***	4.8 [2.1;9.1] vs 1.6 [0.4;4.9]***	5.4 [2.1;8.9] vs 1.8 [0.7;4.6]***
	Women	7.1 [2.9;14.1] vs 1.9 [0.9;5.6]***	7 [3;13.9] vs 1.9 [0.9;5.3]***	7.1 [2.8;13.9] vs 2.1 [1;6.4]***
Black/ African American	Men	4.9 [2.6;7.3] vs 2.9 [1.4;5]***	4.6 [2.7;7.5] vs 2.9 [1.2;4.9]***	4.3 [2.3;6.9] vs 3.3 [1.7;5.7]
	Women	7.6 [4.6;11] vs 4.6 [2.4;10.8]***	7.6 [4.9;11.8] vs 4.3 [2.3;9]***	7 [4.3;10.1] vs 5.6 [2.8;11]
Hispanic/ Latinx	Men	7.3 [4.6;12.4] vs 4.1 [1.9;9.2]***	7.5 [4.6;12.8] vs 3.3 [1.9;8.9]***	7.1 [3.9;12.1] vs 4.6 [2.2;10.4]***
	Women	10 [5;15.4] vs 4.1 [1.6;11.6]***	9.5 [4.6;15.6] vs 4 [1.6;11.3]***	9.6 [4.5;14.9] vs 4.7 [2;13.8]***
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander	Men	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]
	Women	0 [0;0.1] vs 0 [0;0]*	0 [0;0.1] vs 0 [0;0]*	0 [0;0.1] vs 0 [0;0]
Two or more races	Men	2.1 [0.9;3.9] vs 1.1 [0.3;2.6]***	2.2 [1;3.8] vs 1 [0.1;2.4]***	2.1 [0.9;3.6] vs 1.2 [0.3;2.6]***
	Women	2.9 [1.1;5.2] vs 1.3 [0.3;2.3]***	2.6 [1.2;4.9] vs 1 [0.3;2.4]***	2.7 [0.9;5.6] vs 1.7 [0.6;3]***
Unknown race	Men	4.9 [2;8.3] vs 1.7 [0.7;4.1]***	4.1 [2;7.2] vs 1.6 [0.6;4.6]***	4.9 [1.9;8.1] vs 2 [0.7;4.6]***
	Women	3.6 [0.9;6.3] vs 1.3 [0.3;2.8]***	2.7 [1;5.5] vs 1.1 [0.3;3.6]***	3.6 [1;6.3] vs 1.4 [0.3;3.2]***

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

Table 8: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (J.D.s awarded)

Race	Gender	More minorities than the average	More minorities than the average	More minorities than the average
		in the faculty body	in the faculty body (FT)	in the faculty body (PT)
	Men	93.6 [70.2;124.4] vs 68.5 [57.2;100.5]***	94.5 [77;122.1] vs 67.6 [55.1;98.9]***	88.7 [68.9;124.5] vs 69.3 [57.2;100.8]***
	Women	102.9 [85.8;130.8] vs 67.4 [50;95.3]***	100.8 [86.8;130.6] vs 67.1 [49.6;98.3]***	99.5 [83.9;133] vs 67.9 [50;100.9]***
White Caucasian		112.9 [63.2;146.2] vs 105.6 [81.9;144.6]	118.1 [76.6;147.6] vs 100.7 [78.8;140.8]	114.6 [66.9;152.4] vs 105.5 [83.6;139.6]
Minorities		73.1 [53.7;107.9] vs 27.1 [17.9;48.3]***	69.6 [50.6;103.2] vs 27.3 [17.8;53]***	69.6 [47.1;103.2] vs 29.1 [18;55.9]***
White Caucasian	Men	57.6 [37.1;82.2] vs 55 [42.4;71.8]	62.1 [40.4;79.7] vs 53.4 [39.4;70.9]*	57.5 [35.6;83.4] vs 55.1 [42.4;71.7]
	Women	56.6 [33.1;71.8] vs 48.3 [36.6;66.5]	57.1 [35.7;71.5] vs 46.7 [36;66.4]*	56.4 [34.6;77.7] vs 48.9 [36.3;64.7]
Minorities	Men	30.4 [22.7;41.6] vs 11.9 [7.3;19.8]***	29.6 [22.3;39.3] vs 11.9 [7.3;19.3]***	28.4 [19.6;39.8] vs 12.3 [7.6;22.3]***
	Women	42.7 [30.6;69.9] vs 15.1 [9.4;26.2]***	39.4 [28.9;64.5] vs 15.4 [9.4;26.3]***	38.7 [28.3;68.2] vs 15.6 [9.4;30.9]***
American Indian/ Alaska Native		1 [0.4;2.1] vs 0.9 [0.3;1.4]	1 [0.4;1.7] vs 0.9 [0.4;1.6]	0.9 [0.4;1.8] vs 0.9 [0.3;1.6]
Asian		15.5 [6;26.4] vs 4.4 [2.3;9.7]***	14.7 [5.7;25.6] vs 4.4 [2.2;11.4]***	13.6 [4.9;25.6] vs 4.6 [2.3;11.1]***
Black/ African American		13.4 [7.6;25.9] vs 8 [4.7;15.4]***	13.3 [7.8;22.7] vs 8 [4.6;15.3]***	12.9 [7.1;19.8] vs 8.2 [4.8;15.9]**
Hispanic/ Latinx		20.9 [14.8;39.9] vs 7.3 [4.3;18.3]***	20.9 [13.6;39.7] vs 7.4 [4.3;18.6]***	19.4 [12.5;36.1] vs 8.6 [4.7;19.5]***

Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander		0.2 [0;0.6] vs 0.1 [0;0.3]***	0.1 [0;0.4] vs 0.1 [0;0.3]**	0.1 [0;0.4] vs 0.1 [0;0.4]*
Two or more races		6.2 [2.9;9.5] vs 3 [1.7;5.5]***	4.6 [2.1;8.8] vs 3 [1.6;5.9]***	6.3 [1.9;9.9] vs 3 [1.7;5.6]***
Unknown race		7.5 [2.3;13.2] vs 4 [1.9;9]**	7 [2.3;13.1] vs 4 [1.9;8.7]**	7.3 [2.4;14.2] vs 4.1 [1.9;9.1]***
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Men	0.4 [0;1] vs 0.1 [0;0.4]**	0.4 [0;0.7] vs 0.1 [0;0.6]*	0.3 [0;0.7] vs 0.1 [0;0.6]
	Women	0.3 [0;1] vs 0.3 [0;0.6]	0.1 [0;1] vs 0.3 [0;0.7]	0.1 [0;0.9] vs 0.3 [0;0.8]
Asian	Men	6.4 [2.7;11.7] vs 1.7 [0.7;3.9]***	5.7 [2.5;10.6] vs 1.9 [0.6;5.1]***	5.7 [2.6;10.6] vs 1.9 [0.8;4.7]***
	Women	9.2 [3.7;14.6] vs 2.1 [1;5.5]***	8.3 [3.1;14.5] vs 2.1 [1;7]***	8.3 [3;14.7] vs 2.3 [1;6.3]***
Black/ African American	Men	5.3 [2.6;9.1] vs 2.9 [1.7;5]**	5.2 [3;8.7] vs 2.9 [1.6;5]**	4.6 [2.6;8.2] vs 3.1 [1.7;5.3]***
	Women	7.6 [5.1;16.7] vs 4.9 [3;9]**	8.1 [5.3;14] vs 4.6 [2.7;9]**	7.6 [4.8;12.1] vs 5 [3;10.3]***
Hispanic/ Latinx	Men	9.6 [6.1;16.9] vs 3.9 [2.7;1]**	9.4 [5.9;16.9] vs 3.9 [1.9;6.9]***	8.9 [5.7;16.5] vs 4.3 [2.3;8.6]***
	Women	12.3 [7.9;22.1] vs 4 [1.7;9.4]***	12 [6.7;21] vs 4 [1.7;10]***	11.3 [6.4;21] vs 4.1 [2;10.2]***
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander	Men	0 [0;0.1] vs 0 [0;0]***	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]*	0 [0;0] vs 0 [0;0]***
	Women	0 [0;0.3] vs 0 [0;0]***	0 [0;0.1] vs 0 [0;0]*	0 [0;0.1] vs 0 [0;0]
Two or more races	Men	2.6 [0.4;4.4] vs 1.3 [0.4;2.6]**	2.1 [0.5;4.4] vs 1.3 [0.4;2.9]**	2.2 [0.5;4.3] vs 1.3 [0.4;2.6]**
	Women	3 [0.9;5.8] vs 1.6 [0.6;2.7]***	2.6 [0.9;5.7] vs 1.4 [0.6;3.1]***	3.1 [0.9;6] vs 1.6 [0.6;2.6]***
Unknown race	Men	4.7 [1;8.1] vs 2.2 [1;4.9]**	4.9 [0.9;7.8] vs 2.1 [1;4.7]**	3.8 [1.3;8.4] vs 2.4 [0.9;5.3]**
	Women	2.8 [0.7;6.3] vs 1.6 [0.6;3.7]**	2.7 [0.6;5.7] vs 1.6 [0.6;3.7]**	3.5 [0.9;6.4] vs 1.6 [0.6;3.6]***

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

Table 9: More women in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (bar passage)

Variable	More women than the average in the faculty body	More women than the average in the faculty body (FT)	More women than the average in the faculty body (PT)
Avg. First-Time Bar Passage Rate Difference	5.5% [-2.7;12.4] vs -1.1% [-7.5;6.2]***	5.9% [-1.8;11.8] vs -1.9% [-6.8;4.9]***	3.2% [-3.1;10.6] vs 1.4% [-6.9;6.9]**
Avg. School First-Time Bar Passage Rate	82.2% [72.5;87.5] vs 77.4% [69.2;83.8]***	82% [73.4;87.7] vs 76.1% [69.1;83.4]***	80.4% [70.3;86.1] vs 77.6% [70.4;85]
First-Time Passers	126.9 [89.4;168.7] vs 85 [59.7;146.1]***	124.1 [91.6;170.4] vs 80 [59.1;146.4]***	122.1 [84.5;161.8] vs 93.3 [62.6;152.6]***
First-Time Passers Rate	71.8% [62.1;77.9] vs 67.8% [57.9;75.8]*	70.5% [63.7;77.8] vs 68.5% [57.4;75.3]**	70.4% [61.6;76.6] vs 68.1% [58.5;77.1]

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.

Table 10: More minorities in the faculty body than the average (FT/PT) (bar passage)

Variable	More minorities than the average	More minorities than the average	More minorities than the average
	in the faculty body	in the faculty body (FT)	in the faculty body (PT)
Avg. First-Time Bar Passage Rate Difference	5.5% [-6;12.7] vs 1.3% [-5.1;6.4]**	6.5% [-3.6;13.2] vs 0.6% [-6.1;6.2]***	3.9% [-5.9;12.4] vs 1.9% [-5.1;6.5]*
Avg. School First- Time Bar Passage Rate	78.6% [63.2;86.8] vs 78.7% [72.1;84.8]	82.5% [66.1;88.3] vs 77.5% [70.9;84]*	78.3% [65.8;86] vs 79.1% [72;84.9]
First-Time Passers	129.5 [84.8;171.3] vs 89.7 [67.7;146.2]***	139.3 [87.7;171.8] vs 89.4 [66.6;140.1]***	127.7 [80.4;170.4] vs 95.6 [67.9;146.5]***
First-Time Passers Rate	69.2% [58.9;75.8] vs 69.2% [60.7;77.1]	69.6% [60.3;76.3] vs 68.7% [59.6;77.1]	67.7% [58.7;75.8] vs 69.7% [60.9;77.1]

Note 1: Median 25% to 75% quartiles (***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively).

Note 2: Racial minorities include American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, and Unknown race.

Note 3: FT = Full Time; PT = Part Time.