

## Diversity of Authorship in Volume 109

As part of our efforts to review and publish the scholarship of diverse authors, Volume 109 of *The Georgetown Law Journal* committed to tracking the diversity statistics of every article that we reviewed this year. This was our first time attempting this endeavor, and we are continuously looking for ways to improve our data and the processes we use to track these statistics. However, we are confident that the numbers we are able to present below are conservative calculations of the actual diversity statistics for Volume 109.

We hope that by presenting this data publicly, we will encourage other peer law reviews to follow suit in tracking diversity data and in committing to elevate the voices of diverse authors through their publications. We would also like to encourage our peer law reviews to collaborate with us as we continue to develop best practices in collecting this data. We would be more than happy to share our methods with any of our fellow law reviews.

Finally, we would like to encourage all our legal scholars to take seriously the opportunity to report the ways you identify as diverse. While we are still committed to blind review of all scholarship and considering pieces on the merits of their contribution, we do think it is extremely valuable to know the composition of our authorship as we seek to elevate many different kinds of voices and perspectives in the field of legal scholarship.

### Breakdown by Number of Articles

Metric	Number of Articles	Percentage of Articles Screened
Total number of articles screened and catalogued	860	100%
Total number of articles screened that exhibited at least one diverse author	485	56.4%
Total number of articles published	22	2.6%
		Percentage of Articles Published
Total number of articles published that exhibited at least one diverse author	13	59.1%
Articles published with female authors	10	45.5%
Articles published with authors of color	8	36.4%
Articles published with women of color authors	5	22.7%
Articles published with Black authors	2	9.1%

### Breakdown by Diverse Author

We would like to note that **we did not track the total number of individual authors** screened this year, so we are not able to produce the percentages for each category against the total authorship. This is something we hope to remedy as soon as next year (Volume 110). We only tracked the multiple authors of a piece if it exhibited at least one diverse author. Because of this lack of data, the percentages below represent the percentage share of the **total diverse authorship** for each category of diversity. However, we did track individualized data per diverse author and would be happy to produce further intersectional combinations of that data upon written request. Please contact [email for Senior Diversity Editor] for further information.

Category	Number of Authors	% Share of Diverse Authorship (not total authors)
Total number of diverse authors screened	524	100%
Female	377	72.0%
Gender non-binary	7	1.3%
Authors of Color	230	43.9%
Black	55	10.5%
LatinX	35	6.7%
Asian	64	12.2%
Indian	14	2.7%
Middle Eastern and/or Israeli	51	9.7%
Other non-white	8	1.5%
Diverse Sexual Orientation (non-heterosexual)	62	11.8%
Diverse Socioeconomic Background	24	4.6%
Immigrant	7	1.3%
Authors with Disability	4	0.8%
Women of Color	106	20.2%
Black women	31	5.9%

We are also developing processes to track the diversity data for student note submissions to *GLJ*, but that the numbers presented here only reflect those for article submissions by legal scholars and lawyers.