FISCAL YEAR 2025 REGULAR ARMY ACCESSION BOARD,
JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE

1. **General**.

a. The applicants you recommend for selection will become the Judge Advocate General's Corps (JAG Corps) of the future. Your goal, therefore, is to select those individuals who demonstrate the greatest potential for outstanding service as Soldier-lawyers.

b. In analyzing individual records to determine whether an applicant is qualified for selection, the board should consider the factors listed below. No single factor is dispositive; however, a low score may be based on a demonstrated lack of integrity, moral turpitude, or professional ineptitude. Ultimately, you should score highly those individuals that you are confident will provide principled counsel, attain mastery of the law, steward the organization, and demonstrate servant leadership.

(1) **Intellect**. Judge Advocates must be intelligent enough to practice in our diverse legal functions. Academic achievement can be a strong indicator of intellect. In addition, academic success is often an indicator of self-discipline, grit, and maturity—all attributes necessary for a successful Judge Advocate. Grading systems, however, may vary among academic institutions, and you must exercise great care when evaluating and comparing the academic records of applicants.

(2) **Interpersonal Skills**. Judge Advocates must possess the ability to understand and work effectively with service members and civilians of all ranks, grades, and backgrounds.

(3) **Work Ethic**. You should carefully examine each applicant's file to find evidence of the applicant's strong work ethic.

(4) **Physical Readiness**. Judge Advocates must maintain a high level of physical readiness in order to meet mission requirements. Physical fitness is therefore an important indicator of an applicant's suitability for Army service. The board will consider general physical condition and potential to comply with the standards of Army Regulation 600-9, The Army Body Composition Program, in evaluating an applicant's potential for Army service.

(5) **Character and Leadership Ability**. Army leaders and attorneys must possess the highest character. Judge Advocates must embody the Army Values: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage. In particular, honor and integrity are the bedrock of our dual professions, which enable a Judge Advocate to deliver principled counsel. Soldiers and noncommissioned officers

must be able to trust their officers. Accordingly, you should select only those applicants whose records demonstrate an uncompromising commitment to these values.

(6) **Prior Military Experience**. Some applicants may have prior enlisted or commissioned service. You should review the files of these applicants for indicators of leadership potential, maturity, teamwork, and the ability to excel as a Judge Advocate. The JAG Corps also has a need for officers with special military skills and training. Military experience will be considered a positive factor.

(7) **Legal and Work Experience**. Each applicant has submitted a resume detailing his or her work experience. Applicants also have the option of submitting up to three letters of recommendation. You should carefully examine this information to assess initiative, legal and analytical skills, judgment, and maturity.

(8) **JAG Corps Intern and Extern Programs**.

(i) These programs introduce students to military legal practice and provide meaningful opportunities for supervisory Judge Advocates to evaluate their performance and potential. The board should give careful consideration to those applicants who have demonstrated superior potential through successful performance as interns or externs.

(ii) Applicants who participated in the JAG Corps Summer Internship and Summer Associate Programs had the option to apply for a JAG Corps commission in the Early Decision Accession Board, which convened at the conclusion of the summer internship period. Board members will not draw a negative inference for those applicants who were either not selected at this prior board, or those who opted out of consideration.

(9) **Graduates of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) Program**.

(i) Some applicants are ROTC graduates who are attending or have attended law school on an approved educational delay. These applicants are already commissioned, but applied for and were granted a delay from Regular Army service based, in part, on a recommendation by the JAG Corps. The board is strongly encouraged to give careful consideration to the selection of ROTC educational delay applicants.

(ii) Successful completion of an ROTC program requires that an individual demonstrate a strong sense of personal integrity, honor, and responsibility while developing an understanding of the basic concepts and principles of leadership and military art and science. These attributes are reliable indicators of the potential to serve successfully as a Judge Advocate.

(10) **Communication Skills**. Judge Advocates must be effective communicators in person and in writing—precise, persuasive, and professional. You should select only those applicants whose records demonstrate superior communication skills.

(11) **Involvement in Campus and Civic Activities**. Participation and achievement in extracurricular activities is a strong indication of initiative and leadership capacity. Non-participation in such activities, should not, however, operate against an applicant's interest when heavy course loads and gainful employment in financing the expenses of college and law school have denied the applicant the opportunity to engage in extracurricular activities.

2. **Field Screening Officer's (FSO) Report**. All applicants will have been interviewed by an FSO, a Judge Advocate designated to perform recruiting and interviewing functions, who has prepared a report for your consideration. You should carefully evaluate the FSO Report, giving special attention to the FSO's assessment of the applicant's potential for JAG Corps service. The narrative justifications for an FSO's recommendation are particularly important and lend meaning to the other elements of the FSO Report. Each FSO report includes an overall recommendation on selection according to the following tiered ranking system.

a. **Absolute must select**: a truly extraordinary applicant who is outstanding in all dimensions.

b. **Must select**: a strong applicant about whom the FSO is genuinely enthusiastic; possesses the key qualities and skills needed to make a positive impact on our people and mission.

c. **Recommended for selection**: an average applicant with no glaring weakness, but few significant strengths; has potential to develop into an effective Judge Advocate with training and development.

d. **Not recommended for selection**: an applicant about whom the FSO has reservations; does not currently have the qualities or skills our dual professions demand.

e. **Absolute do not select**: the applicant is clearly deficient in multiple respects; the FSO has severe misgivings; avoid selecting.

3. **Adverse Information**. The board must independently evaluate and weigh derogatory information presented to the board. The board should evaluate indications of disciplinary action relative to an individual's overall record and potential, while, at the same time, considering the seriousness of the offense. Accordingly, the board should use care in assessing the weight placed on one incident, which may be atypical of an otherwise outstanding record.

4. **Prior Non-Selection**. Prior non-selection will not be considered a reason for non-selection by a subsequent board. The board must make an independent evaluation on the basis of the applicant's record as compared with other applicants considered by the board.

5. **Diversity and Equal Opportunity**. The strength of our Army comes from our diversity. Developing and maintaining qualified and demographically diverse leadership is critical for mission effectiveness and is essential to national security. Effective leaders understand that organizational success depends on the ability of people of different backgrounds to work together, while bringing the value of their diverse experiences to the mission. With a culture that embraces diversity, the Army is better able to attract and keep the best men and women from across the Nation, and to operate more successfully around the world. Moreover, the success of today's Army comes from a total commitment to the ideals of freedom, fairness, and human dignity upon which our country was founded. It is vital that our Army is in fact one of equal opportunity–equal opportunity for all Soldiers is the only acceptable standard for our Army. This principle applies to every aspect of career development and utilization in our Army, but is especially important to demonstrate in the accession process. Select meritorious applicants who create and maintain an inclusive environment where individual attributes are recognized, accepted, and, most importantly, valued, regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex (including gender identity), or sexual orientation. In doing so our Soldiers will have a clear perception of equal opportunity in the selection process.

U.S. ARMY
BE ALL YOU CAN BE. HQDA | OTJAG

FY25 1L Summer Intern Board

Applications / Selection Rate

	Applications	Selects	Selection Rate
FY25	**200**	**57**	**28.5%**
FY24	151	57	37.7%
FY23	124	58	46.8%
FY22	186	21	11.3%
FY21	257	17	6.6%
FY11	353	UNK	UNK

Academic Profiles

FY25

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 178 / 142
- Average: 159

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 178 / 146
- Average: 162

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.60
- Selects: 3.71

FY24

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 180 / 143
- Average: 158

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 180 / 146
- Average: 160

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.61
- Selects: 3.74

Trends and Takeaways

- **32% increase in applications from FY24 and 61% increase from FY23.**
- **Applicants represented 103 law schools. Schools with most applications:**
  - UVA (10); U. South Carolina (8); Elon (7); U. Iowa (7)
- **T14 law schools represented in applicants:**
  - U. Chicago (1); Duke (1); Harvard (1); U. Penn (2); UVA (10); Columbia (1); Cornell (1); Georgetown (2)
- **Offices have the capacity to accommodate approximately 60 1L interns. Based on FY24's offer acceptance rate:**
  - 57 offers = 43 1L interns
  - 73 offers = 55 1L interns

Demographics

	Applicants	Selects	Law Students (2023)	Army Officers (2023)	JAs (2023)	Licensed Attorneys (2023)
Race						
African-American	8.5% (+4.5%) 17 (+11)	5.3% (+1.8%) 3 (+1)	7.8%	11%	7.5%	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8.0% (+1.4%) 16 (+6)	7.0% (+1.7%) 4 (+1)	7%	7%	6%†	6%
White**	77.0% (-5.1%) 154 (+30)	86.0% (+1.8%) 49 (+1)	60.7%	68%	76.6%	79%
Hispanic*	16.0% (+4.7%) 32 (+15)	15.8% (NC) 9 (NC)	13.7%	9%	5.2%	6%
American Indian	0.5% (-0.2%) 1 (NC)	0.0% (NC) 0 (NC)	0.4%	<1%	0.2%	0.5%
Multiracial (Other)	6.0% (-0.6%) 12 (+2)	1.8% (-5.2%) 1 (-3)	4% *6.4% Unknown*	2%	9.7%	4%
Sex						
Female	42.0% (-2.4%) 84 (+17)	49.1% (-3.5%) 28 (-2)	55.7%	21%	30%	39%
Male	58.0% (+2.4%) 116 (+32)	50.9% (+3.5%) 29 (+2)	44.3%	79%	70%	61%

*Applicants were questioned separately about whether they are of Hispanic ethnicity from their race.

**White, non-Hispanic: 65% of Applicants; 73.7% of Selects.

† 2022 statistic due to a glitch in IPPS-A that does not accurately account for this demographic.

U.S. ARMY
BE ALL YOU CAN BE. HQDA | OTJAG

FY25 1L Summer Intern Board

Applications / Selection Rate

	Applications	Selects	Selection Rate
FY25	**200**	**73**	**36.5%**
FY24	151	57	37.7%
FY23	124	58	46.8%
FY22	186	21	11.3%
FY21	257	17	6.6%
FY11	353	UNK	UNK

Academic Profiles

FY25

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 178 / 142
- Average: 159

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 178 / 146
- Average: 161

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.60
- Selects: 3.67

FY24

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 180 / 143
- Average: 158

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 180 / 146
- Average: 160

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.61
- Selects: 3.74

Trends and Takeaways

- **32% increase in applications from FY24 and 61% increase from FY23.**
- **Applicants represented 103 law schools. Schools with most applications:**
  - UVA (10); U. South Carolina (8); Elon (7); U. Iowa (7)
- **T14 law schools represented in applicants:**
  - U. Chicago (1); Duke (1); Harvard (1); U. Penn (2); UVA (10); Columbia (1); Cornell (1); Georgetown (2)
- **Offices have the capacity to accommodate approximately 60 1L interns. Based on FY24's offer acceptance rate:**
  - 57 offers = 43 1L interns
  - 73 offers = 55 1L interns

Demographics

	Applicants	Selects	Law Students (2023)	Army Officers (2023)	JAs (2023)	Licensed Attorneys (2023)
Race						
African-American	8.5% (+4.5%) 17 (+11)	6.8% (+3.3%) 5 (+3)	7.8%	11%	7.5%	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8% (+1.4%) 16 (+6)	6.8% (+1.5%) 5 (+2)	7%	7%	6%†	6%
White**	77% (-5.1%) 154 (+30)	84.9% (+0.7%) 62 (+14)	60.7%	68%	76.6%	79%
Hispanic*	16% (+4.7%) 32 (+15)	13.7% (-2.1%) 10 (+1)	13.7%	9%	5.2%	6%
American Indian	0.5% (-0.2%) 1 (NC)	0.0% (NC) 0 (NC)	0.4%	<1%	0.2%	0.5%
Multiracial (Other)	6% (-0.6%) 12 (+2)	1.4% (-5.6%) 1 (-3)	4% *6.4% Unknown*	2%	9.7%	4%
Sex						
Female	42% (-2.4%) 84 (+17)	47.9% (-4.7%) 35 (+5)	55.7%	21%	30%	39%
Male	58% (+2.4%) 116 (+32)	52.1% (+4.7%) 38 (+11)	44.3%	79%	70%	61%

*Applicants were questioned separately about whether they are of Hispanic ethnicity from their race.

**White, non-Hispanic: 65% of Applicants; 74% of Selects.

† 2022 statistic due to a glitch in IPPS-A that does not accurately account for this demographic.

U.S. ARMY
BE ALL YOU CAN BE. HQDA | OTJAG

FY25 2L Summer Intern Board
Primary Selects

Applications / Selection Rate

	Applications	Primary Selects	Selection Rate
FY25	**198**	**110**	**55.6%**
FY24	177	101	57.1%
FY23	181	72	42.1%
FY22	193	72	37.3%
FY21	179	72	40.2%
FY20	221	75	33.9%

Academic Profiles

FY25

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 180 / 141
- Average: 158

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 180 / 143
- Average: 160

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.57
- Selects: 3.63

FY24

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 180 / 136
- Average: 157

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 180 / 145
- Average: 159

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.44
- Selects: 3.54

Trends and Takeaways

- **17 FY24 1L interns and 2 summer associates applied for the 2L internship**
  - Of the **56** Summer 2024 1L interns and summer associates, **40** applied to the EDP and **33** were selected
  - **15** of the 1L EDP selects applied for a 2L internship and **15** were selected
  - **2** of the 1L EDP non-selects applied for a 2L internship and **2** were selected (1 primary, 1 alternate)
  - **2** 1L interns who did not apply for EDP, applied for a 2L internship and were selected
  - Board requested senior leader perspective on how to weigh EDP selects applying for the 2L internship
- **Law schools with most applications:**
  - George Mason (5); St. Thomas (5); Fordham (4); Georgetown (4); Mercer (4); Pace (4); U. Alabama (4); U. Kentucky (4)
- **T14 law schools represented:**
  - Duke (1); Harvard (1); U. Penn. (1); UC Berkeley (1); UCLA (1); Cornell (1); Georgetown (4)
- **Offices have indicated capacity for 160 law student interns for Summer 2025**

Diversity
Primary Selects Only

Race						
	Applicants	**Selects**	**Law Students (2023)**	**Army Officers (2023)**	**JAs (2023)**	**Licensed Attorneys (2023)**
African-American	11.1% (+5.4%) 22 (+12)	4.5% (-1.4%) 5 (-1)	7.8%	11%	7.5%	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.1% (-1.1%) 10 (-1)	5.5% (+1.5%) 6 (+2)	7%	7%	6%†	6%
White**	79.8% (+4.1%) 158 (+24)	85.5% (+8.3%) 94 (+16)	60.7%	68%	76.6%	79%
Hispanic*	16.2% (+0.8%) 32 (+4)	17.3% (+4.4%) 19 (+6)	13.7%	9%	5.2%	6%
American Indian	0.5% (-1.2%) 1 (-2)	0.9% (-1.1%) 1 (-1)	0.4%	<1%	0.2%	0.5%
Multiracial (Other)	3.5% (-6.2%) 7 (-11)	3.6% (-7.3%) 4 (-7)	4% *6.4% Unknown*	2%	9.7%	4%
Gender						
Female	37.9% (-2.8%) 75 (+3)	44.5% (+0.9%) 49 (+5)	55.7%	21%	30%	39%
Male	62.1% (+2.8%) 123 (+18)	55.5% (-0.9%) 61 (+4)	44.3%	79%	70%	61%

*Applicants were questioned separately about whether they are of Hispanic ethnicity from their race.
**White, non-Hispanic: 69.2% of Applicants; 72.7% of Selects.

† 2022 statistic due to a glitch in IPPS-A that does not accurately account for this demographic.

U.S. ARMY
BE ALL YOU CAN BE. HQDA | OTJAG

FY25 2L Summer Intern Board
Primary & Alternate Selects

Applications / Selection Rate

	Applications	Primary & Alternate Selects	Selection Rate
FY25	**198**	**142**	**71.7%**
FY24	177	125	70.6%
FY23	181	72	42.1%
FY22	193	72	37.3%
FY21	179	72	40.2%
FY20	221	75	33.9%

Academic Profiles

FY25

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 180 / 141
- Average: 158

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 180 / 141
- Average: 158

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.57
- Selects: 3.60

FY24

LSAT (Applicants)
- High/Low: 180 / 136
- Average: 157

LSAT (Selects)
- High/Low: 180 / 145
- Average: 159

Undergrad GPA (Avg.)
- Applicants: 3.44
- Selects: 3.54

Trends and Takeaways

- **17 FY24 1L interns and 2 summer associates applied for the 2L internship**
  - Of the **56** Summer 2024 1L interns and summer associates, **40** applied to the EDP and **33** were selected
  - **15** of the 1L EDP selects applied for a 2L internship and **15** were selected
  - **2** of the 1L EDP non-selects applied for a 2L internship and **2** were selected (1 primary, 1 alternate)
  - **2** 1L interns who did not apply for EDP, applied for a 2L internship and were selected
  - Board requested senior leader perspective on how to weigh EDP selects applying for the 2L internship
- **Law schools with most applications:**
  - George Mason (5); St. Thomas (5); Fordham (4); Georgetown (4); Mercer (4); Pace (4); U. Alabama (4); U. Kentucky (4)
- **T14 law schools represented:**
  - Duke (1); Harvard (1); U. Penn. (1); UC Berkeley (1); UCLA (1); Cornell (1); Georgetown (4)
- **Offices have indicated capacity for 160 law student interns for Summer 2025**

Diversity
Primary & Alternate Selects

Race						
	Applicants	**Selects**	**Law Students (2023)**	**Army Officers (2023)**	**JAs (2023)**	**Licensed Attorneys (2023)**
African-American	11.1% (+5.4%) 22 (+12)	8.5% (+2.9%) 12 (+5)	7.8%	11%	7.5%	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.1% (-1.1%) 10 (-1)	4.3% (+1.1%) 6 (+2)	7%	7%	6%†	6%
White**	79.8% (+4.1%) 158 (+24)	83.1% (+4.7%) 118 (+20)	60.7%	68%	76.6%	79%
Hispanic*	16.2% (+0.8%) 32 (+4)	14.8% (-1.2%) 21 (+1)	13.7%	9%	5.2%	6%
American Indian	0.5% (-1.2%) 1 (-2)	0.7% (-0.9%) 1 (-1)	0.4%	<1%	0.2%	0.5%
Multiracial (Other)	3.5% (-6.2%) 7 (-11)	3.5% (-7.7%) 5 (-9)	4% *6.4% Unknown*	2%	9.7%	4%
Gender						
Female	37.9% (-2.8%) 75 (+3)	43.7% (+1.3%) 62 (+9)	55.7%	21%	30%	39%
Male	62.1% (+2.8%) 123 (+18)	56.3% (-1.3%) 80 (-8)	44.3%	79%	70%	61%

*Applicants were questioned separately about whether they are of Hispanic ethnicity from their race.

**White, non-Hispanic: 69.2% of Applicants; 71.8% of Primary and Alternate Selects.

† 2022 statistic due to a glitch in IPPS-A that does not accurately account for this demographic.

U.S. ARMY
BE ALL YOU CAN BE. HQDA | OTJAG

FY25 FLEP Selection Board

Applications / Selection Rate

	Applications	Selection Rate
FY25	**128 (103 / 25)**	**19.5%**
FY24	112 (87 / 25)	22%
FY23	101 (81 / 20)	25%
FY22	120 (103 / 17)	21%
FY21	151 (130 / 21)	16.5%

Academic Profiles

	Overall	Officers	Enlisted
LSAT (Applicants)	**156**	**157**	**152**
LSAT (Selects)	**162**	**163**	**157**
GPA (Applicants)	**3.42**	**3.40**	**3.47**
GPA (Selects)	**3.61**	**3.63**	**3.49**

Trends and Takeaways

- **Quality of selects remained consistent**
  - Last year average LSAT / GPA among selects: 159 / 3.63 (compared to 162 / 3.61 this year)
  - Most officer selects from: MI (6); MP (4); AD (2); AR (2); AV (2)
- **Diversity outcomes**
  - Gender: increase in female applicants and females outperformed males (31.3% of applications and 36% of selects)
  - Race / Ethnicity: Overall more diverse applicant pool than last year, but less diversity among selectees
  - NCOs
    - 68% of NCO applicants were minorities (17 of 25); last year, 48% of the NCO applicants were minorities (12 of 25)
    - Slightly lower selection rate than officers: 12% (3 of 25) enlisted applications / 21% (22 of 103) officer applications
- **Commissioning source comparison**

ROTC: 51% of applicants; 50% of selectees
USMA: 32% of applicants; 36% of selectees
OCS: 16% of applicants, 14% of selectees
Direct Appointment: 1% of applicants, 0% of selectees

Diversity

Race						
	Applicants	**Selects**	**RA Officers**	**RA Enlisted**	**JAs**	**Licensed Attorneys**
African-American	12.5% (-1.8%) 16 (NC)	4% (NC) 1	11%	22%	7.5%	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.7% (-6%) 6 (-6)	8% (NC) 2	7%	6%	6%	6%
White**	73.4% (+7.3%) 94 (+20)	84% (+4%) 21 (+1)	68%	48%	76.6%	79%
Hispanic*	11.7% (+4.6%) 15 (+7)	0% (-8%) 0 (-2)	9%	21%	5.2%	6%
American Indian	0.7% (+0.7%) 1 (+1)	0% (NC) 0	<1%	1%	0.2%	0.5%
Other	8.6% (+6.8%) 11 (+9)	4% (+4%) 1 (+1)	2%	3%	9.7%	4%
Gender						
Female	31.3% (+2.7%) 40 (+8)	36% (+4%) 9 (+1)	21%	15%	30%	39%
Male	68.8% (-2.6%) 88 (+8)	64% (-4%) 16 (-1)	79%	85%	70%	61%

*Applicants were questioned separately about whether they are of Hispanic ethnicity from their race.
**White, non-Hispanic: 64.8% of Applicants; 84% of Selects.

U.S. ARMY
BE ALL YOU CAN BE. HQDA | OTJAG

FY25 RA Fall Accession Board

Applications / Selection Rate

	Applicants	Primary Selects	Selects + Alternates	Selection Rate
FY25	**199**	**155**	**167**	**77.9% / 83.9%**
FY24	227	161	161	70.9%
FY23	203	146	158	71.9% / 77.8%
FY22	323	170	170	52.6%
FY21	494	134	192	28.6% / 40.9%

Academic Profiles

FY25

Undergrad GPA

- Applicants: 3.44
- Selects: 3.51

Law Schools w/ Most Apps

- George Wash. (7)
- Texas Tech (5)
- UNC (5)

FY24

Undergrad GPA

- Applicants: 3.42
- Selects: 3.50

Law Schools w/ Most Apps

- Miss. Coll. (8)
- New England (5)
- Florida A&M (4)
- George Mason (4)
- NC Central (4)

Trends and Takeaways

- **Decrease (12%) in applications from last year**
- **T14 law schools well-represented:**
  - Duke (1); Harvard (2); UVA (1); U. Mich. (2); Cornell (3); Georgetown (4)
- **Impact on Diversity**
  - Decrease in African-American, Hispanic, and female applicants and selects.
  - Females outperformed males (26.1% of applicants but 31% of selects)
  - HBCU law schools represented (primary selects/applicants): Florida A&M (0/1); NCCU (3/4); Thurgood Marshall (1/1); UDC (1/1)
- **Solid performance for interns/externs, moot court competitors, and ed delay officers**
  - Former interns: 9 out of 12 selected (75%); 5 EDP (Early Decision Program) applicants reapplied, 3 selected
  - Former/current Army JAGC externs: 11 out of 11 selected (100%)
  - 18 of 19 (95%) of ed delay officers were selected
  - Two Moot Court competitors applied, one selected as a primary, one selected as a secondary

Diversity

Race	Applicants	Selects	Law Students (2023)	Army Officers (2023)	JAs (2023)	Licensed Attorneys (2023)
African-American	8.0% (-8.3%) 16 (-21)	6.5% (-6.7%) 10 (-11)	7.8%	11%	7.5%	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.0% (+0.7%) 12 (NC)	6.5% (+2.7%) 10 (+4)	7%	7%	6%†	6%
White**	75.9% (+4.5%) 151 (-11)	75.5% (NC) 117 (-3)	60.7%	68%	76.6%	79%
Hispanic*	15.1% (-2.5%) 30 (-10)	15.5% (-2.1%) 24 (-4)	13.7%	9%	5.2%	6%
American Indian	1.0% (+0.1%) 2 (NC)	1.3% (NC) 2 (NC)	0.4%	<1%	0.2%	0.5%
Multiracial (Other)	9.0% (+2.8%) 18 (+4)	10.3% (+4.0%) 16 (+6)	4% *6.4% Unknown*	2%	9.7%	4%
Gender						
Female	26.1% (-3.0%) 52 (-14)	31.0% (-3.0%) 48 (-6)	55.7%	21%	30%	39%
Male	73.9% (+3.0%) 147 (-14)	69.0% (+3.0%) 107 (+2)	44.3%	79%	70%	61%

*Applicants were questioned separately about whether they are of Hispanic ethnicity from their race.
**White, non-Hispanic: 63.3% of Applicants; 62.6% of Selects.

† 2022 statistic due to a glitch in IPPS-A that does not accurately account for this demographic.