



# Evaluation Process and Ratings of Supreme Court Nominees by the American Bar Association

March 22, 2022

This Insight provides information related to the evaluation and rating of a Supreme Court nominee by the [American Bar Association](#) (ABA). Once a [President nominates](#), or announces an intention to nominate, an individual to a vacancy on the Court, the nominee is evaluated by the American Bar Association's [Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary](#).

The committee [states](#) that each evaluation “focuses solely on a nominee’s professional qualifications” and “does not take into consideration a nominee’s philosophy, political affiliation or ideology.” A nominee’s professional qualifications include his or her integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament. [According to the committee](#), it “conducts the most extensive nationwide peer review possible [of the nominee] on the premise that the highest court in the land requires a lawyer or judge with exceptional professional qualifications.” Consequently, the evaluation process [typically involves](#) conducting hundreds of interviews with those “persons most likely to have information regarding the professional qualifications of the nominee.” It [also involves](#) an examination of the nominee’s legal writings by law school professors (often recognized experts in areas of law related to the nominee’s writings) and practicing lawyers with experience arguing before the Court.

In reporting the result of its evaluation, the ABA committee rates a nominee as “Well Qualified,” “Qualified,” or “Not Qualified.” The [committee’s rating](#) can be unanimous (appearing as a single rating) or, if not unanimous, the rating by the majority or substantial majority of the committee is listed first, followed by the rating or ratings given by a minority of the committee. Occasionally, [under certain circumstances](#), a committee member is recused or otherwise abstains from participating in a vote on the rating for a nominee.

A nominee’s rating [is submitted](#) in writing to the [Senate Judiciary Committee](#), White House, and U.S. Department of Justice. Typically, the [Senate Judiciary Committee has also invited](#) the ABA committee to testify, as the first public witness, about its evaluation and rating of the nominee at his or her confirmation hearing.

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

IN11896

# Pocket Constitution



The Declaration of Independence  
The Constitution of the United States  
The Bill of Rights  
Amendments XI–XXVII  
Gettysburg Address



**TheCapitol!Net**

TCNFPC.com

## Ratings of Nominees from 1990 to 2022

**Table 1** provides ABA ratings information for Supreme Court nominees from 1990 to 2022. As shown by the table, of the 12 nominees rated by the committee, 11 received a rating of “Well Qualified” (and the rating was unanimous for 10 of the 11 nominees).

According to the committee, to receive a rating of “Well Qualified,” a nominee “must be a preeminent member of the legal profession, have outstanding legal ability and exceptional breadth of experience, and meet the very highest standards of integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament. The rating ... is reserved for those found to merit the Standing Committee’s strongest affirmative endorsement.”

A rating of “Qualified” means that the nominee satisfies the committee’s “high standards with respect to integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament” and the committee considers “the nominee is fully qualified to perform all of the duties and responsibilities” associated with serving on the Court.

**Table 1. ABA Ratings of Supreme Court Nominees, 1990-2022**

Nominee	Year	Rating / Unanimous?	Recusals or Abstentions
Jackson	2022	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Barrett	2020	Well Qualified / No <sup>a</sup>	n/a
Kavanaugh	2018	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Gorsuch	2017	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Garland	2016	Well Qualified / Yes	1 recusal
Kagan	2010	Well Qualified / Yes	1 abstention
Sotomayor	2009	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Alito	2005	Well Qualified / Yes	1 recusal
Miers	2005	No Rating <sup>b</sup>	n/a
Roberts <sup>c</sup>	2005	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Breyer	1994	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Ginsburg	1993	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a
Thomas	1991	Qualified / No <sup>d</sup>	1 recusal
Souter	1990	Well Qualified / Yes	n/a

**Source:** American Bar Association at [https://www.americanbar.org/groups/committees/federal\\_judiciary/ratings](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/committees/federal_judiciary/ratings).

### Notes:

- A substantial majority of the committee rated Amy Coney Barrett as “Well Qualified,” while a minority rated her as “Qualified.”
- The Miers nomination was withdrawn prior to being rated by the ABA.
- For the position of Chief Justice. John G. Roberts, Jr., was similarly rated as “Well Qualified” when initially nominated to be an Associate Justice.
- A substantial majority of the committee rated Clarence Thomas as “Qualified,” while a minority rated him as “Not Qualified.”

## Evaluation of Nominees Prior to 1990

Although the ABA has evaluated nominees to the Supreme Court since 1955, it has not used the same terminology or ratings system in its evaluation of nominees for the past 67 years. For example, during the

Eisenhower presidency, several Supreme Court nominees were characterized as “eminently qualified.” This term was used to describe [John Harlan](#), [William Brennan, Jr.](#), and [Charles Whittaker](#). Another Eisenhower nominee, [Potter Stewart](#), was described by the ABA as being “exceptionally well qualified.” This term was also used to describe [Byron White](#) (nominated by President Kennedy).

Later during the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon presidencies, the ABA characterized a number of nominees as “highly acceptable from the viewpoint of professional qualifications.” The ABA used this language to describe [Arthur Goldberg](#), [Abe Fortas](#) (for both his Associate Justice and Chief Justice nominations), [Thurgood Marshall](#), [Homer Thornberry](#), [Warren Burger](#), and [Clement Haynsworth, Jr.](#) The ABA used similar language for [Harry Blackmun](#), [Lewis F. Powell, Jr.](#), and [John Paul Stevens](#) (“meets high standards of professional competence, judicial temperament and integrity”). In 1981, the ABA characterized [Sandra Day O’Connor](#) as meeting “the highest standards of judicial temperament and integrity” while being “qualified from the standpoint of professional competence.”

Since the mid-1980s, the ABA has used the term “Well Qualified” as its highest rating—with [William H. Rehnquist](#) being the first nominee to receive this rating when he was nominated to be Chief Justice in 1986. CRS compiled information about the evaluation of nominees prior to 1990 by examining news articles and information provided by the ABA.

## Author Information

Barry J. McMillion  
Analyst in American National Government

Jennifer Teefy  
Senior Research Librarian

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS’s institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

# Learn how Capitol Hill really works

**All of our programs and any combination of their topics can be tailored for custom training for your organization.**

For more than 40 years, TheCapitol.Net and its predecessor, Congressional Quarterly Executive Conferences, have been teaching professionals from government, military, business, and NGOs about the dynamics and operations of the legislative and executive branches and how to work with them.

Our training, on-site and online, and publications include congressional operations, legislative and budget process, communication and advocacy, media and public relations, research, testifying before Congress, legislative drafting, critical thinking and writing, and more.

- **Diverse Client Base**—We have tailored hundreds of custom on-site and online training programs for Congress, numerous agencies in all federal departments, the military, law firms, lobbying firms, unions, think tanks and NGOs, foreign delegations, associations and corporations, delivering exceptional insight into how Washington works.™
- **Experienced Program Design and Delivery**—We have designed and delivered hundreds of custom programs covering congressional/legislative operations, budget process, media training, writing skills, legislative drafting, advocacy, research, testifying before Congress, grassroots, and more.
- **Professional Materials**—We provide training materials and publications that show how Washington works. Our publications are designed both as course materials and as invaluable reference tools.
- **Large Team of Experienced Faculty**—More than 150 faculty members provide independent subject matter expertise. Each program is designed using the best faculty member for each session.
- **Non-Partisan**—TheCapitol.Net is non-partisan.
- **GSA Schedule**—TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training: GSA Contract GS02F0192X.

Please see our Capability Statement on our web site at [TCNCS.com](http://TCNCS.com).

Custom training programs are designed to meet your educational and training goals, each led by independent subject-matter experts best qualified to help you reach your educational objectives and align with your audience.

As part of your custom program, we can also provide online venue, classroom space, breaks and meals, receptions, tours, and online registration and individual attendee billing services.

For more information about custom on-site training for your organization, please see our web site: [TCNCustom.com](http://TCNCustom.com) or call us: 202-678-1600, ext 115.



*Non-partisan training and publications that show how Washington works.™*

PO Box 25706, Alexandria, VA 22313-5706  
202-678-1600 • [www.thecapitol.net](http://www.thecapitol.net)



TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training.  
GSA Contract GS02F0192X

