

OFFICE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR



October 1, 2024

Chief Justice Marquez, Members of the Judiciary Committee of the Colorado House of Representatives, and Members of the Judiciary Committee of the Colorado Senate:

I am pleased to present the Fiscal Year 2024 Annual Legislative Report for the Colorado Judicial Department's Judicial Officer Outreach Program. In alignment with the legislative intent of SB 19-043, codified in C.R.S. § 13-3-101(11)(a), this program was established within the Office of the State Court Administrator to focus on outreach and education related to judicial vacancies and the judicial application process.

The Judicial Officer Outreach Program plays a vital role in advancing the Colorado Judicial Department's commitment to a fair and impartial justice system by working to cultivate a state court bench that reflects the rich diversity of the communities it serves. This report provides an overview of the program's outreach efforts for Fiscal Year 2024, from July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and includes statewide demographic data on current judicial officers. I am happy to report that the data has been expanded to include additional categories for race, ethnicity, and gender diversity, as well as the personal and professional experiences of Colorado's state court judges to better capture the diverse demographics and experiences of our judiciary. Given the vacancy in program leadership from fall 2023 until this past spring, the report also outlines key focus areas for the upcoming year.

The program's success is due in large part to the dedication of the Colorado judiciary, judicial officers, the legal community, stakeholders, higher education and law school partners, community organizations, and the broader community. The program will continue to build on these partnerships and successes to ensure our judiciary better reflects the diverse communities it serves.

Thank you for your continued commitment and support of the Judicial Officer Outreach Program.

Sincerely,

Nga Vương-Sandoval
Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead
Colorado Judicial Department



JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH PROGRAM

FY 2024 Annual Legislative Report

Colorado Judicial Department

Office of the State Court Administrator

1300 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, CO 80203

www.courts.state.co.us

720-625-5000



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Statutory Reporting Requirement	4
FY 2024 Data Reporting	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 Colorado Judicial Officer Diversity FY 2023 - FY 2024 	
Diversity of Judges on the Bench	6
Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program Overview	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Pillar 1: Data and Research • Program Pillar 2: Community Engagement • Program Pillar 3: Pipeline Development • Program Pillar 4: Connection and Well-Being 	
Looking Ahead	21
Appendix	23
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide demographics data for judicial officers • Demographics data for FY 2023 - FY 2024 New Judicial Appointments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Four-year comparison • 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire statewide responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Colorado Supreme Court ◦ Colorado Court of Appeals ◦ Colorado Judicial Districts 1-22 ◦ Denver County Court 	

The Colorado Judicial Department is committed to ensuring document accessibility. For digitally accessible tables located in the Appendix, please contact the Judicial Officer Outreach Program at: nga.vuongsandoval@judicial.state.co.us.



“ Over the past few years, it has been exciting to witness the growing impact of this office. The relationships we have developed with the legal community have helped to cultivate a diverse pipeline of applicants from across the state and to level the playing field for all by demystifying the process. I am proud of how this office has supported our judicial officer community, and I eagerly anticipate the new ways it will foster the Mission, Vision, and Values of our Branch in the years to come. ”

MONICA M. MARQUEZ
CHIEF JUSTICE - COLORADO SUPREME COURT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program remains committed to building a state judicial system that reflects the diversity of Colorado’s communities. By offering engagement opportunities and analyzing data on current judicial officers, JOO listens to judicial districts across the state and creates connections for aspiring judicial officers and law school students to learn from and about the judiciary.

JOO fosters relationships within the legal community, law schools, higher education institutions, and community organizations, breaking down misconceptions about becoming a judicial officer. It facilitates connections, sparks conversations, and addresses perceived barriers in the judicial application process.

The 2024 Judicial Officer Outreach Program Legislative Report includes demographic data for judicial officers appointed to the bench in FY 2024, compared to last year's appointments and demographics.

As part of JOO’s mission to provide accurate and up-to-date information, the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographic Questionnaire was distributed to all Colorado judicial officers and the collected responses are included. This year’s questionnaire features enhanced and new demographic questions to better capture the diversity within the judiciary.

In prior years, JOO provided one-on-one coaching, mentorship programs, and summer legal internships for law students in rural Colorado. As the challenges faced by judicial officer applicants evolve, JOO remains adaptable and responsive to recruitment and retention needs. Coinciding with our mission, JOO has also been evaluating its programs to ensure they remain relevant and effective in addressing current challenges. Moving forward, the JOO will continue conducting listening sessions to deepen its understanding of the unique needs of Colorado’s judicial districts and develop customized solutions.

Judicial diversity is crucial to advancing the judiciary’s mission of ensuring equal access to justice and maintaining the integrity of the rule of law. Feedback and insights from the JOO’s statewide listening sessions with judicial districts and judicial officers underscore the need for more judicial officer applicants, particularly from diverse backgrounds, to join the bench. A diverse judiciary, coupled with the fair treatment of all litigants, sends a strong message of inclusivity and reinforces the consistent application of the law. This diversity helps challenge misconceptions about the impartiality and fairness of the judicial system, thereby strengthening public trust and enhancing the judiciary's credibility.





STATUTORY REPORTING REQUIREMENT

In accordance with Senate Bill 19-043 and C.R.S. § 13-3-101(11)(a), the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) program was launched in 2020 within the Office of the State Court Administrator (SCAO) of the Colorado Judicial Department. This initiative is dedicated to educating and engaging the public about judicial office vacancies and the application process, driving forward the Colorado Judicial Department's mission to foster a fair and impartial justice system. By striving to create a state court bench that reflects the vibrant diversity of Colorado's communities, the JOO program champions inclusivity and representation in the judiciary.

This report is part of the mandated reporting under C.R.S. § 13-3-101(11)(b)(I), delivered annually by October 1 to the Chief Justice of the Colorado Supreme Court and the Judiciary Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate "concerning the background, professional history, and qualification of judicial officers in the state." The FY 2024 Annual Legislative Report, encompassing the period from July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, provides an in-depth look at the background, professional history, and qualifications of the state's judicial officers.

“ The recruitment of judicial applicants with diverse life experiences is a shared responsibility. The JOO is uniquely situated to bring stakeholders together to collaborate towards achieving a bench that more closely reflects the communities we serve. A bench that has a diversity of life experiences and perspectives increases public respect and confidence in its rulings. We expect judges to follow the law and do so in a way that is shaped by their life experiences. ”



JEFFREY R. PILKINGTON
DISTRICT COURT CHIEF JUDGE - 1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT




FY 2024 DATA REPORTING

Judicial Officer Appointments - FY 2023 - FY 2024


Consistent with previous years, the FY 2024 Annual Legislative Report includes data on the number of diverse judges serving on the Colorado state court bench as of June 30, 2023, which is detailed in the Appendix.

From July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, the Colorado Judicial Department welcomed twenty-seven judges to the bench, a 43.7% decrease from FY 2023. Of the new appointments, 48.1% are women and 51.9% are men, which is a 3.72% decrease for women and a 2.8% increase for men from last fiscal year.



Colorado Judicial Officer Appointment Diversity - FY 2024

From July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, of the twenty-seven new appointees, 14.8% were judges of color: no American Indian/Native judge (0%), one Asian/Asian American judge (3.7%) one Black/African American judge (3.7%), two Hispanic/Latino judges (7.40%), and no multiracial judges (0%) joined the bench, thirteen judges, or 48.1% of FY2024 appointments, identified as white (not Hispanic or Latino), which decreased from 60.60% last year, no information was provided for nine appointees (33.3%), and one (3.7%) declined to answer. Of the new judge appointees, fourteen (53.84%) were judicial officers (magistrates - seven, municipal court judges - one, county court judges - five, district court judge - one) at the time of appointment. As of the writing of this report, 17.94% of judges on the Colorado state bench self-identified as judicial officers of color and two or more races.




2024 DATA REPORTING

2024 COLORADO JUDICIAL OFFICER DIVERSITY FY 2024

The 2024 Annual Legislative Report presents newly compiled and expanded data on judicial diversity, building upon prior reports from the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) program. The Judicial Officer Demographic Questionnaire (JODQ) received a total of 323 responses statewide, reflecting a 0.933% increase from the 320 responses received from the survey in the previous year.


The Colorado Judicial Department currently has 340 active judicial officers and received 323 responses across judicial districts, representing a 95% response rate.

Of these responses, seven were submitted by justices, 245 were submitted by judges, including senior judges, the latter being introduced as a new respondent category with an additional 71 responses submitted by magistrates. From the 323 responses, the specific categories of the respondents' current roles are as follows:




Data from Denver County Court judges is typically excluded from the Annual Legislative Report due to the court's distinct appointment process and governing authority. However, to provide a more comprehensive overview of Colorado's judiciary, responses from Denver County Court judges and magistrates have been collected separately, with the results available in the Appendix on page 50.

In addition to tracking new appointments, the JOO program monitors several leading indicators throughout the year increasing the number of racial, ethnic, gender-diverse, LGBTQIA+ applicants, and applicants with disabilities for judgeships; enhancing the resources available to decision-makers; and increasing the number of diverse judicial nominating commissioners.



COLORADO JUDICIAL OFFICER DIVERSITY FY 2024

- To ensure the most current data, the JODQ was distributed to judicial officers between August and September 2024. Respondent participation was voluntary, with the option to “Decline to answer” and “None of these statements apply to me.” The aim was to build on existing data while gathering insights into both personal demographics and professional experiences. The 2024 questionnaire included questions from a prior survey conducted at the Annual Judicial Conference in September 2022, but also introduced new categories and questions, as outlined below:
- For the question regarding the respondent’s race, it now includes more detailed categories:
 - Asian/American specifies countries including China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, The Philippines, Singapore, and Việt Nam
 - Middle Eastern/North African
 - Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian
 - Native/Indigenous
 - Asian, including India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, and Pakistan
- A question asking the respondent for their age within a range was added with the following categories: 30 and under, 31-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-65, 66+, and “Decline to answer.”
- A question was added asking the respondent if, aside from English, there are other languages that they are proficient in speaking. The categories include Arabic, Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese), French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Portuguese, Somali, Spanish, Vietnamese, other, and not applicable.
- A question was added asking the respondent if, aside from English, there are other languages in which they are proficient writers. The categories include Arabic, Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese), French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Portuguese, Somali, Spanish, Vietnamese, other, and not applicable.
- For gender identity, expanded options were provided to include:
 - Intersex
 - Non-binary
- For the sexual orientation question, additional categories have been added:
 - Asexual
 - Bisexual
 - Gay
 - Lesbian
 - Queer
- The question regarding being a refugee, immigrant, or child of immigrants has been updated to better acknowledge an individual’s direct lived experience. It now asks if the respondent has personal lived experience as a refugee or immigrant.
- The question asking if the respondent has a significant physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more life activities has been modified by removing the word “significant” to recognize the respondent’s unique personal experiences and perspectives.



- Additional categories have been added to the question of whether the respondent is the first person in their family to graduate from high school, college or law school. The categories include:
 - I am the first in my family to receive a master's degree.
 - I am the first in my family to receive a doctorate degree.
- A question was added asking the respondent if the following statements apply to them regarding whether they are teaching or have taught at higher education institutions:
 - I taught as a professor at a college/s or university.
 - I taught as a professor at a graduate school/s.
 - I taught as a professor at a law school/s.
 - None of these statements apply to me.
- The question was added asking the respondent about their personal and professional experiences overseas:
 - I have lived overseas for school.
 - I have lived overseas for work.
 - I have lived overseas for personal reasons.
 - None of these statements apply to me.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program was originally established around three main components that defined its framework. In response to the increasing need to cultivate strong relationships and wellness within the judiciary, JOO is adding a fourth pillar: Connection and Well-Being. This new pillar will help ensure we are actively listening to and addressing the needs of judicial officers across the state.

THE JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH PROGRAM (JOO)

FOUR PRIMARY PILLARS



JOO DATA METHODOLOGY

The JOO employs a range of tracking methods and tools to compile and present current demographic data on judicial officers. This includes voluntary demographic information from judicial officer applicants, new appointment information, and responses to the statewide Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire. Since providing demographic data is optional, the accuracy of the information relies heavily on respondents' participation and self-reporting.

JOO 1st Pillar: Pipeline Development

OBJECTIVE AND FOCUS

Pipeline Development enhances engagement and connections to create equitable opportunities for judicial officer applicants.
Java with Judges (JWJ)


The Java with Judges (JWJ) program is guided by a Steering Committee composed of members from the Judicial Officer Outreach Program, the Inclusivity, Diversity, Equity, and Anti-Racism (IDEA) Committee of the Colorado Court of Appeals, and the Colorado Supreme Court's working group on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

A defining feature of JWJ is its small-group format, where participants engage directly with two judicial officers and one law clerk. Each session is limited to six students, allowing for personalized interaction, deeper engagement, and ample opportunity for attendees to ask questions and gain insights from the panelists.

Since its inception, the overwhelmingly positive feedback from law students indicates that this unique opportunity for meaningful conversations, direct insights, and the chance to pose questions to judicial officers and law clerks has proven invaluable. The interest demonstrated by law students highlights their interest in engaging with and potentially serving as law clerks and future judicial officers.

From July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024 (FY 2024), JWJ hosted 23 networking events, with 100 students registered. To maximize accessibility, eight sessions were held in-person, while 15 were offered virtually to accommodate judicial officer and law student schedules.

Since its launch four years ago, the program has connected approximately 450 students with 240 judges and 123 law clerks through both in-person and virtual sessions.



“ A diverse and inclusive judiciary is one way in which the government can demonstrate its commitment to treating members of the public equitably. Appointing people from all walks of life to judicial positions helps create within the judiciary a richness of experience and perspective that is foundational for impartiality, helpful for comprehending the varied matters that come before courts, and critical to understanding the ways in which our decisions may impact people’s lives. ”

PAX L. MOULTRIE
JUDGE - COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS



JOO 2nd Pillar: Community Engagement

The Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program's Community Engagement pillar emphasizes the critical role of outreach and education in judicial officer recruitment, enhancing training programs, and informing the public about the judicial nomination and appointment processes. This component is designed to foster meaningful connections between legal professionals and the broader community, promoting a deeper understanding and stronger relationships with the judiciary and judicial officers.

A key aspect of this pillar is fulfilling the statutory mandate to provide education and outreach regarding judicial vacancies. This includes delivering targeted educational programs to attorneys and law students, focusing on judicial vacancies and the application process.

The JOO Program acknowledges that understanding the unique strengths and challenges of judicial districts and officers across the state is vital for tailoring outreach, recruitment, training, and recruitment efforts. To support this mission, the program has been conducting statewide listening sessions, gathering valuable insights and recommendations from judicial officers and districts, which will inform and strengthen judicial officer recruitment and retention strategies.

Moreover, the JOO Program has been actively collaborating with local law schools, universities, and colleges to raise awareness among students about careers as judicial officers. These efforts aim to foster mentorship opportunities and establish pipelines for clerkships and judicial officer roles.

Judicial recruitment and retention are fundamental to maintaining a robust judiciary. To support these efforts, the JOO Program continues to collaborate with the Office of the Governor, the Nominating Commissions, and the Judicial Performance Commission to enhance recruitment initiatives and strengthen retention strategies.



JOO 3rd Pillar: Data and Research

DATA REPORTING


The 2024 Annual Legislative Report presents new and expanded judicial officer data on demographics, building on previous JOO program reports. In August 2024, a Judicial Officer Demographic Questionnaire (JODQ) was distributed to judicial officers in Colorado to enhance existing data and capture their personal and professional experiences. The 2024 JODQ incorporates questions from the prior survey conducted at the Annual Judicial Conference in September 2022.

Data Point 1: Race/Ethnicity Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- Of the 323 respondents to the questionnaire, sixty-five individuals self-identified as belonging to a diverse racial category. The detailed breakdown of these responses is as follows. A comparison from FY 2023 and FY 2024 is also provided below as well as the Appendix.

STATEWIDE JUDICIAL OFFICER RACE/ETHNICITY - FY 2024 and FY 2023 COMPARISON					
Some respondents have self-identified in multiple categories. Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race/Ethnicity	FY 2024		FY 2023		% Statewide Population
	# of Judges	% of Judges	# of Judges	# of Judges	
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	6	1.85%	9	2.70%	3.80%
Black/African American	13	4.02%	15	4.50%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	256	79.20%	276	82.40%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	30	9.28%	27	8.10%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	1	0.30%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	0.20%
Mixed race	4	1.23%	6	1.80%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	4	1.23%	2	0.60%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	1	0.30%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	1	1.23%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	15	4.64%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total # and Total %	323	100%	335	100%	100%



“ Our fair and impartial justice system relies on judges to objectively assess the facts and apply the law accordingly. Naturally, this decision-making process is influenced by each judge's unique life experiences. A judiciary that reflects the diversity of backgrounds and perspectives within our community enhances and enriches this process. ”

GREGORY J. STYDUHAR
DISTRICT COURT CHIEF JUDGE - 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT



- The additional race categories included in the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire offered more options, resulting in a more accurate representation of Colorado’s judiciary demographics.
- Demographic data for judicial officers across all 22 judicial districts is provided in the appendix and is compared to the demographics of each county within those districts. The results are also compared to the overall population demographics of the state of Colorado. The racial data from the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire appears to align with the racial percentages for the state.

Data Point 2: Age

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- From the 323 respondents who answered the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, 323 respondents self-disclosed their age range as follows:
 - 30 and under - 1
 - 31 - 39 - 22
 - 40 - 49 - 104
 - 50 - 59 - 122
 - 60 - 65 - 44
 - 66+ - 22
 - Decline to answer - 8
- Based on the responses received from the 2024 questionnaire, the majority of judicial officers in Colorado are between the ages of 50-59. Judges under 40, as well as those over 66 at the later years of their careers, are the least represented on the Colorado bench. Most current judicial officers are expected to serve for at least another six to ten years before retiring, which may contribute to retention on the bench.



Data Point 3: Foreign Language Proficiency

Total Respondents: 323


KEY FINDINGS

- Foreign language proficiency among Colorado judicial officers is key to advancing the shared objective of ensuring equal access to the courts, regardless of an individual's English proficiency. The U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division has partnered with court systems in over 20 states to "remove barriers for people with limited English proficiency and ensure compliance with Title VI." In Colorado, the language skills of judicial officers are crucial in promoting access to justice, reflecting the diversity of the state's communities, and strengthening the relationship between the judiciary and those it serves.
- The benefits of judicial officers being multilingual include enhanced connections with diverse communities, greater cultural awareness, and increased sensitivity to the needs of individuals from various backgrounds. According to data from the American Community Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, the top 10 languages spoken in Colorado are:

- Spanish
- Vietnamese
- Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese)
- Amharic (Somali or Afro-asiatic language)
- Korean
- Russian
- Nepali, Marathi, or Indic languages
- Arabic
- Other languages of Asia
- French (including Cajun)


- Based on responses from the 323 participants to the question, "Aside from English, are there other languages that you are proficient in speaking? Please specify which language(s)," Colorado judicial officers self-reported proficiency in a variety of languages. The most spoken languages, other than English, were provided by the respondents. 261 respondents responded "Not applicable" to this question.

- Spanish - 41
- German - 11
- French - 7
- Other - 3
- Chinese - 1
- Japanese - 1
- Korean - 1
- Portuguese - 1



- Based on responses from the 323 participants to the question, "Aside from English, are there other languages that you are proficient in writing? Please specify which language(s)," Colorado judicial officers reported proficiency in a variety of languages. The most spoken languages, other than English, were provided by the respondents. 281 respondents responded "Not applicable" to this question.

- Spanish - 29
- German - 9
- French - 2
- Portuguese - 1
- Other - 1





Data Point 4: Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- According to the Harvard Division of Continuing Education - Professional Executive Development, “a growing body of research indicates a strong correlation between gender equity and organizational success.” This link ties in with organizational health, as “organizations that actively create and promote strong internal processes incorporating a variety of perspectives, experiences, and leadership styles consistently outperform competitors and homogenous leadership team.” Gender diversity in the judicial system attracts a broader pool of applicants and talent, invites various perspectives and points of view, and demonstrates that judicial officers are reflective of the broad and diverse communities that they serve.
- From the 323 responses received on the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire for the “What is your gender identity question?”, the responses were as follows:
 - 143 - Male (44.27%)
 - 163 - Female (50.46%)
 - 17 - Declined to answer (5.26%)
- From the 323 responses received on the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, for the question “What is your sexual orientation?”, the responses were as follows. Some respondents self-identified in more than one category:
 - 256 - Heterosexual (78.3%)
 - 11 - Gay (3.4%)
 - 7 - Bisexual (2.1%)
 - 6 - Lesbian (1.8%)
 - 4 - Queer (1.2%)
 - 3 - Asexual (0.9%)
 - 40 - Decline to answer (12.2%)



Data Point 5: Military Veteran

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- For the question “Are you a military veteran?” on the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, 16 (4.95%) respondents answered yes, 303 (93.8%) answered no, and four answered “not applicable” (1.23%).

Data Point 6: Refugee or Immigrant Experience

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- Colorado’s Office of New Americans latest 2021 American Community Survey estimates that approximately 570,273 foreign-born individuals reside in Colorado. This number constitutes 9.8% of Colorado’s overall population.
- From the 323 responses received on the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire for the question “Are you a refugee or an immigrant?”, nine (2.78%) respondents self-identified as being a refugee or immigrant, 308 (95.3%) respondents answered “no”, and six (1.85%) respondents answered, “not applicable”.
- Having a judge who is a refugee or immigrant brings several important benefits to the judiciary and the communities they serve for the following reasons:
 - **Diverse Perspectives:** Judges with refugee or immigrant backgrounds bring unique life experiences that enrich their understanding of diverse cultural, social, and legal challenges. This perspective allows them to better empathize with individuals from various backgrounds, particularly those facing similar experiences.
 - **Enhanced Fairness and Inclusion:** Judges who have experienced migration or displacement personally may be more attuned to the biases or barriers faced by marginalized populations, helping to ensure more equitable treatment in courtrooms.
 - **Representation and Trust:** Having a judiciary that reflects the diversity of the community it serves helps build public confidence in the legal system. Refugee or immigrant judges can strengthen trust between courts and immigrant or refugee communities by showing that the judiciary is accessible and inclusive.
 - **Decision-Making:** Diverse experiences contribute to more well-rounded decision-making. Judges who understand the complexities of immigration and refugee issues can offer more nuanced judgments in cases involving immigration law or the experiences of displaced persons.
 - **Role Models and Mentorship:** Judges with refugee or immigrant backgrounds serve as role models for individuals from similar backgrounds, inspiring them to pursue legal careers and contribute to a more diverse judiciary.
 - **Cultural Competency:** A judge who has experience as a refugee or immigrant may possess a deeper understanding of the cultural nuances and sensitivities of immigrant communities. This can improve communication and reduce misunderstandings in court proceedings involving individuals from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

“ Diversity and inclusivity on the bench means including a unique and critical perspective to the judicial branch for the citizens of Colorado. If we exclude or ignore diverse voices then there can be no true and meaningful discourse, or progress for the judiciary. ”




ISABEL PALLARÉS
JUDGE, DENVER COUNTY COURT

Data Point 7: Disability

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- For the question “Are you disabled due to a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more life activities?” on the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, seven (2.2%) respondents answered yes, 304 (94.1%) answered no, and 12 (3.7%) declined to answer.




Data Point 8: First to Graduate from College, Graduate School, and Law School

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- For the following question on the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, the respondents were asked to “Select all statement(s) that apply to you.” Some respondents self-identified in multiple categories and with responses are as follows:
 - I am the first in my family to graduate from high school. - 7 (2.16%)
 - I am the first in my family to graduate from college. - 65 (20.1%)
 - I am the first in my family to receive a master's degree. - 20 (6.19%)
 - I am the first in my family to receive a doctorate degree. - 83 (25.69%)
 - I am the first in my family to graduate from law school. - 237 (73.37%)
 - None of these statements apply to me. - 75 (23.21%)
 - Decline to answer. - 10 (3.09%)



Data Point 9: Worked During School and Law as a Second More Career

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

In the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, respondents were instructed to "Select all statement(s) that apply to you." Some respondents self-disclosed more than one response, and the responses are as follows:

- I worked full-time while going to college and/or law school. - 107 (33.12%)
- Law is my second career. - 67 (20.74%)
- Law is my third career. - 8 (2.47%)
- Law is my fourth or more career. - 0 (0.00%)
- None of these statements apply to me. - 159 (49.22%)
- Decline to answer. - 10 (3.09%)


Data Point 10: Higher Education Work Experience

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- In the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, respondents were instructed to "Select all statement(s) that apply to you." The responses are as follows:

- I taught as a professor at a college. - 31 (9.59%)
- I taught as a professor at a graduate school. - 4 (1.23%)
- I taught as a professor at a law school. - 23 (7.12%)
- None of these statements apply to me. - 260 (79.5%)
- Decline to answer. - 9 (2.78%)
- Other - 0 (0.00%)




Data Point 11: Overseas Experience

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- In the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, respondents were instructed to "Select all statement(s) that apply to you." Some respondents self-disclosed multiple answers and are as follows:

- I have lived overseas for school. - 76 (21.7%)
- I have lived overseas for work. - 29 (8.3%)
- I have lived overseas for personal reasons. - 36 (10.3%)
- None of these statements apply to me. - 202 (57.5%)
- Decline to answer. - 8 (2.3%)




Data Point 12: Caregiver

Total Respondents: 323

KEY FINDINGS

- For the following statement from the 2024 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, the respondents were asked to “Select all statement(s) that apply to you.” Some of the respondents self-reported multiple categories and are as follows:
 - I am a caregiver for my child/ren. - 152 (43.3%)
 - I am a caregiver for my parent(s) and/or other adult family members. - 49 (14.0%)
 - I am a caregiver in another capacity. - 10 (2.8%)
 - None of these statements apply to me. - 130 (37.0%)
 - Decline to answer. - 10 (2.8%)



“ The JOO has been instrumental in providing data, programming and prioritizing equity efforts in both the appointment and support of judges from marginalized groups including people of color and LGBTQ communities. The significance of appointing judges that represent those from communities who are overrepresented in the criminal justice system, such as the Black and Latino communities, cannot be overstated. It is the responsibility of the judiciary to ensure an impartial and inclusive environment for participants in our system-- the JOO is public assurance that this responsibility is recognized and actualized. ”

DEA M. LINDSEY
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE - 20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT



“ Diversity among judicial officers and within our communities serves to enhance our justice system by encompassing a range of perspectives to ensure fairness and compassion in the application of our laws. It helps the rule of law resonate more deeply with everyone, making justice inclusive and reflective of our shared community values. Embracing diversity as a judicial branch demonstrates a commitment to build an equitable society where all voices are heard and respected. ”

SUSAN BLANCO

DISTRICT COURT CHIEF JUDGE - 8TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT



JOO 4th Pillar: Connection and Well-Being

KEY POINTS

- The JOO Program is pleased to announce the introduction of a fourth and vital pillar: Connection and Well-Being. This new focus area is essential for cultivating meaningful relationships among current and future judicial officers, fostering positive work environments, strengthening ties with the communities they serve, and humanizing judicial officers by showcasing their work and impact.
- Judicial officer well-being is vital for the judiciary for several reasons:
 - **Judicial Impartiality:** Maintaining the mental, emotional, and physical well-being of judicial officers ensures they can perform their duties without undue stress, preserving their ability to make impartial decisions.
 - **Quality of Judgments:** Well-being directly affects cognitive function, decision-making, and attention to detail. Judicial officers in good health are more likely to deliver sound, thoughtful, and well-reasoned judgments, enhancing the quality of justice.
 - **Retention and Longevity:** Prioritizing the well-being of judicial officers reduces burnout, turnover, and early retirements, thereby helping retain experienced officers on the bench and ensuring continuity within the judiciary.
 - **Public Confidence:** The public's trust in the judiciary relies on the perception of its officers being capable and composed. Ensuring judicial officers' well-being fosters public confidence in their ability to perform their roles effectively.
 - **Ethical Standards:** A focus on well-being helps judicial officers maintain ethical standards and professionalism, as they are less likely to experience stress-related lapses in judgment or behavior.
 - **Workplace Environment:** Supporting well-being promotes a positive and supportive work environment within the judiciary, contributing to overall morale and collaboration among court staff and officers and the communities it serves.
 - **Mental Well-Being:** Judicial officers who are mentally and physically healthy are better equipped to manage their caseloads efficiently, avoiding delays and ensuring that justice is delivered fairly and promptly.



“ Ensuring fairness for everyone in our community means we need to be mindful of the various biases that can influence courtroom proceedings. The diversity of our personal experiences enriches our ability to tackle these crucial issues, emphasizing the removal of bias and upholding fairness for all. ”

JON J. OLAFSON
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE - 2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

LOOKING AHEAD

As the Judicial Officer Outreach Program (JOO) moves into its next phase, the commitment to promoting judicial diversity remains paramount. A judiciary that reflects the diversity of its population is essential to ensuring fair and impartial access to justice and upholding the rule of law. When individuals and communities see judges who reflect their backgrounds and experiences and observe fair and dignified treatment in court, it reinforces a powerful message of inclusion and justice. This not only challenges harmful stereotypes about the legal system but also fosters a more just and equitable judicial process.


JOO will continue to advance its mission by focusing on its four core pillars: data and research, community outreach, pipeline development, and fostering connection and well-being. In the new emphasis on connection and well-being, the program plans to highlight the work and accomplishments of judicial officers, offering a more humanized and accessible perspective of the judiciary to address and dispel prevailing misconceptions. This shift in approach aims to enhance both the well-being within the judiciary and the public's understanding.

Current and past initiatives will be assessed and modified as needed, with the possibility of reactivation to respond to ongoing feedback and the evolving needs of the judiciary, judicial officers, higher education institutions, law schools, the legal community, and community stakeholders. This ongoing program evaluation is essential to ensure they effectively support the judiciary's recruitment and retention efforts.

The JOO's continuous feedback from statewide listening sessions with judicial districts, officers, and stakeholders highlights the need to attract a larger and more diverse pool of applicants to the bench. In response, the JOO believes that fostering meaningful connections and opportunities between aspiring and current judges can help alleviate challenges for judges. The feedback also underscores the importance of wellness and support for judges, enabling them to better serve in their roles.

For the upcoming year, the JOO is excited to present new opportunities for engaging applicants interested in serving on the bench. Our program will feature both large and small-scale events designed to provide firsthand insights from current judicial officers across the state, encompassing a range of expertise and experience. These engagement opportunities will address the challenges and recommendations shared by JOO's listening sessions. The events will include sessions tailored to address the questions, challenges, and concerns of potential judicial applicants, and will offer practical tools for becoming a successful applicant, candidate, and judicial officer.





The JOO Program will continue fostering open dialogue across Colorado's soon-to-be twenty-three judicial districts. This engagement is essential for promoting the recruitment, retention, and diversity of judicial officers and seeks to provide:

Comprehensive Understanding: Engaging with judicial officials and professionals offers valuable insight into the specific challenges and barriers to diversity in different regions. This approach helps uncover district-specific issues and opportunities that may be overlooked from a broader perspective. Direct collaboration with judicial officers allows for the development of customized solutions that address the unique needs of each district. Moreover, understanding the ongoing efforts of judges helps prevent redundancy and strengthens the existing efforts, including the lunchtime trainings in the 1st Judicial District, “Courageous Conversations” efforts in the 20th Judicial District, as well as other work across the state.

Inclusive Participation: A listening tour ensures that voices from all parts of the state, especially from underrepresented communities, are heard. This inclusive approach builds trust and encourages judicial officers and employees to share their experiences and insights, which are essential for driving meaningful change tailored to their unique needs. Rural districts often feel overlooked in conversations, as public attention and media focus is oftentimes focused on the metro and the surrounding metro areas.

Tailored Solutions: By directly gathering input from each district, solutions can be specifically designed to address the unique needs and circumstances of each area. This localized approach enhances the likelihood of successful implementation and impact, as the solutions are more relevant and actionable. For instance, judicial districts in greater Colorado often have fewer judicial officers and staff compared to the Denver metro area. Identifying alternative resources to support these districts is crucial for the well-being of judicial officers and their districts.

Build Relationships and Trust: A listening tour helps build relationships between judicial officers, judicial employees, and the communities they serve. It demonstrates a commitment to transparency and accountability, which enhances trust in the judicial system and encourages ongoing collaboration and support for diversity initiatives.

APPENDIX

**RACE, ETHNICITY, AND GENDER DATA OF COLORADO STATE COURTS
FY 2024 & FY 2023 COMPARISON**

(THE BLUE SECTIONS OF THE APPENDIX EXCLUDES DATA FOR DENVER COUNTY COURT, AS THIS DATA IS PROVIDED SEPARATELY AT THE END OF THE APPENDIX.)

COLORADO JUDICIAL - STATEWIDE RACE/ETHNICITY			
Some respondents have self-identified in multiple categories for both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the U.S. Census Statewide % Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	6	1.85%	3.80%
Black/African American	13	4.02%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	256	79.20%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	30	9.28%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	1	0.30%	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.20%
Mixed race	4	1.23%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	4	1.23%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	1	0.30%	Category not available
Other	1	1.23%	Category not available
Decline to answer	15	4.64%	Category not available
Total # and Total %	323	100%	100%

STATEWIDE JUDICIAL OFFICER GENDER - FY 2024 and FY 2023 COMPARISON					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Statewide Gender	FY 2024 # of Judges	FY 2024 % of Judges	FY 2023 # of Judges	FY 2023 % of Judges	% Statewide Population
Male	143	44.27%	184	54.90%	50.60%
Female	163	50.46%	151	45.10%	49.40%
Decline to Answer	17	5.26%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total # and Total %	323	100%	335	100%	100%

APPENDIX

**2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
FY 2024 Judicial Appointments by Race and 4-year Comparison**

NEW JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY RACE FY 2024 (July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024)			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0%	1.70%
Asian	1	3.70%	3.80%
Black/African American	1	3.70%	4.80%
Hispanic/Latino	2	7.40%	22.70%
Multiracial	0	0.00%	3.50%
White (not Hispanic or Latino)	13	48.10%	66.10%
No information provided	9	33.30%	No category provided
Decline to answer	1	3.70%	No category provided
Total # and Total %	27	100%	100%

NEW JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY RACE - 4 YEAR COMPARISON				
Race	FY 2021 07/01/20- 06/30/21	FY 2022 07/01/21 - 06/30/22	FY 2023 07/01/22 - 06/30/23	FY 2024 07/01/23 - 06/30/24
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	1	0
Asian	0	1	3	1
Black/African American	5	3	1	1
Hispanic/Latino	4	4	5	2
Multiracial	2	0	3	0
White (not Hispanic or Latino)	19	24	33	13
No information provided	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	9
Decline to answer	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	1
Total #	30	32	46	27

APPENDIX

**2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
FY 2024 Judicial Appointments By Gender and Four-year Comparison**

JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY GENDER FOR FY 2024 (July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024)			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide Population
Male	13	50.60%	50.60%
Female	14	49.40%	49.40%
Total	27	100%	100%

JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY GENDER - FOUR YEAR COMPARISON				
Gender	FY 2021 07/01/20- 06/30/21	FY 2022 07/01/21 - 06/30/22	FY 2023 07/01/22 - 06/30/23	FY 2024 07/01/22 - 06/30/24
Male	12	16	23	13
Female	18	16	23	14
Decline to answer	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	30	32	46	27

APPENDIX

**2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
COLORADO SUPREME COURT**

COLORADO SUPREME COURT			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Race	# of Justices	% of Justices	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	5	71.42%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	2	28.57%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available
Other	0	0%	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available
Total	7	100%	100%

COLORADO SUPREME COURT			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Gender	# of Justices	% of Justices	% Statewide Population
Male	4	57.14%	50.60%
Female	3	42.85%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	No category available
Total	7	100%	100%

APPENDIX

**2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
Colorado Court of Appeals**

COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	2	9.09%	3.80%
Black/African American	1	4.54%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	13	59.09%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	4	18.18%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.20%
Mixed race	1	4.54%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available
Decline to answer	1	4.54%	Category not available
Total	22	100%	100%

COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide Population
Male	11	50.00%	50.60%
Female	10	45.45%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	4.54%	Category not available
Total	22	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
1st Judicial District
Total Respondents - 23

1st JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GILPIN AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES					
Some respondents have self-identified in multiple categories. Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Gilpin County	% Jefferson County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.70%	3.40%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.50%	1.70%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	20	84%	85.00%	76.50%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	3	8%	7.20%	16.20%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available.	Category not available.	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native	0	0.00%	0.30%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	1	0.00%	4.10%	2.80%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.80%	1.20%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	2	8.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	23	100%	100%	100%	100%

1st JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GILPIN AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Gilpin County	% Jefferson County	% Statewide
Male	11	47.82%	52.80%	50.30%	50.60%
Female	9	39.13%	47.20%	49.70%	49.40%
Decline to answer	3	13.04%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	23	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
2nd Judicial District
 Total respondents: 26

(The blue sections of the appendix excludes Data for Denver County Court. This data is provided separately at the end of the Appendix in green.)

2nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT - DENVER COUNTY				
Some respondents provided more than one reponse for this question. Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Entire Denver County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	3.60%	3.80%
Black/African American	3	11.53%	8.90%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	21	80.76%	53.90%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	2	7.69%	29.20%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	12.70%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	0.08%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	26	100%	100%	100%

2nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT - DENVER COUNTY			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide Population
Male	14	53.84%	50.60%
Female	12	46.15%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available
Total	26	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
3rd Judicial District
Total respondents: 4

3rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT - HUERFANO and LAS ANIMAS COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Huerfano County	% Las Animas County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.00%	1.60%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.70%	2.20%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	4	100.00%	64.80%	55.40%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0.00%	30.10%	38.40%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.30%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	3.70%	2.80%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	5.40%	4.10%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	4	100%	100%	100%	100%

3rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT - HUERFANO and LAS ANIMAS COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Huerfano County	% Las Animas County	% Statewide
Male	3	75%	50.70%	52.00%	50.60%
Female	0	0.00%	49.30%	48.00%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	25%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	4	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
4th Judicial District
 Total respondents: 33

4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - EL PASO and TELLER COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% El Paso County	% Teller County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	3.40%	1.20%	3.80%
Black/African American	2	6.06%	7.00%	1.20%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	31	93.93%	66.70%	86.60%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0.00%	19.10%	7.90%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.40%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	5.40%	3.00%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.40%	1.40%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	33	100%	100%	100%	100%

4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - EL PASO and TELLER COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% El Paso County	% Teller County	% Statewide
Male	11	33.33%	50.80%	51.10%	50.60%
Female	22	66.60%	49.20%	48.90%	49.40%
Decline to Answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	33	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
5th Judicial District
Total respondents: 6

5th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - CLEAR CREEK, EAGLE, LAKE, and SUMMIT COUNTIES							
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023							
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Clear Creek County	% Eagle County	% Lake County	% Summit County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.30%	1.50%	1.00%	1.80%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.20%	1.60%	1.10%	1.70%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	5	83.30%	86.60%	65.60%	60.80%	78.20%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	1	16.60%	8.10%	30.50%	34.90%	17.10%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.90%	1.80%	3.10%	1.80%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.50%	1.30%	2.90%	1.20%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - CLEAR CREEK, EAGLE, LAKE, and SUMMIT COUNTIES							
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023							
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Clear Creek County	% Eagle County	% Lake County	% Summit County	% Statewide Population
Male	2	33.33%	52.50%	52.90%	53.30%	50.60%	50.60%
Female	4	66.66%	47.50%	47.10%	46.70%	49.40%	49.40%
Decline to Answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	6	6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
6th Judicial District
 Total respondents: 8

6th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - ARCHULETTA, LA PLATA, and SAN JUAN COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023						
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Archuleta County	% of La Plata County	% San Juan County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam, etc.).	1	12.50%	1.10%	0.90%	0.70%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.00%	0.70%	0.20%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	5	62.50%	78.00%	78.50%	80.70%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	1	12.50%	16.80%	12.80%	15.60%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.90%	2.60%	2.70%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	3.40%	7.60%	1.00%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	1	12.50%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

6th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - ARCHULETTA, LA PLATA, and SAN JUAN COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023						
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Archuleta County	% of La Plata County	% San Juan County	% Statewide Population
Male	3	37.50%	49.60%	50.70%	54.40%	50.60%
Female	4	50.00%	50.40%	49.30%	45.60%	49.40%
Decline to Answer	1	12.50%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
8th Judicial District
 Total respondents: 18

8th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - JACKSON and LARIMER COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Jackson County	% Larimer County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	1	5.55%	0.50%	2.60%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	0.30%	1.40%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	14	77.70%	84.30%	80.30%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	1	5.55%	12.40%	13.10%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	1	5.55%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	1.80%	3.10%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	2.90%	1.20%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	1	5.55%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	18	100%	100%	100%	100%

8th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - JACKSON and LARIMER COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Jackson	% Larimer	% Statewide Population
Male	7	38.80%	54.30%	49.90%	50.60%
Female	10	55.55%	45.70%	50.10%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	5.55%	Category to available	Category to available	Category not available
Total	18	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
9th Judicial District
 Total respondents: 9

9th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GARFIELD, PITKIN, and RIO BLANCO COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023						
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Garfield County	% Pitkin County	% Rio Blanco County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.00%	2.20%	0.60%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.60%	1.20%	1.50%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	8	88.80%	63.60%	83.50%	83.50%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	1	11.11%	32.80%	11.70%	11.00%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.20%	0.10%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.10%	1.90%	2.80%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.90%	0.60%	1.70%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	9	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

9th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GARFIELD, PITKIN, and RIO BLANCO COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source - US Census, Population estimates						
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Garfield County	% Pitkin County	% Rio Blanco County	% Statewide Population
Male	3	33.30%	51.50%	52.00%	51.30%	50.60%
Female	6	66.60%	48.50%	48.00%	48.70%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	9	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
10th Judicial District
Total respondents: 11

10th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - PUEBLO COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Pueblo County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.30%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0%	3.00%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	9	81.10%	51.80%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	2	18.18%	42.40%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	3.40%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	3.30%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	11	100%	100%	100.00%

10th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - PUEBLO COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Pueblo County	% Statewide Population
Male	5	45.45%	49.70%	50.60%
Female	5	45.45%	50.30%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	9.09%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	11	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
14th Judicial District
 Total respondents: 6

14th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GRAND, MOFFAT, ROUTT COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population est. July 1, 2023						
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Grand County	% Moffat County	% Routt County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.00%	0.70%	1.00%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.40%	1.10%	1.20%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	5	83.30%	85.60%	78.50%	87.40%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	1	16.66%	10.10%	17.30%	9.10%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.10%	2.30%	1.70%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.00%	1.70%	0.70%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

14th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GRAND, MOFFAT, ROUTT COUNTIES						
Statewide % & county % - Source: US Census, Population est. July 1, 2023						
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Grand County	% Moffat County	% Routt County	% Statewide Population
Male	2	33.30%	53.70%	52.00%	53.70%	50.60%
Female	4	66.60%	46.30%	48.00%	47.70%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
16th Judicial District
Total respondents: 4

16th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - BENT, CROWLEY, and OTERO COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023						
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Bent County	% Crowley County	% Otero County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.50%	1.40%	1.00%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	7.00%	11.10%	1.80%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	2	50.00%	56.40%	54.90%	53.60%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	1	25%	33.20%	29.70%	42.30%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.80%	2.10%	3.10%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	3.60%	3.80%	3.90%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	25.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	1	25.50%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

16th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - BENT, CROWLEY, and OTERO COUNTIES						
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023						
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Bent County	% Crowley County	% Otero County	% Statewide Population
Male	3	75.00%	64.00%	73.70%	49.30%	50.60%
Female	0	0.00%	36.00%	26.30%	50.70%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	25.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
17th Judicial District
Total respondents: 25

17th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - ADAMS and BROOMFIELD COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Adams County	% Broomfield County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	4.80%	7.60%	3.80%
Black/African American	2	8.00%	4.50%	1.70%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	16	64.00%	45.70%	73.60%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	4	16.00%	43.20%	14.50%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.30%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	3.60%	3.00%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	1	4.00%	2.40%	0.90%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	2	8.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	25	100%	100%	100%	100%

17th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - ADAMS and BROOMFIELD COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source - US Census, Population estimates					
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Adams County	% Broomfield County	% Statewide Population
Male	11	44.00%	50.80%	50.50%	50.60%
Female	11	44.00%	49.20%	49.50%	49.40%
Decline to answer	3	12.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	25	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
19th Judicial District
 Total respondents: 15

19th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - WELD COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Weld County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	2.20%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.90%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	12	80.00%	62.80%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	2	13.33%	31.30%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.60%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.70%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	1	6.66%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	15	100%	100%	100%

19th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - WELD COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Weld County	% Statewide Population
Male	7	46.60%	51.80%	50.60%
Female	7	46.60%	48.20%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	6.60%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	15	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
20th Judicial District
Total respondents: 13

20th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - BOULDER COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Boulder County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	5.20%	3.80%
Black/African American	1	7.69%	1.30%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	9	69.23%	76.20%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	2	15.38%	14.70%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	1	7.69%	3.10%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	0.90%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	13	100%	100%	100%

20th JUDICIAL DISTRICT - BOULDER COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Boulder County	% Statewide Population
Male	8	61.53%	50.40%	50.60%
Female	5	38.46%	49.60%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	13	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
21th Judicial District
Total respondents: 10

21st JUDICIAL DISTRICT - MESA COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Mesa County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	1.20%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.00%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	8	80.00%	79.90%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0.00%	15.60%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.20%	0.20%
Mixed race	1	10.00%	2.60%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	1.50%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	1	10.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	10	100%	100%	100%

21st JUDICIAL DISTRICT - MESA COUNTY				
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Mesa County	% Statewide Population
Male	6	60.00%	49.40%	50.60%
Female	3	30.00%	50.40%	49.40%
Decline to answer	1	10.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	10	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
22nd Judicial District
Total respondents: 4

22nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT - DOLORES and MONTEZUMA COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Dolores County	# Montezuma County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0.00%	0.60%	0.90%	3.80%
Black/African American	0	0.00%	1.70%	1.00%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	4	100.00%	84.50%	71.90%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0.00%	8.20%	12.70%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	0	0.00%	2.30%	2.80%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	3.30%	13.60%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	4	100%	100%	100%	100%

22nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT - DOLORES and MONTEZUMA COUNTIES					
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023					
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Dolores County	% Montezuma County	% Statewide Population
Male	2	50.00%	55.10%	49.60%	50.60%
Female	2	50.00%	44.90%	50.40%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Total	4	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX

2024 DENVER COUNTY COURT - DEMOGRAPHICS DATA

TOTAL RESPONDENTS: 12

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Current Role		
What is your current role?	# of Judges	% of Judges
County Court Judge	11	91.67%
Magistrate	1	8.33%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - 2024 Race/Ethnicity Demographics				
Some respondents self-reported more than one category. Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023				
What is your race?	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Denver County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam, etc.).	1	8.33%	3.60%	3.80%
Black/African American	3	25.00%	8.90%	4.80%
Caucasian/White	6	50.00%	53.90%	66.10%
Hispanic/Latino	3	25.00%	29.20%	22.70%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0.00%	0.10%	0.20%
Mixed race	1	8.33%	12.70%	3.50%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0.00%	0.08%	1.70%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	1	8.33%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available	Category not available
Total	12	100%	100%	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Gender			
Statewide % and county % - Source: US Census, Population estimates July 1, 2023			
What is your gender?	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide Population
Male	2	16.66%	50.60%
Female	10	83.33%	49.40%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%	Category not available
Total	12	100%	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Gender Identity		
What is your gender identity?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Asexual	0	0.00%
Bisexual	0	0.00%
Gay	0	0.00%
Heterosexual	11	91.66%
Lesbian	1	8.33%
Queer	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Decline to answer	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

APPENDIX

2024 DENVER COUNTY COURT - DEMOGRAPHICS DATA

TOTAL RESPONDENTS: 12

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Age Range		
What is your age?	# of Judges	% of Judges
30 or under	0	0.00%
31-39	0	0.00%
40-49	7	58.33%
50-59	4	33.30%
60-65	1	8.33%
66+	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Foreign Language Proficiency - Speaking		
Some respondents self-reported more than one category.		
Aside from English, are there other languages that you are proficient with speaking? Please specify which language(s).	# of Judges	% of Judges
Arabic	0	0.00%
Chinese (including Mandarin, Cantonese)	0	0.00%
French	1	8.33%
German	0	0.00%
Hindi	0	0.00%
Japanese	0	0.00%
Korean	0	0.00%
Latin	0	0.00%
Portugese	0	0.00%
Somali	0	0.00%
Spanish	3	25.00%
Vietnamese	0	0.00%
Other	1	8.33%
Not applicable	8	66.66%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Foreign Language Proficiency - Reading		
Some respondents self-reported more than one category.		
Aside from English, are there other languages that you are proficient with writing? Please specify which language(s).	# of Judges	% of Judges
Arabic	0	0.00%
Chinese (including Mandarin, Cantonese)	0	0.00%
French	1	8.33%
German	0	0.00%
Hindi	0	0.00%
Japanese	0	0.00%
Korean	0	0.00%
Latin	0	0.00%
Portugese	0	0.00%
Somali	0	0.00%
Spanish	3	25.00%
Vietnamese	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Not applicable	9	75.00%
Total	12	100%

APPENDIX

2024 DENVER COUNTY COURT - DEMOGRAPHICS DATA

TOTAL RESPONDENTS: 12

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Military Veteran		
Are you a military veteran?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	0	0.00%
No	12	100.00%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Refugee or Immigrant		
Are you a refugee or an immigrant?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	2	16.67%
No	10	83.33%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Disability		
Are you disabled due to a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more life activities?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	1	8.33%
No	11	91.67%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - First in Family - Education		
Some respondents self-disclosed more than one response.		
Select all statement(s) that apply to you.	# of Judges	% of Judges
I am the first in my family to graduate from high school.	0	0.00%
I am the first in my family to graduate from college.	4	33.33%
I am the first in my family to receive a master's degree.	1	8.33%
I am the first in my family to receive a doctorate degree.	7	58.33%
I am the first in my family to graduate from law school.	11	91.66%
None of these statements apply to me.	1	8.33%
Decline to answer.	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

APPENDIX

2024 DENVER COUNTY COURT - DEMOGRAPHICS DATA

TOTAL RESPONDENTS: 12

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Work and Legal Career		
Some respondents self-disclosed more than one response.		
Select all statement(s) that apply to you.	# of Judges	% of Judges
I worked full-time while going to college and/or law school.	10	83.33%
Law is my second career.	4	33.33%
Law is my third career.	1	8.33%
Law is my fourth or more career.	0	0.00%
None of these statements apply to me.	1	8.33%
Decline to answer.	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Higher Education and Law School Teaching Experience		
Some respondents self-disclosed more than one response.		
Select all statement(s) that apply to you.	# of Judges	% of Judges
I taught as a professor at a college/s or university.	1	8.33%
I taught as a professor at a graduate school/s.	0	0.00%
I taught as a professor at a law school/s.	0	0.00%
None of these statements apply to me.	11	91.60%
Decline to answer.	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Overseas Experience		
Some respondents self-disclosed more than one response.		
Select all statement(s) that apply to you.	# of Judges	% of Judges
I have lived overseas for school.	3	25.00%
I have lived overseas for work.	0	0.00%
I have lived overseas for personal reasons.	3	25.00%
None of these statements apply to me.	7	58.33%
Decline to answer.	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%

DENVER COUNTY COURT - Caregiver		
Some respondents self-disclosed more than one response.		
Select all statement(s) that apply to you.	# of Judges	% of Judges
I am a caregiver for my child/ren.	8	66.66%
I am a caregiver for my parent(s) and/or other adult family members.	1	8.33%
I am a caregiver in another capacity.	0	0.00%
None of these statements apply to me.	4	33.33%
Decline to answer.	0	0.00%
Total	12	100%