

# OFFICE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

---



October 1, 2025

Dear Chief Justice Márquez and Esteemed Members of the Judiciary Committees:

In accordance with the legislative intent of SB 19-043 (C.R.S. § 13-3-101(11)(a)), I am pleased to present the FY25 Annual Legislative Report for the Colorado Judicial Department's Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program. From July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, the JOO Program has continued to advance its mission of promoting judicial transparency, diversity, and public trust through targeted outreach and education related to judicial vacancies and the nomination process.

A key highlight of this year's work was the *2025 Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Symposium* an in-person, half-day event designed specifically for attorneys and aspiring judges interested in pursuing judge positions. The symposium was informed by a series of statewide listening sessions with judges, diverse legal community leaders, district representatives, and community leaders, ensuring it reflected the needs and perspectives of those it aims to serve.

Core to our efforts is the Community Engagement Pillar of the JOO Program, which remains central to judge recruitment, outreach, and training. Over the past year, the JOO Program has deepened relationships with judicial districts, legal professionals, government agencies, and community-based organizations. These statewide engagements—including in-person visits, stakeholder meetings, and collaborative programming—have informed strategies for recruitment, retention, and public education.

Looking ahead, the JOO Program is excited to launch some key initiatives that build upon this momentum including a hybrid extension of the 2025 Symposium, offering accessible sessions for aspiring judges unable to attend in person and for rural districts and a judge sponsorship program pairing experienced judges with future applicants.

This year's report includes new data points that highlight the path judicial officers take to reach the bench. These additions underscore our commitment to understanding the path that current judicial officers have taken towards being on the bench and provide resources to make the path accessible for all.

Thank you for your continued support of the Judicial Officer Outreach Program as we advance a more accessible, diverse, and community-connected judiciary in Colorado.

Sincerely,

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



## Judicial Officer Outreach Program

# FY 2025 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Colorado Judicial Department

Office of the State Court Administrator  
1300 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, CO 80203  
[www.courts.state.co.us](http://www.courts.state.co.us)  
720-625-5000

# Table of Contents

## **Executive Summary - 4**

## **Statutory Reporting Requirement - 5**

## **Judicial Officer Outreach Program Overview - 6**

## **Judicial Officer Outreach Program Data Methodology - 7**

## **The Colorado Merit Selection System - 8**

## **How Judges and Magistrates Are Appointed: Key Differences - 8**

## **FY 2025 Data Reporting - 8**

FY 2025 - Judge Appointments - 8

FY 2025 - Colorado Judicial Officer Diversity - 9

Judicial Officers' Path to the Bench - 10

## **Judicial Officer Outreach Program 4 Pillars - 13**

Pillar 1: Pipeline Development - 13

- Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Symposium - 13
- Java With Judges - 14

Pillar 2: Community Engagement - 15

Pillar 3: Data and Research - 17

Pillar 4: Connection and Well-Being - 28

## **Judicial Officer Outreach Programs and Initiatives - 16**

- Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Virtual Series- 16
- BenchMark - 17

## **Looking Ahead - 29**

## **Appendix - 30**

- Statewide Judicial Officer Demographics Data - 30
- Demographics data FY 2025 New Judicial Officer Appointments - 31
- Four-year comparison - 31
- 2025 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire statewide responses
  - Colorado Supreme Court - 33
  - Colorado Court of Appeals - 34
  - Colorado Judicial District 1 through 23 - 35
  - Denver County Court - 58

**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](mailto:nga.vuongsandoval@judicial.state.co.us) or 720-625-5000.**



“  
*Our judges make important decisions every day that affect the people before them - people who come from all walks of life. For that reason, it is so important that our state court bench reflects a broad range of professional and life experiences. That experience helps our bench make sound, compassionate decisions. We are excited about the outreach our JOO has done to encourage attorneys across all our Colorado communities to consider a career on the bench.*

**THE HONORABLE MONICA M. MÁRQUEZ**  
**Chief Justice, Colorado Supreme Court**  
”

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines Colorado’s continued efforts to build a judiciary that reflects the state’s diverse communities, fulfills the educational and outreach requirements of SB 19-043, and advances strategies to improve transparency, equity, and access to judicial service.

### I. Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program

Structured around four pillars: Pipeline Development, Community Engagement, Data and Research, and Connection and Well-Being. The JOO Program promotes inclusive pathways to the bench by partnering with government partners, legal professionals, non-legal professionals, law schools, higher education institutions, and community organizations.

### II. Judicial Officer Demographics and Appointment Trends

The report presents FY 2025 judicial appointment and demographic data, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender. These metrics offer insight into appointment trends and serve as benchmarks for assessing outreach impact, tracking progress, and identifying areas for continued development.

### III. Community Engagement: Strategic, Inclusive, and Responsive

This year’s statewide listening sessions, conducted across judicial districts, offered region-specific perspectives on the challenges and opportunities in judicial recruitment. The insights gathered helped shape program initiatives and reaffirmed JOO’s dedication to focused outreach and tailored local support, while also identified shared challenges across districts.



#### IV. New Initiatives: Strengthening Colorado’s Judicial Pipeline

Leveraging insights from community engagement, the JOO Program is launching two new initiatives: *Your Honor: Journey to the Bench* (Virtual series) and *BenchMark*. These initiatives aim to increase access and deepen understanding of judicial careers from judges while continuing to strengthen the pipeline to the bench.

#### V. Looking Ahead

The JOO Program will continue advancing its mission through new and rebranded initiatives, applicant resources through virtual and in-person events, continued community engagement, pipeline building, collaborative events with judicial districts and stakeholders, and listening sessions. These efforts aim to amplify diverse perspectives, foster district-level collaboration, and identify structural barriers to inform responsive, data-driven solutions.

### STATUTORY REPORTING REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to Senate Bill 19-043 and C.R.S. § 13-3-101(11)(a), the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) program was established in 2020 within the Office of the State Court Administrator (SCAO) of the Colorado Judicial Department. This initiative is designed to educate and engage the public regarding judicial vacancies and the application process, in alignment with the Department’s mission to promote a fair and impartial justice system. Through its efforts to cultivate a state court bench that reflects the rich diversity of Colorado’s communities, the JOO program advances principles of inclusivity and equitable representation within the judiciary.

This report is submitted in accordance with the statutory reporting requirements outlined in C.R.S. § 13-3-101(11)(b)(I), which mandate an annual submission by October 1 to the Chief Justice of the Colorado Supreme Court and the Judiciary Committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. The FY 2025 Annual Legislative Report, covering the period from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, presents a comprehensive overview of the background, professional history, and qualifications of Colorado's judicial officers.

“Our Judicial Officer Outreach Program is critical for at least two reasons: First, we need more applicants to fill vacancies. To attract them, the program helps to ensure attorneys know about the vacancies and why they might be a good fit. Second, the program promotes diversity, which makes us intellectually and culturally richer. It also allows the branch to more closely resemble the communities we serve. This instills confidence in the courts and the rule of law.

**THE HONORABLE WILLIAM W. HOOD**  
Justice, Colorado Supreme Court





Jamie Sorrells-Director of Consumer Protection and Community Engagement 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Amy Padden-District Attorney 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, and Michael Mauro-Senior Chief Deputy District Attorney 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District.

Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership, The Honorable Michelle Amico-Chief Judge 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, Jenni Turnidge-Court Executive, Lindsey Adams-Administrative Office Manager.

18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court Judges, County Court Judges, Magistrates, Judge H. Clay Hurst, Judge Joseph Whitfield, Judge Benjamin Figa, Judge Jacob Edson, Judge Natalie Strickland, Magistrate Robert Caldwell, Judge Michelle Jones, Janira Pacheco-Deputy Chief Probation Officer, Judge Garen Gervy, Judge Danielle Touart-Chief Probation Officer Douglas Gray, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, and Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership.


## JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program was originally established upon three foundational pillars: (1) Pipeline Development, (2) Community Engagement, and (3) Data and Research. A fourth pillar, (4) Connection and Well-Being, was added last year to ensure the program remains responsive to the evolving needs of judges throughout the State of Colorado.

Together, these pillars guide the continued growth and refinement of the JOO Program as it works to foster stronger community connections, enhance collaboration with key stakeholders, and support the professional and personal well-being of judges across the state.

### THE JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH PROGRAM (JOO)

#### FOUR PRIMARY PILLARS





## JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM DATA METHODOLOGY

The Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program employs a combination of data collection tools and tracking methods to compile and maintain current demographic information about judges across the state. This information is sourced from several key inputs:

- Voluntary demographic data submitted by applicants during the application or appointment process.
- Details on new judicial appointments, which are gathered from official records and public announcements.
- Responses to the statewide Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, which is distributed annually to current judges and senior judges.

Participation in the demographic survey is entirely voluntary, and individuals may choose whether or not to disclose their demographic characteristics. As a result, the completeness and accuracy of the dataset are directly influenced by each respondent's willingness to self-identify and share this information. The JOO Program takes into account the variability in response rates and makes note of potential gaps or limitations in the dataset due to non-response.

Additionally, respondents are allowed to select *multiple categories* for certain questions, particularly those concerning race and ethnicity. While this approach better reflects the diverse identities of judges, it also means that the sum of responses for a given question may exceed the total number of respondents. Consequently, the interpretation of the data should consider the possibility of overlapping responses.

To support transparency and responsible data use, the reported figures are estimates based on self-reported and voluntarily submitted data, which may not reflect the entire population of judges.



*Justice is best served when the bench reflects the breadth of human experience. Judging is not done in isolation; we are better jurists when we work alongside colleagues whose backgrounds challenge and expand our own assumptions.*

**THE HONORABLE RYAN J. STUART**  
District Court Chief Judge, 23rd Judicial District

# THE COLORADO MERIT SELECTION SYSTEM

## Judicial Nominating Commissions

Established by constitutional amendment in 1966, Colorado's Merit Selection System provides for the appointment of state judges based on qualifications rather than political affiliation. When a judicial vacancy arises in the county court, district court, court of appeals, or supreme court, a nonpartisan judicial nominating commission reviews applications, conducts interviews, and submits a list of nominees to the governor. For appellate vacancies, three nominees must be submitted. The appointed judge serves an initial provisional term of two years and must stand for retention in the next general election.

Colorado utilizes two types of judicial nominating commissions:

1. **Supreme Court Nominating Commission** – This statewide commission recommends candidates for vacancies on the Colorado Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. It is chaired by the Chief Justice (non-voting) and comprises one attorney and one non-attorney from each congressional district, plus one additional non-attorney member residing in Colorado.
2. **Judicial District Nominating Commissions** – Each of Colorado's 23 judicial districts has its own commission, chaired by a justice of the supreme court in a non-voting capacity. These commissions are responsible for nominating candidates for vacancies in their respective district and county courts.

## HOW JUDGES AND MAGISTRATES ARE APPOINTED: KEY DIFFERENCES

- **Judges** - In Colorado, a district court judge is a judicial officer appointed by the Governor and is responsible for presiding over serious legal matters, including felony trials and complex civil lawsuits.
- **Magistrate** - A Magistrate is an administrative judicial officer appointed by the Chief Judge of the judicial district in Colorado, typically handling less serious cases such as family law disputes, traffic violations, and small claims. Magistrates have limited jurisdiction and are not subject to the same retention process as judges, allowing for quicker resolutions in certain cases.

## FY 2025 DATA REPORTING

### Judicial Officer Appointments FY 2025

An important clarification in the Fiscal Year 2025 report (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025) is the classification of judicial appointments and promotions into three categories:

- Judges new to the judicial system
- Judges appointed to a higher court
- Judges appointed by the Chief Justice to serve as Chief Judge


This distinction separates new appointees from those with prior judicial service who are advancing within the system.

It is important to note that the information in this section pertains only to judges appointed by the Office of the Governor and does not include Denver County Court Judges who are selected through a distinct appointment process and governing authority.


During Fiscal Year 2025, the Colorado Judicial Department welcomed 20 judge appointments by the Office of the Governor. Of the 20 who were appointed as judges, there were 6 judges new to the judicial system and 14 were judges appointed to a higher court. There were 5 appointed by the Chief Justice to serve as Chief Judge.

Twenty judges were appointed to the bench for FY 2025, a 29.9% decrease from last fiscal year. Among the new appointees, 65% are women and 35% are men, reflecting a 16.9% increase in the number of women appointed and a 16.9% decrease in the number of men appointed compared with the previous fiscal year.

Of the 20 judges, (10%) identified as judges of color: Asian/Asian American (5%), Black/African American (5%), and no Hispanic/Latino, Indigenous/Native American or multiracial judges were appointed. The remaining appointees (90%), identified as white (not Hispanic or Latino), representing an 4.8% decrease from the previous fiscal year. As of the writing of this report, 16.3% of judges on the Colorado state bench self-identify as having a diverse background or multiracial.



Of the newly appointed judges, 17 (85%) were serving as judicial officers at the time of their appointment to a higher court. Their previous positions were: Magistrate (52.9%), and County Court Judge (23.5%).




## 2025 DATA REPORTING

### COLORADO JUDICIAL OFFICER DIVERSITY FY 2025

The 2025 Annual Legislative Report expands on previous Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) findings by including new questions about judicial officers' paths to the bench. The Judicial Officer Demographic Questionnaire (JODQ) received 248 responses statewide, down 23% from 323 responses the previous year.

As of this reporting period, Colorado has 444 active judicial officers, resulting in a survey response rate of approximately 55.85%. Respondents included:

- 7 Colorado Supreme Court Justices
- 16 Colorado Court of Appeals Judges
- 115 District Court Judges
- 49 County Court Judges
- 56 Magistrates
- 2 Senior Judges



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 have been collected separately, with the results available in the Appendix beginning on page 30.

In addition to tracking new appointments, the JOO program monitors key data points throughout the year such as race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, and others, serving as a resource for decision-makers within the Colorado Judicial Department, the Colorado State Legislature, and other stakeholders.

## JUDICIAL OFFICERS' PATH TO THE BENCH

For this year's Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire, the core questions remained largely the same as last year's, with the addition of new categories addressing the court or judicial district currently served and the number of times each judicial officer position was applied for, as outlined below:

Which court or judicial district do you currently serve in? The options included:

- Colorado Supreme Court
- Colorado Court of Appeals
- Judicial Districts 1 through 23
- County Court
- Magistrate
- Senior Judge



*A diverse judiciary strengthens public trust by reflecting the communities it serves. Judges with varied backgrounds bring unique insights that enhance legal reasoning, reduce bias, and promote fairness. Ultimately, this representation promotes justice, accountability, and respect for the rule of law.*

**THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER J. BAUMANN**  
District Court Chief Judge, 2<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District

To gain further insight into a judicial officer's path to the bench, the following eight questions and response options were incorporated into the questionnaire.

1. For the first judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?
  - Magistrate
  - County Court
  - District Court
  - Colorado Court of Appeals
  - Colorado Supreme Court
  
2. For the first judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?
  - 1-9
  - 10 or more
  - Decline to answer
  
3. For the second judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position:
  - Magistrate
  - County Court
  - District Court
  - Colorado Court of Appeals
  - Colorado Supreme Court
  - Not applicable
  
4. For the second judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?
  - 1-9
  - 10 or more
  - Decline to answer
  
5. For the third judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?
  - Magistrate
  - County Court
  - District Court
  - Colorado Court of Appeals
  - Colorado Supreme Court
  - Not applicable



“  
*A diverse bench embodies the strength and spirit of our communities. It builds trust, fosters connection, and inspires greater confidence in a justice system that serves everyone, equally and fairly.*

**THE HONORABLE PAUL R. DUNKELMAN**  
**District Court Chief Judge, 5<sup>th</sup> Judicial District**



*I believe that diversity is important for two key reasons. First, it is essential for our community to have confidence in our courts. To build this trust, our judicial system should reflect the diversity present within our community. When judges represent different segments of society, it enhances public confidence in the judicial process. Second, having diverse perspectives on the bench is crucial. This variety of backgrounds allows for more informed decisions, as judges bring their unique experiences and insights to the table.*

**THE HONORABLE DAVID H. YUN**  
**Judge, Colorado Court of Appeals**

6. For the third judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?

- 1-9
- 10 or more
- Decline to answer

7. For the fourth judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?

- Magistrate
- County Court
- District Court
- Colorado Court of Appeals
- Colorado Supreme Court
- Not applicable

8. For the fourth judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?

- 1-9
- 10 or more
- Decline to answer



Katie Tefler-Supervisor-Arapahoe County Public Defenders Office, David Kaplan-Office Head-Douglas County Public Defenders Office, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, and Manuel Banks, Manager of Culture and Leadership.



Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership, Rachel Powell-Chief Deputy District Attorney 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, Tony Gioja-Chief Deputy District Attorney 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Brent Nelson-Assistant District Attorney 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District.



Laurie Mactavish-Family Court Facilitator 5<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, and the Honorable Paul R. Dunkelman-Chief Judge 5<sup>th</sup> Judicial District.



Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Symposium. Judicial Officer Outreach Program team, speakers, moderators, and attendees.

## **JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM**

### **PILLAR 1 - PIPELINE DEVELOPMENT**

Pipeline Development enhances engagement and connections to create equitable opportunities for judicial officer applicants. It aims to foster meaningful connections within the legal and non-legal community in order to create more equitable and accessible pathways for individuals aspiring to become judges. These efforts help ensure that a broader, more diverse pool of qualified candidates is informed, supported, and empowered to pursue judicial appointments.

### **YOUR HONOR: JOURNEY TO THE BENCH SYMPOSIUM**

As part of its ongoing commitment and efforts to strengthen the judicial officer pipeline, the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program hosted the *2025 Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Symposium*. Sponsored by the Colorado Women’s Bar Association and its Foundation, the event was held in May at the Colorado Bar Association and targeted attorneys and aspiring judicial applicants planning to seek judicial appointment within one to three years.

The symposium featured keynote remarks by the Honorable Chief Justice Monica Márquez and plenary remarks by the Honorable Justice Richard Gabriel, both emphasizing the importance of public service and the duties of judicial leadership. Judge Elizabeth Harris of the Colorado Court of Appeals provided sponsor remarks for the Colorado Women’s Bar Association Foundation. The breakout session panels included a Colorado Court of Appeals judge, two chief judges, seven district court judges, three county court judges, a representative from the Office of the Governor, and a retired judge. The event drew 43 registered participants. Panel discussions were moderated by representatives from the Colorado Women’s Bar Association, Asian Pacific American Bar Association, South Asian Bar Association, Sam Cary Bar Association, Colorado Trial Lawyers Association, the Colorado Attorney General’s Office, and a private law firm. Since the symposium, among the attendees who applied for a judge position, one has been selected as a finalist by the Colorado Nomination Commission.



The Honorable Richard L. Gabriel, Colorado Supreme Court Justice delivers the plenary address.



The Honorable Monica M. Márquez, Colorado Supreme Court Chief Justice delivers the keynote address.



The Honorable Elizabeth L. Harris, Colorado Court of Appeals Judge provided welcoming remarks on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Foundation.



Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Symposium breakout sessions.

Seven breakout sessions offered on core aspects of judicial officer preparation:

- Behind the Robe: A Day in the Life of a Judge
- Building Bridges: Establishing Connections for Judicial Success
- The Judicial Nomination Process: Getting Your Name in the Room
- Silencing Self-Doubt: Overcoming Imposter Syndrome
- Beyond Your Specialty: Learning New Areas of Law
- Ethics in Action: Upholding Integrity on the Bench
- The Judicial Family: Balancing Work and Life as a Judge

The symposium concluded with *Judges in a Flash: Speed Networking with the Bench*, an engaging, interactive and fast-paced networking session.



Judges in a Flash: Speed Networking with the Bench session.

## **JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM**

### **JOO PILLAR 1 - PIPELINE DEVELOPMENT**

Pipeline Development enhances engagement and connections to create equitable opportunities for judicial officer applicants.

#### **JAVA WITH JUDGES (JWJ)**

The Java with Judges (JWJ) program was established under the guidance of a Steering Committee composed of representatives 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 hallmark of the JWJ program is its small-group format, in which participants engage in direct, informal dialogue with two judicial officers and one law clerk. Each session is intentionally limited to six (6) law students to foster meaningful interaction, promote substantive engagement, and provide participants with an opportunity to ask questions and gain insight from the panelists.



*A judiciary that reflects the rich variety of backgrounds and experiences represented in our community enhances public trust in the judicial system because when people see judges who look like them and who have similar life experiences, it reassures them that they will be understood and treated equitably. Having a diverse judiciary also allows judges to help each other understand the nuances and implications of legal decisions and leads to more thoughtful and well-reasoned results.*

**THE HONORABLE JACLYN CASEY BROWN**  
Judge, Colorado Court of Appeals

Since the program's inception, law student feedback have reported that the opportunity to engage in candid conversations, receive direct insights from members of the judiciary, and ask individualized questions has been beneficial. The strong and consistent interest in JWJ reflects students' enthusiasm for deeper engagement with the judiciary and their potential aspirations to serve as law clerks or future judicial officers.

From July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025 (FY 2025), JWJ held approximately 22 sessions, 8 in person and 14 virtually. About 72 students registered during this period, with participation from 14 judges and 9 law clerks. These numbers are approximate, as not all registrants attended the sessions they signed up for.

Since the program's launch in 2021, JWJ has hosted a total of about 130 sessions, 24 in person and 106 virtual. An estimated 311 students have participated, along with 67 judges and 31 law clerks. These figures are also approximate due to inconsistencies in actual attendance.

## **JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM**

### **JOO PILLAR 2 - COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Acknowledging the diversity across Colorado's judicial districts, the Judicial Outreach Officer (JOO) continues statewide listening sessions through district visits and meetings with judges, senior court leadership, government officials, and legal and community leaders to foster mutual understanding and support for local and statewide initiatives.

The individuals and organizations include Chief Judges, Judges, Clerk of Court, Court Executives, District Attorneys and their senior leadership, Office of the Public Defender, County Attorneys, Office of the Mayor, Colorado Bar Association, local bar associations, Colorado Chamber of Commerce, local economic and business development offices, and community organizations. Insights gained from these visits and meetings inform recruitment, training, and retention strategies tailored to each district's needs.

During these engagements, the JOO Team has met with leadership from judicial districts, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and community-based groups to:

- Share overviews and updates about the JOO Program;
- Gain insight into each district's priorities and challenges, as well as each organization's mission, values, and objectives; and
- Explore opportunities for strategic collaboration to advance common goals and priorities.



Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership, The Honorable Erin Sokol-Chief Judge 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, The Honorable Chad Miller-Deputy Chief Judge 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Scott Sosebee-Court Executive 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District.

Alana Percy-Clerk of Court, Simone Jones-Deputy Court Executive, Olivia Cardenas-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Specialist, the Honorable Kyle Seedorf-Chief Judge 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Curisha Vera-Clerk of Court, Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, and Patricia Kmitta-Court Executive.

Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, Brian Mason-District Attorney 17<sup>th</sup> Justice District, Olivia Cardenas-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Specialist, and Karen Schweih, PhD-Director of Policy and Public Affairs, Adams County District Attorney's Office.

The JOO program also supports district-specific information sessions and events and collaborates with government organizations and local bar associations to develop targeted events and training addressing district-specific themes and priorities.

## JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES

As part of our ongoing commitment to the Community Engagement pillar of the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program, we will be launching two key initiatives to expand educational outreach, support judicial recruitment, enhance training and mentorship, and increase public understanding of the judicial application process.

## YOUR HONOR: JOURNEY TO THE BENCH VIRTUAL SERIES

An expansion of the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program, Your Honor: Journey to the Bench Symposium hosted in May 2025 will now be offered in a virtual format. Seven webinar sessions will take place each Wednesday from January 7 through February 18, 2026. This virtual offering provides an opportunity for participants outside the Denver metropolitan area, as well as those unable to attend the in-person event, to engage in the program. The sessions will include:

- Behind the Robe: A Day in the Life of a Judge
- Building Bridges: Establishing Connections for Judicial Success
- Silencing Self-Doubt: Overcoming Imposter Syndrome
- Beyond Your Specialty: Learning New Areas of Law
- Ethics in Action: Upholding Integrity on the Bench
- The Judicial Family: Balancing Work and Life as a Judge
- Beyond Your Specialty: Learning New Areas of Law



Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, Carol Rigato-Court Executive, the Honorable Ryan Stuart-Chief Judge 23rd Judicial District, and Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership.



Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, Danielle Summerville-Colorado Springs Mayor's Office, and Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership.



Nga Vương-Sandoval-Judicial Officer Outreach Program Lead, George Brauchler-District Attorney-23rd Judicial District, and Manuel Banks-Manager of Culture and Leadership.

## BENCHMARK – JUDICIAL OFFICER SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

*BenchMark* is a new initiative designed to connect attorneys and aspiring judges with experienced judges for a five-month sponsorship experience. This program inspired by elements of the former *Dream Team 2.0* mentorship model and is tailored for individuals planning to apply for a judgeship within the next 1–3 years. A select number of participants will be matched with a judge sponsor to establish personalized goals and expectations.

## JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM

### JOO PILLAR 3 - DATA AND RESEARCH

The 2025 Annual Legislative Report presents expanded judicial officer data on the judges' journey to the bench and number of times they applied to their current and previous judiciary positions, building on previous JOO program reports. In August 2025, 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 JODQ incorporates questions from the prior survey conducted that was distributed to judicial officer across the state.



*Representation continues to matter, and judicial diversity only serves to strengthen the core principles of fairness and due process for all. And viewpoint diversity on the bench allows us, as judicial officers, to have meaningful conversations with one another about the legal issues and concerns affecting others, and that allows us to be more thoughtful and considerate in our own decisions.*

**THE HONORABLE ELISE V. MYER**  
District Court Judge, 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial District

# JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM

## JOO PILLAR 3 - DATA AND RESEARCH

The 2025 Annual Legislative Report presents expanded judicial officer data on the judges' journey to the bench and number of times they applied to their current and previous judiciary positions, building on previous JOO program reports. In August 2025, 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 JODQ incorporates questions from the prior survey conducted that was distributed to judicial officer across the state.

### DATA POINT 1: RACE/ETHNICITY

#### KEY FINDINGS

The statewide total and data points 1 through 12 on the following pages represent responses from justices, district court judges, county court judges, magistrates, and senior judges who completed the questionnaire. Of the 248 total respondents, 41 individuals self-identified as members of one or more diverse racial group. A detailed demographic breakdown of these responses is provided below, along with a comparative analysis of Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025. Additional supporting information can be found in the Appendix on page 30.

**Please note:** Some respondents have self-identified in multiple categories for both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the Census Reporter. These multiple responses may impact the overall results that exceed that overall number and percentage.

STATEWIDE JUDICIAL OFFICER RACE/ETHNICITY - FY 2025 AND FY 2024 COMPARISON					
Race/ Ethnicity	FY 2025 # of Judges	FY 2025 % of Judges	FY 2024 # of Judges	FY 2024 % of Judges	% Statewide Population
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	8	3.2%	6	1.8%	3%
Black/African American	12	4.8%	13	4.0%	4%
Caucasian/White	204	82.2%	256	79.2%	64%
Hispanic/Latin	11	4.43%	30	9.2%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	1	0.3%	Category not available
Mixed race	3	1.2%	4	1.2%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	6	2.4%	4	1.2%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	1	.30%	Category not available
Other	17	6.8%	1	.30%	1%
Decline to Answer	12	4.8%	15	4.6%	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>



*Diversity is omnipresent. As long as there are people of color, women, LGBTQ, people with disabilities, immigrants, refugees, veterans, and so many more, there will always be a need for the bench to look like who it serves.*

**THE HONORABLE MARQUES IVEY**  
County Court Judge, 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District

## **JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM**

### **JOO PILLAR 3 - DATA AND RESEARCH**


The appendix presents demographic data for judicial officers across all twenty-three (23) judicial districts. This data is compared to the demographic makeup of each respective county and to the overall population demographics of the State of Colorado. Racial demographic information gathered through the 2025 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire appears to generally reflect the statewide racial distribution, as reported by Census Reporter.

### **DATA POINT 2: AGE**

#### **KEY FINDINGS**

From the respondents who answered the 2025 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire, 244 respondents self-disclosed their age range as follows:

- 30 and under - 0.4%
- 31 - 39 - 6.5%
- 40 - 49 - 36%
- 50 - 59 - 38.5%
- 60 - 65 - 12.6%
- 66+ - 4.5%
- Decline to answer - 1.6%




Based on the responses received from the 2025 questionnaire, the majority of judicial officers in Colorado are between the ages of 50-59. Judicial officers under 30 years old, as well as those over 66 and 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 - INSTANCES OF APPLYING FOR A JUDICIARY POSITION

The following eight additional questions were incorporated to provide a comprehensive account of each judicial officer’s trajectory to the bench, including the specific judicial position(s) for which they applied and how many times they applied for that particular position and included the following questions along with the responses submitted:


1. For the first judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?

- Magistrate - 34.3%
- County Court Judge - 1.2%
- District Court Judge - 0.4%
- Colorado Court of Appeals Judge - 0%
- Colorado Supreme Court Justice - 0%
- Other - 64.1%




2. For the first judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed? Respondents could select from the following options: 1 to 9, or 10 or more.

- 1 - 44.1%
- 2 - 21.1%
- 3 - 11.3%
- 4 - 5.7%
- 5 - 6.5%
- 6 - 3.6%
- 7 - 0%
- 8 - 0.4%
- 9 - 0%
- 10 or more times - 2.4%
- Decline to answer - 4.9%



3. For the second judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position? (If applicable)


- Magistrate - 12%
- County Court Judge - 0%
- District Court Judge - 0.8%
- Colorado Court of Appeals Judge - 0%
- Colorado Supreme Court Justice - 0.8%
- Not applicable - 86.4%



4. For the second judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed? Respondents could select from the following options: 1 to 9, or 10 or more.


- 1 - 39.6%
- 2 - 17.9%
- 3 - 10.4%
- 4 - 6.6%
- 5 - 4.7%
- 6 - 0.9%
- 7 - 2.8%
- 8 - 1.9%
- 9 - 0.9%
- 10 - 3.8%

Decline to answer - 10.4%



5. For the third judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position? (If applicable).


- Magistrate - 1.2%
- County Court Judge - 0%
- District Court Judge - 0%
- Colorado Court of Appeals Judge - 0%
- Colorado Supreme Court Justice - 0%
- Not applicable - 65.1%
- Other - 33.7%



6. For the third judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed (if applicable)?

- 1 - 54.2%
- 2 - 16.7%
- 3 - 8.3%
- 4 - 8.3%
- 5 - 4.2%
- 6 - 0%
- 7 - 0%
- 8 - 0%
- 9 - 0%
- 10 - 4.2%


Decline to answer - 1






7. For the fourth judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position? (If applicable).

- Magistrate - 0%
- County Court Judge - 0%
- District Court Judge - 0%
- Colorado Court of Appeals Judge - 0%
- Colorado Supreme Court Justice - 0%
- Not applicable - 50%
- Other - 50%



8. For the fourth judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed (if applicable)?

- 1 - 12.5%
- 2 - 0%
- 3 - 37.5%
- 4 - 0%
- 5 - 12.5%
- 6 - 0%
- 7 - 0%
- 8 - 0%
- 9 - 0%
- 10 - 12.5%
- Decline to answer - 25%



*A diverse judiciary is essential to promoting fairness, equity, and public trust in our legal system. Judges who represent a broad range of backgrounds and experiences bring unique perspectives that enrich the decision-making process and help mitigate the effects of bias. By reflecting the diversity of the communities we serve, courts are better equipped to deliver justice that is both impartial and inclusive.*

**THE HONORABLE ERIN SOKOL**  
**District Court Chief Judge, 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District**

## DATA POINT 3 - FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

### KEY FINDINGS

Foreign language proficiency among judges in Colorado is an added component in advancing the shared goal of ensuring meaningful access to the courts for all individuals, regardless of English language proficiency. The U.S. Department of Justice - Civil Rights Division has collaborated with court systems in more than 20 states to eliminate language access barriers and support compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

According to data from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, the ten most commonly spoken languages in Colorado, aside from English regardless of English-speaking level are:

1. Spanish
2. Vietnamese
3. Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese)
4. Russian
5. French (including Cajun)
6. German
7. Arabic
8. Amharic (including Somali and other Afro-Asiatic languages)
9. Korean
10. Tagalog (including Filipino)

Based on responses from the 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 below. 139 respondents responded "Not applicable" to this question.

1. Spanish - 14.4%
2. German - 3.3%
4. Other - 2.8%
3. French - 2.2%
7. Korean - 0.6%
9. Not applicable - 76.8%

Based on responses from the 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 various languages. The most spoken languages, other than English, were provided by the respondents. Spanish - 8.7%, German - 2.3%, French - 1.2%, Other - 1.2%, 86.6% respondents responded "Not applicable" to this question.




## DATA POINT 4: GENDER IDENTITY AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION

### KEY FINDINGS

The Harvard Division of Continuing Education–Professional Executive Development highlights a growing body of research demonstrating a significant correlation between gender equity and organizational success. This relationship is closely linked to organizational health, as entities that intentionally foster inclusive internal processes drawing on diverse perspectives, experiences, and leadership styles consistently outperform those with homogenous leadership structures. Within the judicial system, gender diversity broadens the talent pool, enriches decision-making through varied viewpoints, and reinforces public confidence by ensuring that the bench reflects the diverse communities it serves.


From the responses received on the 2025 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire for the “What is your gender identity?” question, the responses were as follows:

- Male - 43.3%
- Female - 50.6%
- Intersex - 0%
- Non-binary - 0.6%
- Transgender - 0%
- Decline to answer - 5.6%



From the responses received on the 2025 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:

- Asexual - 0%
- Bisexual - 1.6%
- Gay - 2.2%
- Heterosexual - 79.7%
- Lesbian - 3.3%
- Queer - 0%
- Other - 1.1%
- Decline to answer - 12.1%




## DATA POINT 5: MILITARY VETERAN

### KEY FINDINGS

For the question “Are you a military veteran?” on the 2025 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire:

- Yes - 6.6%
- No - 91.8%
- Not applicable - 1.6%




## DATA POINT 6: REFUGEE OR IMMIGRANT EXPERIENCE

### KEY FINDINGS

Colorado’s Office of New Americans latest reporting in the 2023 American Community Survey estimates that approximately 563,101 foreign-born individuals reside in Colorado. This number constitutes 9.6% of Colorado’s overall population. From the responses received on the 2025 Judicial Officer Demographics Questionnaire for the question “Are you a refugee or an immigrant?:

- Yes - 3.3%
- No - 95%
- Not applicable - 1.7%



The inclusion of judges with refugee or immigrant backgrounds enriches the administration of justice and strengthens the judiciary’s capacity to serve an increasingly diverse society. The following points highlight the key benefits of such representation:


- Expanded judicial perspective through lived experience
- Enhanced procedural fairness and equity
- Increased public confidence and trust in the judiciary
- Added depth and nuance in judicial decision-making
- Promotion of representation and mentorship within the legal profession
- Improved cultural competency in legal proceedings

## DATA POINT 7: DISABILITY

### KEY FINDINGS

For the question “Are you disabled due to a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more life activities?” respondents provide the following answers:

- Yes - 1.1%
- No - 95.6%
- Declined to answer - 3.3%




## DATA POINT 8: DATA POINT 8: FIRST TO GRADUATE FROM COLLEGE, GRADUATE SCHOOL, AND LAW SCHOOL

### KEY FINDINGS

For the following question, 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. - 1.8%
- I am the first in my family to graduate from college. - 13%
- I am the first in my family to receive a master's degree. - 4%
- I am the first in my family to receive a doctorate degree. - 17.8%
- I am the first in my family to graduate from law school. - 48.2%
- None of these statements apply to me. - 13.4%
- Decline to answer. - 1.8%



## DATA POINT 8: DATA POINT 8: FIRST TO GRADUATE FROM COLLEGE, GRADUATE SCHOOL, AND LAW SCHOOL

### KEY FINDINGS

For the following question, 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. - 1.8%
- I am the first in my family to graduate from college. - 13%
- I am the first in my family to receive a master's degree. - 4%
- I am the first in my family to receive a doctorate degree. - 17.8%
- I am the first in my family to graduate from law school. - 48.2%
- None of these statements apply to me. - 13.4%
- Decline to answer. - 1.8%

## DATA POINT 9: WORK DURING SCHOOL AND LAW SCHOOL AS A SECOND OR MORE CAREER

### KEY FINDINGS

Respondents were asked 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. - 27.6%
- Law is my second career. - 14.1%
- Law is my third career. - 3.1%
- Law is my fourth or more career. - 0.5%
- None of these statements apply to me. - 52.6%
- Decline to answer. - 2.1%




## DATA POINT 10: HIGHER EDUCATION WORK EXPERIENCE

### KEY FINDINGS

Respondents were asked to "Select all statement(s) that apply to you." The responses are as follows:

- I taught as a professor at a college. - 8.7%
- I taught as a professor at a graduate school. - 1.1%
- I taught as a professor at a law school. - 5.4%
- None of these statements apply to me. - 82.1%
- Decline to answer. - 2.7%




## DATA POINT 11: OVERSEAS EXPERIENCE

### KEY FINDINGS

Respondents were asked 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. - 29.2%
- I have lived overseas for work. - 7.2%
- I have lived overseas for personal reasons. - 8.2%
- None of these statements apply to me. - 53.8%
- Decline to answer. - 1.5%




## DATA POINT 12: CAREGIVER

### KEY FINDINGS

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. - 43.2%
- I am a caregiver for my parent(s) and/or other adult family members. - 14.6%
- I am a caregiver in another capacity. - 3%
- None of these statements apply to me. - 36.7%
- Decline to answer. - 2.5%



*True justice begins when judges look beyond their own experience. By engaging with diverse lives and stories, we deepen empathy and expand our vision. When we connect heart to heart, we build a justice system rooted in humanity, strengthening both our communities and our world.*

**THE HONORABLE KELLEY R. SOUTHERLAND**  
District Court Judge - 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District



## JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM

### PILLAR 4: CONNECTION AND WELL-BEING

Recognizing of the critical role that health and interpersonal connection play in judicial performance, the fourth foundational pillar of the JOO Program is Connection and Well-Being. This focus area underscores the judiciary's ongoing commitment to fostering a resilient, effective, and human-centered judicial system. Judicial officer well-being is essential to the overall effectiveness and integrity of the judiciary. The following considerations highlight the significance of this focus:

- **Judicial Impartiality:** Preserving the mental, emotional, and physical health of judges is crucial to ensuring their ability to make impartial and unbiased decisions, free from the influence of undue stress or fatigue.
- **Quality of Judgments:** Cognitive clarity and attention to detail are directly linked to overall well-being. Officers who are in good health are more likely to issue thoughtful, well-reasoned, and legally sound judgments.
- **Retention and Continuity:** Supporting the well-being of judges helps mitigate burnout, reduces premature retirements, and supports the retention of experienced and strong jurists, thus ensuring stability and continuity within the judiciary.
- **Public Confidence:** The public's trust in the judicial system depends on the competence and disposition of its judges. Efforts to support judicial well-being reinforce public confidence in the judiciary's capacity to uphold justice effectively.
- **Ethical and Professional Standards:** A strong foundation of well-being helps safeguard against stress-induced ethical lapses, supporting consistent professionalism and adherence to judicial standards.
- **Workplace Environment:** A judiciary that prioritizes well-being cultivates a positive and collaborative work environment both internally among officers and staff, and externally in interactions with the communities it serves.
- **Operational Efficiency:** Judges in good mental and physical condition are better equipped to manage demanding caseloads, reduce delays, and contribute to the timely and equitable delivery of justice.

The Connection and Well-Being initiatives are coming soon and is designed to cultivate meaningful relationships among judges, strengthen community ties, and promote a supportive professional culture. By highlighting the human aspects of judicial service and emphasizing the importance of wellness, this initiative aims to enhance both individual and institutional performance.

## JUDICIAL OFFICER OUTREACH (JOO) PROGRAM

### LOOKING AHEAD: A VISION FOR CONTINUED GROWTH AND IMPACT

As the Judicial Officer Outreach (JOO) Program moves forward, it does so with a continued commitment to cultivating a judiciary that is accessible, inclusive, and reflective of the people it serves. Informed by statewide listening sessions and guided by the voices of judicial officers, legal professionals, and community stakeholders, the JOO remains responsive to emerging needs while amplifying the impactful work already underway across Colorado’s judicial districts.

Our strategy is rooted in collaboration—drawing on the insights, expertise, and leadership of judicial officers, legal organizations, and local communities to co-curate programs that are timely, relevant, and effective. Initiatives such as *Your Honor: Journey to the Bench* (both the in-person symposium and virtual sessions), *BenchMark*, and *Java with Judges* reflect the JOO’s commitment to demystifying the path to the bench. These efforts are designed to provide direct access to the judiciary, promote mentorship, and foster authentic dialogue that encourages aspiring judges from all backgrounds to envision themselves in judiciary service.

Through ongoing community engagement, the JOO Program has gained a deeper understanding of district-specific challenges and opportunities. Judicial listening tours have highlighted the need for tailored support—especially in rural areas with limited resources. By partnering directly with judicial officers and judicial districts, the JOO Program is supporting, modeling and building upon successful existing efforts including: the 1st Judicial District’s lunch and learn sessions, the 5<sup>th</sup> Judicial District’s *Pathways to the Bench* information sessions, the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District’s legislative networking events with judges, and the 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial District’s “Courageous Conversations.” These partnerships foster innovation and elevate impactful, district and locally-driven solutions tailored to each judicial district.

The JOO’s inclusive, statewide engagement approach also reinforces public trust. By centering underrepresented and diverse communities, building relationships across judicial and community lines, and maintaining a commitment to transparency, the JOO supports not only recruitment and retention, but also strategic cultural change within the judiciary.

Through intentional engagement, data-driven evaluation, and ongoing dialogue, the JOO Program will continue to evolve as a collaborative, innovative, and equity-centered initiative—one that advances access the judiciary and the judiciary for the current and for generations to come.



*Diversity on the bench is important because it more accurately reflects the communities the courts serve. That engenders trust and reinforces notions of fairness and impartiality in our justice system. More importantly, diverse judges bring their unique life experiences to their work, lending perspective and, in my view, better informing their decisions.*

**THE HONORABLE DIEGO HUNT**  
District Court Judge, 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial District

## APPENDIX

### RACE, ETHNICITY, AND GENDER DATA OF COLORADO COURTS FY 2025 AND FY 2024 COMPARISON

Important to note: The judicial officer appointment information in this section includes all judicial officers to include justices, judges, magistrates, and senior judges. However, it does not include Denver County Court judges, as their appointment process and governing authority are distinct. To ensure a more comprehensive overview of Colorado’s judiciary, responses from Denver County Court judges have been collected separately. These results can be found in the Appendix, beginning on page 58.

Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### FY 2025 STATEWIDE JUDICIAL OFFICER RACE/ETHNICITY

Race/Ethnicity	FY 2025 # of Judges	FY 2025 % of Judges	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	8	3.2%	3%
Black/African American	12	4.8%	4%
Caucasian/White	204	82.25%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	11	4.43%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available
Mixed Race	3	1.2%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	6	2.4%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available
Other	17	6.8%	1%
Decline to answer	12	4.8%	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### FY 2025 STATEWIDE JUDICIAL OFFICER RACE/ETHNICITY

##### FY 2025 AND FY 2024 COMPARISON

Statewide Gender	FY 2025 # of Judges	FY 2025 % of Judges	FY 2024 # of Judges	FY 2024 % of Judges	% Statewide
Male	78	31.45%	143	44.27%	51%
Female	91	36.69%	163	50.46%	49%
Intersex	0	0%	0%	0%	Category not available
Non-binary	1	0.43	0%	0%	Category not available
Transgender	0	0%	0%	0%	Category not available
Decline to Answer	10	4.03%	17	5.26%	Category not available
<b>Total # and Total %</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

## APPENDIX

### 2024 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE FY 2025 JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS BY RACE AND 4-YEAR COMPARISON

Please note: Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

NEW JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY RACE FY 2025 (JULY 1, 2024 - JUNE 30, 2025)			
Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	1	4.16%	3%
Black/African American	1	4.16%	4%
Caucasian/White	18	87.5%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	4.16%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

NEW JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY RACE - 4 YEAR COMPARISON					
Statewide Gender	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY2024	FY 2025	% Statewide
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	1	0	0	Category not available
Asian	1	3	1	1	3.3%
Black/African American	3	1	1	1	3.7%
Hispanic/Latino	4	5	2	0	22.7%
Multiracial	0	3	0	0	Category not available
White (not Hispanic or Latino)	24	33	13	18	64.5%
No information provided	Category not available	Category not available	9	0	Category not available
Not applicable	Category not available	Category not available	1	0	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>

## APPENDIX

### FY 2025 JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS BY GENDER AND FOUR-YEAR COMPARISON

Please note: Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

<b>JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY GENDER FY 2025 (JULY 1, 2024 - JUNE 30, 2025)</b>			
<b>Gender</b>	<b># of Judges</b>	<b>% of Judges</b>	<b>% Statewide</b>
Male	7	35%	51%
Female	13	65%	49%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>JUDICIAL OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY GENDER- 4 YEAR COMPARISON</b>				
<b>Gender</b>	<b>FY 2022</b>	<b>FY 2023</b>	<b>FY 2024</b>	<b>FY 2025</b>
Male	16	23	13	7
Female	16	23	14	13
Decline to answer	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE COLORADO SUPREME COURT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

### COLORADO SUPREME COURT RACE/ETHNICITY

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%
Black/African American	0	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	5	85.71%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	2	28.57%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### COLORADO SUPREME COURT - GENDER

Gender	# of Justices	% of Justices	% Statewide
Male	4	57.14%	51%
Female	3	42.85%	49%
Decline to Answer	0	0%	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS

Please note: Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	3	18.75%	3%
Black/African American	1	6.25%	4%
Caucasian/White	11	68.75%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	2	12.5%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS - GENDER

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Statewide
Male	8	50%	51%
Female	7	43.75%	49%
Decline to Answer	1	6.25%	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Please note: Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE/ETHNICITY

##### JEFFERSON AND GILPIN COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	1%	3%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	15	88.23%	85%	75%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	2	11.76%	7%	16%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	6%	4%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	1%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	2	11.76%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### JEFFERSON AND GILPIN COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Gilpin County	% Jefferson County	% Statewide
Male	3	17.64%	55%	51%	51%
Female	3	17.64%	45%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	11	64.70%	Category not available.	Category not available.	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

Please note: Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE/ETHNICITY**

**DENVER COUNTY**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Denver County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	4%	3%
Black/African American	4	18.18%	8%	4%
Caucasian/White	16	72.72%	54%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	4	18.18%	28%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	4.54%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**DENVER COUNTY**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Denver County	% Statewide
Male	7	31.81%	51%	51%
Female	11	50%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	4	18.18%	Category not available.	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 3RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 3RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### HUERFANO AND LAS ANIMAS COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Huerfano County	% Las Animas County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	2%	4%
Caucasian/White	3	100%	64%	54%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	31%	39%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	3%	2%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	2%	1%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 3RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### HUERFANO AND LAS ANIMAS COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Huerfano County	% Las Animas County	% Statewide
Male	2	66.6%	54%	53%	51%
Female	0	0%	46%	47%	49%
Decline to Answer	1	33.3%	Category not available.	Category not available.	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### EL PASO AND TELLER COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# 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.).	2	6.89%	3%	0%	3%
Black/African American	1	3.44%	6%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	23	79.31%	65%	84%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	3.44%	19%	7%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	1	3.44%	6%	6%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	1	3.44%	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	1	3.44%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### EL PASO AND TELLER COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% El Paso County	% Teller County	% Statewide
Male	7	24.13%	51%	51%	51%
Female	12	41.37%	49%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	10	34.48%	Category not available.	Category not available.	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**5TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**5TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**CLEAR CREEK, EAGLE, LAKE, AND SUMMIT COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Clear Creek	% Eagle County	% Lake County	% Summit County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	7	100%	86%	63%	57%	75%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	14.28%	8%	30%	35%	17%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available				
Mixed Race	0	0%	2%	4%	6%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	1	14.28%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available				
Other	0	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available				
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**5TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**CLEAR CREEK, EAGLE, LAKE, AND SUMMIT COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Clear Creek	% Eagle County	% Lake County	% Summit County	% Statewide
Male	3	42.85%	52%	54%	51%	55%	51%
Female	4	57.14%	48%	26%	49%	45%	49%
Decline to Answer	0	0%	Category not available				
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**6TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**6TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**ARCHULETA, LA PLATA, AND SAN JUAN COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Archuleta County	% La Plata County	% San Juan County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	1	0%	0%	1%	0%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	2	40%	77%	77%	79%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	20%	16%	13%	16%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	3%	4%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	1%	5%	1%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	20%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**6TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**ARCHULETA, LA PLATA, AND SAN JUAN COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Archuleta County	% La Plata County	% San Juan County	% Statewide
Male	2	40%	50%	51%	55%	51%
Female	0	0%	50%	49%	45%	49%
Decline to Answer	3	60%	Category not available.	Category not available.	Category not available.	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 7TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 7TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### DELTA, GUNNISON, HINSDALE, MONTROSE, OURAY, AND SAN MIGUEL COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Delta County	% Gunnison County	% Hinsdale County	% Montrose County	% Ouray County	% San Miguel County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	0%	2%	0%	1%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	3	75%	81%	85%	86%	74%	89%	85%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	14%	10%	3%	21%	5%	11%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available						
Mixed Race	0	0%	2%	4%	6%	3%	5%	2%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available						
Other	1	25%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available						
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 7TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### DELTA, GUNNISON, HINSDALE, MONTROSE, OURAY, AND SAN MIGUEL COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Delta County	% Gunnison County	% Hinsdale County	% Montrose County	% Ouray County	% San Miguel County	% Statewide
Male	1	25%	50%	55%	50%	50%	52%	57%	51%
Female	2	50%	50%	45%	50%	50%	48%	43%	49%
Decline to Answer	1	25%	Category not available						
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**8TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**8TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**JACKSON AND LARIMER COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Jackson	% Larimer	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	0%	2%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	10	90.90%	84%	79%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	9.09%	13%	13%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	1%	4%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	1	9.09%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**8TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**JACKSON AND LARIMER COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Jackson	% Larimer	% Statewide
Male	3	27.27%	54%	50%	51%
Female	4	36.36%	46%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	4	36.36%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**9TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

<b>9TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY</b>						
<b>GARFIELD, PITKIN, AND RIO BLANCO COUNTIES</b>						
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># of Judges</b>	<b>% of Judges</b>	<b>% Garfield County</b>	<b>% Pitkin County</b>	<b>% Rio Blanco</b>	<b>% Statewide</b>
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	1%	2%	0%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	6	85.71%	63%	80%	82%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	14.28%	32%	11%	11%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	3%	5%	6%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	14.28%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>9TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER</b>						
<b>GARFIELD, PITKIN, AND RIO BLANCO COUNTIES</b>						
<b>Gender</b>	<b># of Judges</b>	<b>% of Judges</b>	<b>% Garfield County</b>	<b>% Pitkin County</b>	<b>% Rio Blanco</b>	<b>% Statewide</b>
Male	1	14.28%	51%	52%	53%	51%
Female	6	85.71%	49%	48%	47%	49%
Decline to Answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

PUEBLO				
Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Pueblo County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	2%	4%
Caucasian/White	8	80%	51%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	2	20%	42%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	10%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

PUEBLO				
Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Pueblo County	% Statewide
Male	3	30%	50%	51%
Female	3	30%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	4	40%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### CHAFFEE, CUSTER, FREMONT, AND PARK COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Chaffee	% Custer County	% Fremont County	% Park County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	0%	4%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	4	100%	85%	93%	78%	87%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	10%	2%	13%	7%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available				
Mixed Race	0	0%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available				
Other	0	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available				
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### CHAFFEE, CUSTER, FREMONT, AND PARK COUNTIES

Race	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Chaffee	% Custer County	% Fremont County	% Park County	% Statewide
Male	1	25%	52%	50%	58%	53%	51%
Female	3	75%	48%	50%	42%	47%	49%
Decline to Answer	0	0%	Category not available				
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 12TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 12TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### ALAMOSA, CONEJOS, COSTILLA, MINERAL, RIO GRANDE, AND SAGUACHE COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Alamosa County	% Conejos County	% Costilla	% Mineral County	% Rio Grande County	% Saguache County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	5	83.33%	46%	46%	37%	90%	55%	56%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	16.66%	48%	50%	56%	2%	41%	37%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available						
Mixed Race	0	0%	3%	1%	4%	7%	2%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available						
Other	0	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available						
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 12TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### ALAMOSA, CONEJOS, COSTILLA, MINERAL, RIO GRANDE, AND SAGUACHE COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Alamosa County	% Conejos County	% Costilla	% Mineral County	% Rio Grande County	% Saguache County	% Population
Male	2	33.3%	49%	59%	50%	51%	51%	51%	51%
Female	3	50%	51%	50%	50%	49%	49%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	1	16.66%	Category not available						
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**13TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**13TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**KIT CARSON, MORGAN, PHILLIPS, SEDGWICK, WASHINGTON, AND YUMA COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Kit Carson	% Morgan County	% Phillips County	% Sedgwick County	% Washington County	% Yuma Counties	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%	1%	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	9	100%	76%	56%	71%	75%	85%	68%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	20%	37%	27%	19%	11%	29%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available						
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available						
Other	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available						
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**13TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**KIT CARSON, MORGAN, PHILLIPS, SEDGWICK, WASHINGTON, AND YUMA COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Kit Carson	% Morgan County	% Phillips County	% Sedgwick County	% Washington County	% Yuma County	% Statewide
Male	2	22.2%	51%	52%	48%	51%	52%	51%	51%
Female	2	22.2%	49%	48%	52%	49%	48%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	5	55.5%	Category not available						
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 14TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 14TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### GRAND, MOFFAT, AND ROUTT COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	0%	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	6	100%	79%	77%	81%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	16.66%	10%	16%	9%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	10%	4%	8%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 14TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### GRAND, MOFFAT, AND ROUTT COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Grand County	% Moffat County	% Routt County	% Statewide
Male	1	16.66%	51%	51%	52%	51%
Female	3	50%	49%	49%	48%	49%
Decline to Answer	2	33.3%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**15TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**15TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**BACA, CHEYENNE, KIOWA, AND PROWERS COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Baca County	% Cheyenne County	% Kiowa County	% Prowers County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.)	0	0%	3%	0%	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	3	100%	84%	79%	88%	56%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	11%	13%	10%	40%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available				
Mixed Race	0	0%	2%	7%	2%	3%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.)	0	0%	Category not available				
Other	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available				
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**15TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**BACA, CHEYENNE, KIOWA, AND PROWERS COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Baca County	% Cheyenne County	% Kiowa County	% Prowers County	% Statewide
Male	1	33.3%	50%	52%	47%	50%	51%
Female	1	33.3%	50%	48%	53%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	1	33.3%	Category not available				
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 16TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 16TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### BENT, CROWLEY, AND OTERO COUNTIES

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	3%	6%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	3	60%	55%	56%	52%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	20%	32%	29%	42%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	7%	4%	3%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	1%	4%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	20%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 16TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### BENT, CROWLEY, AND OTERO COUNTIES

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Bent County	% Crowley County	% Otero County	% Statewide
Male	3	60%	62%	69%	50%	51%
Female	0	0%	48%	31%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	2	40%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**17TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**17TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**ADAMS AND BROOMFIELD COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	4%	5%	3%
Black/African American	1	5.26%	3%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	15	78.94%	45%	71%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	2	10.52%	43%	15%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	8%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	1	5.26%	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	5.26%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**17TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**ADAMS AND BROOMFIELD COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Adams County	% Broomfield County	% Statewide
Male	6	31.57%	51%	51%	51%
Female	7	36.84%	49%	49%	49%
Non-binary	1	5.26%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available.
Decline to Answer	5	26.31%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Arapahoe County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	6%	3%
Black/African American	3	27.27%	10%	4%
Caucasian/White	5	45.45%	55%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	9.90%	22%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	6%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	1	9.90%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	1	9.90%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Arapahoe County	% Statewide
Male	1	9.90%	50%	51%
Female	4	36.36%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	6	54.54%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 19TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 19TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### WELD COUNTY

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	2%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	7	87.5%	61%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	12.5%	31%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 19TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### WELD COUNTY

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Weld County	% Statewide
Male	2	25%	51%	51%
Female	5	62.5%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	1	12.5%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### BOULDER COUNTY

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Boulder County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	1	7.14%	5%	3%
Black/African American	1	7.14%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	10	71.42%	75%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	15%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	1	7.14%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	1	7.14%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### BOULDER COUNTY

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Boulder County	% Statewide
Male	7	50%	50%	51%
Female	3	21.42%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	4	28.57%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 21ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### 21ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

##### MESA COUNTY

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	4%
Caucasian/White	8	100%	78%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	16%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 21ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER

##### MESA COUNTY

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Mesa County	% Statewide
Male	4	50%	49%	51%
Female	1	12.5%	51%	49%
Decline to Answer	3	37.5%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**22ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**22ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**DOLORES AND MONTEZUMA COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# 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%	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	0%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	1	100%	78%	71%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0%	12%	12%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	4%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	5%	9%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	1%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**22ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**DOLORES AND MONTEZUMA COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Dolores County	% Montezuma County	% Statewide
Male	1	100%	54%	50%	51%
Female	0	0	46%	50%	49%
Decline to Answer	0	0	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**23RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

**23RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT - RACE AND ETHNICITY**

**DOUGLAS, LINCOLN AND ELBERT COUNTIES**

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Douglas County	% Lincoln County	% Elbert County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	1	7.14%	6%	0%	1%	3%
Black/African American	0	0%	1%	6%	1%	4%
Caucasian/White	12	85.7%	77%	75%	84%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	2	14.28%	10%	15%	9%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	0	0%	6%	3%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
Other	0	0%	0%	0%		1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**23RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT - GENDER**

**DOUGLAS, LINCOLN AND ELBERT COUNTIES**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Douglas County	% Lincoln County	% Elbert County	% Statewide
Male	4	28.57%	50%	59%	51%	51%
Female	6	42.85%	50%	41%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	4	28.57%	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# APPENDIX

## 2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

### DENVER COUNTY COURT

**Please note:** Some respondents self-identified under multiple categories in both the Judicial Officer Outreach Program Questionnaire and the statewide percentages reported by the Census Reporter. Additionally, certain respondents may have opted not to answer specific questions, which may affect the total number of responses and corresponding percentages for those questions.

#### DENVER COUNTY COURT - CURRENT ROLE

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges
County Court Judge	9	100%
Magistrate	0	0%
Decline to Answer	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### DENVER COUNTY COURT - RACE AND ETHNICITY

Race/Ethnicity	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Denver County	% Statewide
Asian/Asian American (e.g. China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao, The Philippines, Singapore, Việt Nam, etc.).	0	0%	4%	3%
Black/African American	2	22.22%	8%	4%
Caucasian/White	6	66.6%	54%	64%
Hispanic/Latino	1	11.1%	28%	23%
Middle Eastern/North African	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Mixed Race	1	11.1%	5%	5%
Native/Indigenous/Native American	0	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0	0%	0%	0%
South Asian (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, etc.).	1	0%	Category not available	Category not available
Other	1	11.1%	0%	1%
Decline to answer	0	0%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - AGE**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges
30 or under	0	0%
31-39	1	11.1%
40-49	2	22.2%
50-59	3	33.3%
60-65	3	33.3%
66+	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - GENDER**

Gender	# of Judges	% of Judges	% Denver County	Statewide %
Male	0	0%	51%	51%
Female	5	55.5%	49%	49%
Decline to Answer	4	44.4%	Category not available	Category not available
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

What is your sexual orientation?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Asexual	0	0%
Bisexual	0	0%
Gay	0	0%
Heterosexual	5	55.5%
Lesbian	0	0%
Queer	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Decline to answer	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - FIRST JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the first judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
Magistrate	4	44.4%
County Court Judge	5	55.5%
District Court	0	0%
Colorado Court of Appeals	0	0%
Colorado Supreme Court	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - FIRST JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the first judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
1	6	66.6%
2	0	0%
3	1	11.1%
4	0	0%
5	2	22.22%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	0	0%
9	0	0%
10 or more	0	0%
Decline to answer	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - SECOND JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the second judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
Magistrate	0	0%
County Court Judge	5	55.5%
District Court	0	0%
Colorado Court of Appeals	0	0%
Colorado Supreme Court	0	0%
Not applicable	2	22.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - SECOND JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the second judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
1	1	11.1%
2	2	22.2%
3	0	0%
4	1	11.1%
5	2	22.2%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	0	0%
9	0	0%
10 or more	0	0%
Decline to answer	0	0%
Not applicable	3	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - THIRD JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the third judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
Magistrate	0	0%
County Court Judge	0	0%
District Court	1	11.1%
Colorado Court of Appeals	0	0%
Colorado Supreme Court	0	0%
Nor applicable	8	88.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - THIRD JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the third judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
1	1	11.1%
2	0	0%
3	0	0%
4	0	0%
5	0	0%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	0	0%
9	0	0%
10 or more	0	0%
Decline to answer	0	0%
Not applicable	8	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - FOURTH JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the fourth judicial officer position you applied for, what was the position?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
Magistrate	0	0%
County Court Judge	1	11.1%
District Court	0	0%
Colorado Court of Appeals	0	0%
Colorado Supreme Court	0	0%
Not applicable	8	88.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - FOURTH JUDICIAL OFFICER POSITION**

For the fourth judicial officer position you applied for, how many times did you apply before being appointed?

Judicial Position	# of Judges	% of Judges
1	0	0%
2	0	0%
3	3	33.3%
4	0	0%
5	0	0%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	0	0%
9	0	0%
10 or more	0	0%
Decline to answer	0	0%
Not applicable	8	88.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY - SPEAKING**

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%
Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese)	0	0%
French	0	0%
German	0	0%
Hindi	0	0%
Japanese	0	0%
Korean	0	0%
Latin	0	0%
Portugese	0	0%
Somali	0	0%
Spanish	0	0%
Vietnamese	0	0%
Other	1	11.1%
Not applicable	4	44.4%
Decline to answer	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY - WRITING**

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%
Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese)	0	0%
French	0	0%
German	0	0%
Hindi	0	0%
Japanese	0	0%
Korean	0	0%
Latin	0	0%
Portuguese	0	0%
Somali	0	0%
Spanish	0	0%
Vietnamese	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Not applicable	5	55.5%
Decline to answer	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - MILITARY VETERAN**

Are you a military Veteran?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	0	0%
No	5	55.5%
Decline to answer	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - REFUGEE OR IMMIGRANT**

Are you a refugee or immigrant?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	1	11.1%
No	4	44.4%
Not applicable	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - MILITARY VETERAN**

Are you a military Veteran?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	0	0%
No	5	55.5%
Not applicable	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - REFUGEE OR IMMIGRANT**

Are you a refugee or immigrant?	# of Judges	% of Judges
Yes	1	11.1%
No	4	44.4%
Not applicable	0	0%
Decline to answer	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**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	0	0%
No	5	55.5%
Not applicable	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**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%
I am the first in my family to graduate from college.	2	22.2%
I am the first in my family to receive a master's degree.	0	0%
I am the first in my family to receive a doctorate degree.	2	22.2%
I am the first in my family to graduate from law school.	3	33.3%
None of these statements apply to me.	2	22.2%
Decline to answer.	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**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.	2	22.2%
Law is my second career.	1	11.1%
Law is my third career.	0	0%
Law is my fourth career.	0	0%
None of these statements apply to me.	2	22.2%
Decline to answer.	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**APPENDIX**  
**2025 JUDICIAL OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DENVER COUNTY COURT**

**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.	0	0%
I taught as a professor at a graduate school/s.	1	11.1%
I taught as a professor at a law school/s.	1	11.1%
None of these statements apply to me.	4	44.4%
Decline to answer.	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**DENVER COUNTY COURT - OVERSEA 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.	2	22.2%
I have lived overseas for work.	0	0%
I have lived overseas for personal reasons.	1	11.1%
None of these statements apply to me.	3	33.3%
Decline to answer.	3	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**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.	2	22.2%
I am a caregiver for my parent/s and other adult family member/s.	1	11.1%
I am a caregiver in another capacity.	0	0%
None of these statements apply to me.	2	22.2%
Decline to answer.	4	44.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>