



CBA-CJI Diversity on the Bench Coalition

2024 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Retention

Foreword

The Coalition's work this year has been extremely rewarding. Though we began 2024 with several goals and multiple working groups ready to charge ahead, it became apparent that before we could offer solutions, we had to meaningfully understand the issues.

Conducting the Judicial Officer Focus Groups was enlightening. The experience left us in awe of the hard work and dedication judicial officers offer our great state. It also shined a light on the barriers and issues diverse judicial officers still face. The Focus Group participants told us, over and over, how grateful and happy they were to have this outlet.

In preparing this report, we sought to capture the authentic experiences of diverse judicial officers. We encouraged participants to share openly, ensuring a safe and confidential environment for their voices. As you read, we ask that you approach the report with an open mind. The narratives and quotes, though sometimes stark and challenging, reflect real concerns from individuals navigating the impact of implicit bias and unique pressures in an already stressful role. Additionally, consider that some of the individual comments are not necessarily perspectives shared by all diverse judicial officers, but we did our best to capture recurring themes, collective sentiments, and consistent views across the focus groups.

The many volunteer hours that went into the focus groups and this report were fueled by a deep desire to understand the experiences of diverse judicial officers. Now that we have a better sense of those experiences, we offer targeted recommendations. We hope this report sparks meaningful conversation and provides helpful information.

In Gratitude and Service,

Hon. Cynthia D. Mares

Hon. Maritza Dominguez Braswell

Diversity on the Bench Coalition

Co-Chairs, 2024

CBA-CJI DIVERSITY ON THE BENCH COALITION 2024 REPORT & RECOMMENDATIONS: RETENTION

Introduction

This report is from the Diversity on the Bench Coalition, a collaboration between the Colorado Bar Association and the Colorado Judicial Institute. The Coalition's goal is to partner with community organizations and institutions to ensure the Colorado bench reflects the diverse population in Colorado. Established in 2018, the Coalition has approximately 42 members. The current co-chairs of the Coalition are

Hon. Cynthia D. Mares, a retired judge from the 18th Judicial District and Hon. Maritza Dominguez Braswell, U. S. Magistrate Judge District of Colorado, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

As the Coalition discussed ways to improve diversity on the bench, it became clear that the retention of current diverse judicial officers is a pressing concern. The Coalition embarked on a campaign to collect

feedback, specifically from diverse judicial officers¹ in various districts throughout Colorado. This report conveys their voluntary feedback. The report also offers the Coalition’s recommendations for better retention of strong, qualified, diverse judicial officers.

Method

Focus Group participants were recruited primarily through specialty bar associations, including the Colorado Hispanic Bar Association (CHBA), Asian Pacific American Bar Association of Colorado (APABA), Colorado Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Queer+ Bar Association (CLBA), and Sam Cary Bar Association (SCBA).

Three Focus Groups met via Zoom in May and July of 2024, with 28 judicial officers participating, representing 11 of the 22 judicial districts. There were 6-12 participants in each group. The Coalition’s goal was to offer an opportunity to share thoughts and perspectives in a safe space.

The participants were asked to respond to a series of statements and questions using the Mentimeter software program. Mentimeter is an online polling tool that is designed to interact with participants and allows for instant and anonymous feedback. The program requires participants to sign in via smartphone, tablet, or computer to use the service, then log into the interview by scanning a QR code sent by the facilitator. Participants responded anonymously to the questions and statements. The anonymized results were shared in real-time for all participants to view during the focus group process. The survey results were aggregated for even greater anonymity. Participation in the survey was voluntary. Each question allowed participants to decline to answer, and providing an answer to one question was not a requirement for advancing to the next question in the survey. The focus groups were 90 minutes in duration.

FOCUS GROUP RESULTS

(Compiled from all three focus groups conducted between May–July 2024)

General Feelings about the Judicial Role

When asked how they felt about their job and role as a judge, participants predominantly responded with a strong sense of pride and honor, in addition to feeling “blessed.” And when asked what it feels like to put on the robe, responses included “heavy,” “pressure,” “weight” and “responsibility,” showing that judicial officers take their roles very seriously. Some included “anxious” and “nervous,” partly due to the pressures and responsibilities of their roles. “Hopeful,” “excited,” and “lucky” showed a real optimism and a positive outlook held by respondents, while others felt “neutralized” when they put on their robe, as in “routine,”

and “doing a regular job.” Lastly, several respondents shared mixed feelings, like their robe could feel like a “costume,” “silly,” “play-acting” or “unsafe.” This indicates a more complex or even conflicted relationship with the role, where the robe might feel like a facade or even a source of discomfort for some at times.

Favorite Aspects of the Job

Participants were asked to elaborate on the best parts of their job.

- **Service:** “Serving the community,” “helping resolve conflict,” “making a difference” and “doing good work” responses show a strong

NOTE

1. In this report, “diverse” refers to judicial officers who are often underrepresented by race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation.

commitment to serving the community and assisting individuals in need.

- **People and Relationships:** “Staff I work with,” “working with people,” and “working with litigants” are among favorite parts of the job.
- **Intellectual challenge and growth:** “Intellectual challenge,” “interesting work,” “intellectually stimulating” and continuous “learning from others” are among favorite aspects of the job.
- **Representation and Social Impact:** “Law and representation,” “increasing representation,” “creating a new path,” in addition to “rocking the boat” and “reducing the incarceration rate” highlight a desire to continue to improve the judicial system and society by promoting fairness, justice and diversity.
- **Community Connection:** “Working in the community,” “community interaction,” “connection to the community” and “listening to the unheard” are favorite parts of the job.
- **Mentorship:** Diverse judges value guiding and supporting others, “being a role model,” as well as “being mentored” and supporting themselves.
- **Variety and work-life balance:** “Variety,” “freedom” and “work-life balance” show that judicial officers value the diversity of their work, and the flexibility it offers.
- **Law and Justice:** Citing “enforcing the rule of law” and “explaining the process,” as favorite parts of the job, show a dedication to making sure the legal process is clear and fair to all.

Main Stressors

Participants were asked to list the main stressors of their job as judicial officers. “Managing a heavy workload” is the biggest cause of high stress levels for participants. Other stressors include preparing for retention, having difficult conversations with colleagues, insufficient staffing volumes, and sometimes feelings of being held to unrealistic or unfair standards. Par-

ticipants reported a need for better support from colleagues and leadership. The feeling of not belonging was also a significant concern.

Motivations for Staying or Leaving

Participants were asked what factors keep them committed to the judiciary. They stated “the work itself” keeps more than 66% of diverse judicial officers devoted to the position. And 75% of them said they “agree” or “strongly agree” that they “have more good days than bad days.”

Participants were also asked what factors, if any, would make them consider leaving their judicial role. Half (52%) of participants said the high stress levels would be the main reason for leaving. And 38% said they might leave because of the current retention process and feel unsupported. Constant feelings of isolation, and/or not belonging, are also a common concern for diverse judicial officers.

Participants also stated that the stressors are exacerbated by salaries that do not align with the level or amount of work. More than half said they do not have easy access to wellness resources to manage work-related stress. (*Note: Judicial Wellness training is available in Colorado but might not be easily accessible.)

What Judicial Officers Want More of

Given the choices of “time, staff, training, and technology,” participants prioritized needing more time and staff. Open-ended specific responses included: “need more desk time,” and “more time for pending orders and decisions.”

The need for more judges was evident in many responses, for example, “so that it doesn’t take every weekend to get the work done.” Participants also shared a need for more law clerks, with one participant specifically sharing, “I wish I had a law clerk,” to note they cannot count on help from even one. And while this course varies across districts, more than

one participant described the difficulty of managing all written work product without any assistance whatsoever.

Participants also requested more support from their Chief Judge, including constructive feedback, compassion, and ensuring colleagues are reliable. Participants feel that many facets of the job are not necessarily obvious, which can pull them in many different directions unexpectedly. In other words, the work is not just “being in court and writing orders.” Participants believe it is particularly important to note this in the context of the retention process, saying it would be helpful if retention commissioners learned what it takes to perform well in such a multi-faceted role.

Some participants expressed concerns that their lack of resources, as compared with the resources made available to some counterparts, felt unfair.

Unique Stressors for Diverse Judicial Officers

Many of the stressors the participants identified may be similar to those impacting all judicial officers, of any identity. However, participants reported added stressors in the form of slights, microaggressions, macroaggressions, and other experiences that may be markedly different than those of their non-diverse counterparts.

Nearly all participants, 96%, said their race or ethnicity “often” or “sometimes” impacts how people treat them in their work as a judicial officer. And 85% report they worry “often” or “sometimes” about what others think about them because of their race or ethnicity. Participants described how treatment by others, as well as their own internalization of issues related to their identity can create stress and other difficult feelings. One participant stated, “Being a diverse judge is lonely and isolating.”

Participants reported that derogatory racial and ethnic comments are minimal, though not absent entirely. Some participants said they believe gender identi-

ty and sexual orientation factors in how others treat them.

Though some participants reported a lack of support, many participants reported feeling supported by staff and colleagues. Participants also reported concerted efforts to establish a support system, both in and outside the courts. Some reported a need “to have honest conversations about equity,” and “to have leaders who understand the difficulties of being a diverse judicial officer.” Overall, they want to see an ongoing “commitment from the judicial branch that equity issues are a priority” in Colorado. The following excerpts are from two different participants, sharing their experiences and perspectives:

As judges of color, we just get exhausted, always being the ones doing all this talking. We need people who get it, who are not judges of color, to speak up as well — because it’s exhausting. This job is hard, it’s exhausting, it’s stressful. And we’re doing the work, we’re recruiting and we’re helping people. But it’s just so exhausting that we also must be the ones to do it. And we do it, because no one’s going to go do it for us.

It can very much feel like there’s a lot of push back when a younger, diverse judge ... wants to feel empowered to be able to put some of those changes into action. Sometimes it very much feels, as a diverse judge, that [you’re messaging to us,] ‘we want you here for your number and your statistic and for your appearance, but not necessarily for your opinion or thoughts or advice.’ I think if the Judicial Branch provided more of a culture of being open to some of those voices of change, that that would increase the quality of life for a lot of diverse judges ... They might be able to see a future in the Branch in a more positive way than sometimes they do now.

Additionally, all participants said they experienced some level of imposter phenomenon. The imposter phenomenon is generally defined as follows: “When one internalizes oppression and places blame on

oneself, feeling like an ‘imposter’ rather than recognizing that the work environment can cause that feeling.” (Cokley, Kevin. 2024. “The Imposter Phenomenon: Psychological Research, Theory, and Interventions.” American Psychological Association.) Participants attributed the imposter phenomenon to certain environmental stressors, including implicit bias. Although none (0%) of the participants reported that imposter phenomenon affects them “all the time,” half of the respondents (50%) said they are “sometimes” affected. One in four (25%) said it affects them, but only “rarely.”

How Bias & Stereotypes Show Up

Participants reported that biases and stereotypes about their race, ethnicity, gender identity and sexual orientation show up mostly in the courtroom, from litigants and attorneys, as well as in the retention process. To a lesser extent, biases and stereotypes surface with colleagues when interacting informally.

Several participants who are women (of various races and ethnicities) reported feeling viewed, treated and evaluated differently because of their gender. Approximately half of the participants (52%) report that biases and stereotypes about women show up most in the courtroom.

Several participants of color (of various gender identities) expressed concern that they must work harder than their white colleagues, meaning they work more hours and with higher caseloads, as compared to what they perceive their non-diverse counterparts manage.

Views of the Retention Process

Most of the participants (79%) had been through at least one judicial retention cycle. All agreed that the retention process is complicated. Some reported that they do not believe they will be treated fairly when they are up for retention. The participants generally agreed that there is a difference between what is writ-

ten and what is unwritten when it comes to retention.

When asked how well commissioners understand their day-to-day job, nearly all (91%) gave ratings 0-6 (where 0 meant strongly disagree that they understand the job, and 10 meant strongly agree that they understand the job). Notably, seven participants rated their evaluators with 0, the lowest score possible. These ratings indicate skepticism that the individuals interviewing/evaluating them during the retention process truly understand the judge’s work well enough to properly evaluate them. One participant stated that it is unfair for a retention commissioner to ask questions that have nothing to do with performance and that individuals who evaluate judicial officers should be required to shadow a judge.

Another participant shared the following experience and insight on retention:

As diverse judges we are held to a ridiculously high standard. Our scores are routinely lower than our counterparts doing the same work in the same jurisdiction (as well as across the state). The vitriol we face in comments (both in retention reviews and sometimes even in court) are beyond the pale, and yet are tolerated. And yet it continues to happen, no one changes anything, and now, with the election and if you did jury trials, the process is even worse. How can this happen? This affects our ability to be retained!

Finally, when asked whether the retention process is fair overall, the response was mixed. Half of the participants felt they would be regarded with impartiality, rating the overall process with scores of 7-10. The other half scored the process 0-6, with five participants giving a 0. Additionally, 27% reported feeling heard, giving evaluators scores between 7-10, on a scale of 0-10 (where 0 meant strongly disagree that they felt heard, and 10 meant strongly agree that they felt heard). Notably, 5 participants felt completely unheard, scoring their evaluators a 0.

The range of responses is perhaps best captured in one participant's statement, "While I think I was treated fairly, I don't think that was true for everyone."

Participants who didn't believe they were or would be treated fairly were given an opportunity to elaborate and share their experiences and perspectives. Some reported flaws in the retention process directly related to bias—both implicit and explicit. Four participants elaborated on why they do not believe they were or will be treated fairly in the retention process:

Because I wasn't (treated fairly). They asked me about having a baby, age, and compared me to other diverse judges for no apparent good reason except we are minorities. The chair told me I had a 'pretty face.'

I was not treated fairly. When I tried to give feedback about the disparate treatment, I was ignored and told to play nice. The commissioners are not invested in doing the work to make it fair.

The same behaviors between judges are perceived differently between white male judges and female and diverse judges.

While recognizing that the retention process is necessary, participants expressed a collective view that the process needs to be revised. Judges must be evaluated objectively. Furthermore, when asked whether the feedback during the retention process was helpful and would allow them to do their job better, most participants (86%) rated the feedback as less helpful, giving scores of 0-6 on a scale of 0 to 10. Eleven participants gave a 0, the lowest possible rating. As reflected in the quote below, participants have serious doubts about receiving helpful feedback during the retention process:

I want to be the best judge I can be. I want to be smart. I want to work hard. I want to do all the great things I can do. And I want to provide for my family. When I would get surveys back, when I first got to the bench, that said I'm 'too young' or 'he's

too Mexican,' this is not helpful. And it's hurtful. And I think, 'This is what my job is tied to. This is what they're going to talk about during retention.' They're going to ask me, 'Why are you so kind to Latino people? Why do you explain the process to pro se parties? What's wrong with you?' But I think this is what we are supposed to be doing. So, for me, it's difficult because it's this balance where I want to do--and I do--the right thing. But in the back of my mind, I know we have this retention process.

Retention process suggestions from the Participants

Participants generally agreed that the current retention process is causing premature departures of strong, diverse judicial officers. When asked, they offered suggestions for improving the process:

Selection of Commissioners

- Conduct better vetting of commissioner candidates.
- Insist that former judges serve on the commissions.
- Ensure commissioners are members from diverse, underrepresented, and historically marginalized communities.

Training for Commissioners

Require commissioners to successfully complete intensive and ongoing cultural, equity, and bias training.

- Require commissioners to spend more time in the presence of judges who understand what judges do. ("I don't think commissioners understand our jobs and why judges take certain actions.")
- Require commissioners to examine work done by judges. ("Actually, look at the work we do -- our orders, if we are overturned on appeal, etc.")
- Include diverse judges in the training of commissioners.

- Have a member of each commission who has expertise in bias.
- Assign an inclusion expert to sit in on commissioner interviews and other key processes so they can be a “check” on the process.

Accountability

- Enforce accountability for commissioners and their work expectations, including absences and voting. (“Some commissioner members do not show up for interviews.” “Commissioners [are] not fact checking.” “Commission[ers] only meet [] with you 1–2 times per cycle.” “Allow only attending commissioners to vote.”)
- Forbid commissioners from speaking outside the commission about their views and opinions on judges.
- Remove commissioners from the retention process for violating confidentiality.

Evaluation Criteria and Processes

- Focus on objective metrics and operationalize the objective metrics to minimize subjectivity.
- Allow more time between retention periods.
- Recognize that historic metrics are based upon a biased system of values.
- Add more criteria to the surveys, in a concise format that allows for more data points and requires more responders.
- Allow judges to provide a list of names of individuals who interact with them.
- Discontinue anonymizing survey respondents. (“People’s worst vitriol comes out when they believe they can hide.”)
- Always have a “bias officer” on the commissions - a commissioner with expertise in the areas of discrimination and microaggressions.
- Create opportunities for judges to engage/interact with commissioners about the narrative in a non-adversarial way. (“When a judge would defend themselves on negative comments, commissioners would look at that judge as combative.” “Too much fear by judicial officers

of retribution if we offend a commissioner by asking for accuracy.”)

- Improve gathering of public comment responses and increase survey response rates that are more representative. (“Increase input from attorneys and the public so that people with negative feedback are not the most likely to respond.”)
- Isolate a separate section for feedback from judges’ specific attorneys and litigants reviewed in court because the feedback is not impartial.
- Only rely on surveys if they yield statistically significant results. (“Sometimes there are low survey return rates and small sample sizes. When this occurs, there should be an asterisk stating that these low survey return rates and small sample size are not an accurate representation of the overall rating of the judicial officer.”)

Mentoring through the Retention Process

- Provide more support for judges going through the retention process.
- Assign mentors for each judge going through the retention process.
- Meet on a regular basis with a supportive group of diverse judges going through retention process in different parts of the state.
- Invest resources so JOs can attend professional development workshops or conferences to learn how to improve and prepare for retention or a higher-level judicial position.

The Focus Group Experience

Although the focus groups were intended as information-gathering centers, they ultimately served a second purpose: creating an independent and supportive space where diverse judicial officers could share their views freely, offer support to each other, and engage in solution-oriented discussions to fuel hope and optimism for the future. Participants agreed it was helpful to see what other diverse judicial officers were thinking and feeling. They said, “Thank you for giving us this outlet!” “Keep hosting discussions!”

COALITION RECOMMENDATIONS

After almost a year of discussions with judges, lawyers, diversity bar leaders, and others, as well as the collection of information through these focus groups, the Coalition is proud to synthesize all of the information and insights obtained into a concise list of concrete recommendations.

Although initially aimed at addressing the experiences of diverse judicial officers, these recommendations are widely applicable and could benefit many, if not all, judicial officers. Said another way, these recommendations are intended to foster inclusivity and greater retention, which benefits all judicial officers across Colorado, not just diverse judicial officers.

These recommendations are not exhaustive or final. They are meant to be the start of a conversation, and a springboard for change.

Coalition Recommendation No. 1: Provide Targeted Training to Chief Judges

In judicial districts where judicial officers report a highly involved and knowledgeable chief judge, judicial officers appear more optimistic about retention and generally feel supported. This stands in stark contrast to districts where the chief judge may be less engaged. Additionally, the chief judge in each district can have great influence on the retention process because he or she is a natural resource for commissioners who have questions or need guidance on job functions and related considerations.

Thus, the Coalition recommends investing resources in leadership training for chief judges. Topics can include best practices for performance reviews, inclusivity, implicit bias, active listening, public service leadership and valuing emotional intelligence in the judiciary. Chief judges can then serve as an informed resource for commissioners and remain engaged with judicial officers during the retention process.

Coalition Recommendation No. 2: Ensure Judicial Review Commissions are Well-Equipped and Held Accountable

There is concern among judicial officers that commissioners do not seem to evaluate judicial officers based on clear, objective criteria; that commissioners may not understand the particulars of the work; and that implicit bias plays a role in the process.

The Coalition recognizes the challenge of recruiting volunteers, training them in all aspects of the process and their duties, and keeping them sufficiently engaged during “dormant” periods. The Coalition also acknowledges that commissioners are volunteer public servants who do the very best they can, and may not always have sufficient resources. These challenges may be magnified in rural areas where it is difficult to recruit and retain volunteers in the first place.

Taking this into account, the Coalition recommends forming a committee (that is diverse and fairly represents different geographical areas across Colorado) to review the materials and information provided to the commissioners, and to develop a standardized approach to the review process. Standardization will help interrupt implicit bias, maintain objectivity, and give judicial officers a greater sense of fairness.

However, the Coalition cautions that any such criteria or standardized process must be developed by a diverse group that includes former judicial officers, and that recognizes the importance of using inclusive criteria. Additionally, the Coalition recommends that commissioners receive training and information on the actual work of a judicial officer in that district immediately before conducting a review. The training may be most efficient and helpful if conducted by the chief judge in the district, who will presumably be well-trained, informed, and prepared. See Recommendation # 1, above.

The Coalition also recommends developing a code of conduct for commissioners, as well as a system for removing and replacing commissioners when necessary. And the Coalition recommends recruiting former/retired judges to serve on commissions. Indeed, each commission should be required to include at least one former/retired judge, even if he or she served in a different district.

Coalition Recommendation No. 3: Adjust the Retention Process to Make Room for More Voices

The Coalition recommends a change in the retention framework to help judicial officers feel like active participants in their own process, with some control over the information that feeds into the process. Currently, the retention process is a framework where judicial officers feel scrutinized and criticized, without any meaningful opportunity to engage and grow. Whether they're being reviewed by commissioners, the attorneys who fill out surveys, or the staff who deliver the results, the setting creates a sense of criticism and reprimand, rather than feedback for growth.

However, if the interview process were designed as a discussion, for example, or if the judicial officer had a specific block of time to provide comments and ask questions, it may give the judicial officer a critical opportunity to offer context (rather than look defensive when responding to specific critiques or questions). Additionally, if the judicial officer were required to provide her or his own list of names of people who could offer relevant information about their work, it would allow for a more balanced view. Many judicial officers report that the feedback they receive in surveys feels unfair because it leaves a large swath of people out of the process, and the people it leaves out often have more relevant experience than those who offer comments based on one or two appearances before them.

Coalition Recommendation No. 4: Provide Greater Support During the Retention Process

The work of a judicial officer can be isolating, especially during the retention process, when a judicial officer is particularly vulnerable. These feelings of isolation are layered on top of an often high-stress job, with scarce resources, and—for diverse judicial officers—unique challenges that can be extremely wearing. Thus, the importance of supporting a judicial officer during the retention process cannot be overstated.

The Coalition recommends three forms of support during the retention process: First, a pre-retention meeting with the district's chief judge, which some chief judges already conduct. Again, based on the above recommendation, the chief judge will be equipped to ease the judicial officer's mind, let them know what to expect, and help the judicial officer see feedback in the most positive light. The chief judge can also collect information from the judicial officer that might provide important context for the commissioners before they begin their process.

Second, assignment of a mentor who has already been through the retention process. A mentor can help the judicial officer prepare for the process, and/or serve as a "lifeline." The judicial officer should have the option of being assigned a mentor in the same district, or in a similar district, as there are pros and cons to both (e.g. a judicial officer may feel greater freedom in discussing concerns with someone outside their district, but talking to someone in the same district could feel more relevant and helpful).

Third, a biannual retention workshop that helps prepare all judges across the state for the retention process. During this workshop, judicial officers would learn about any newly revamped and more objective/standardized criteria and processes (as proposed above). They would also learn how to prepare themselves for the process, become familiar with the resources available to support them during the process, and understand precisely how they will

be evaluated. Knowing what to expect and feeling well-equipped is likely to reduce anxiety, make the

process feel less daunting, and help judicial officers embrace the process as fair and helpful.

CONCLUSION

As evidenced in this report, diverse judicial officers take immense pride in their work and accomplishments, but they also face significant challenges. The Coalition is proud to have collected this information.

Through these focus groups and related discussions, the Coalition comes away with this conclusion: in its current form, the retention process may be adding unnecessary stress to an already difficult job with competing demands and a lack of resources. Additionally, diverse judicial officers face unique stressors that may make the retention process particularly difficult and anxiety-provoking. Our hope is that shedding light on this will be helpful to those already thinking about ways to improve the process.

We thank the Colorado Judicial Department for its support. Though the Coalition is an independent body, the Judiciary has been an excellent partner and has displayed a deep commitment to a retention process that is inclusive, fair, and aimed at appointing the most qualified candidates across the state. We know they will give this report and the Coalition's

recommendations careful consideration. The Coalition welcomes the opportunity to share additional insights gained during this process

We also thank the judicial officers who took the time to participate in a focus group or otherwise share their feedback. Without your contributions and whole-hearted participation, this report would not be possible.

Thank you also to each of the diversity bars who provided support in recruiting focus groups participants and who are working alongside the Coalition to promote inclusivity. We know you share our commitment to a judiciary that reflects the rich and diverse backgrounds of all people across the state of Colorado, and we look forward to continuing this work with you.

And finally, thank you to all the Coalition members who contributed to this report, in particular Dr. Guzman and Dr. Potter, whose insights, perspectives, and many, many hours of hard work on this report, were invaluable.

CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Fernando R. Guzman, III, *Assistant Dean for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence, University of Colorado Boulder Law School*

Dr. Hillary Potter, *Associate Professor, Department of Women & Gender Studies, University of Colorado Boulder*

Honorable Cynthia D. Mares, *Judge, 18th Judicial District (Retired)*

Honorable Maritza Dominguez Braswell, *U. S. Magistrate Judge District of Colorado, Colorado Springs, Colorado*

Nicole Soto Quintero, *Law Clerk for Honorable Maritza Dominguez Braswell, U. S. Magistrate, Judge District of Colorado, Colorado Springs, Colorado*

Meghan Bush, *former Director of Local Bar & Legal Community Relations, Colorado & Denver Bar Associations*

Katrina Silbaq, *Access to Justice Program Coordinator, Colorado & Denver Bar Associations*

Machia Mullens, *Law Student, University of Colorado Boulder Law School*

V. William Scarpato III, *Attorney, Denver, Colorado*