

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

**ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY &
LEGAL COUNSEL**
EDWARD M. MACON

COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
LELIA BAUM HOPPER, DIRECTOR

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
CAROLINE E. KIRKPATRICK, DIRECTOR

FISCAL SERVICES
JOHN B. RICKMAN, DIRECTOR

SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
100 NORTH NINTH STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-2334
(804) 786-6455

HUMAN RESOURCES
RENÉE FLEMING MILLS, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ROBERT L. SMITH, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL PLANNING
CYRIL W. MILLER, JR., DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL SERVICES
PAUL F. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

LEGAL RESEARCH
STEVEN L. DALLE MURA, DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS
KRISTI S. WRIGHT, DIRECTOR

December 17, 2014

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr., Co-Chairman
Senate Committee on Courts of Justice
General Assembly Building, Room 621
Capitol Square
Richmond, Virginia 23219

The Honorable Mark D. Obenshain, Co-Chairman
Senate Committee on Courts of Justice
General Assembly Building, Room 429
Capitol Square
Richmond, Virginia 23219

The Honorable David B. Albo, Chairman
House Committee on Courts of Justice
General Assembly Building, Room 529
Capitol Square
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Re: 2014 Judicial Performance Evaluation Reports Pursuant to Code § 17.1-100

Dear Chairmen Norment, Obenshain and Albo:

Hard copies of the 2014 Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) reports were hand delivered to the Division of Legislative Services on December 1, 2014. The attached pdf document consists of the evaluation reports prepared for eighteen judges who are eligible for reelection during the 2015 session of the General Assembly.¹ These judges had previously been evaluated in the court to which the judge is currently elected. The attached document contains reports for the following judges:

¹ Two additional evaluation reports were delivered on December 1, 2014. Those judges have, since delivery of the reports, announced their upcoming retirements. They are not seeking reelection in 2015.

1. The Honorable Karen J Burrell
2. The Honorable Gordon F. Willis
3. The Honorable Cheryl V. Higgins
4. The Honorable David L. Williams
5. The Honorable Pamela E. Hutchens
6. The Honorable Bruce A Wilcox
7. The Honorable Alfred O Masters, Jr.
8. The Honorable Gary A Mills
9. The Honorable Colleen K. Killilea
10. The Honorable Birdie Hairston Jamison
11. The Honorable William J. Minor, Jr.
12. The Honorable Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi
13. The Honorable Gino W Williams
14. The Honorable Deborah L Rawls
15. The Honorable Jacqueline R. Waymack
16. The Honorable Judith Anne Kline
17. The Honorable S. Anderson Nelson
18. The Honorable Robert C. Viar, Jr.

A copy of the attached pdf document is being provided to the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for posting with reports provided to the General Assembly.

Virginia Code § 17.1-100 requires that

- A. ... By December 1 of each year, the Supreme Court, or its designee, shall transmit a report of the evaluation in the final year of the term of each justice and judge whose term expires during the next session of the General Assembly to the Chairmen of the House and Senate Committees for Courts of Justice.
- B. The reporting requirement of this section shall become effective when funds are appropriated for this program and shall apply to the evaluation of any justice or judge who has had at least one interim evaluation conducted during his term.

Legislation passed during the 2014 Session of the General Assembly, further provides:

2. That any evaluation of a justice or judge previously conducted by the judicial performance evaluation program in the court to which the judge or justice is currently elected shall satisfy the requirements for an interim evaluation under subsection B of § 17.1-100 of the Code of Virginia as amended by this act.
3. That the first set of evaluation reports required by this act to be transmitted to the General Assembly shall be submitted to the Chairmen of the House and Senate Committees for Courts of Justice by December 1, 2014.

(2014 Acts of Assembly, Chapter 808.)

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr., Co-Chairman
The Honorable Mark D. Obenshain, Co-Chairman
The Honorable David B. Albo, Chairman
December 17, 2014
Page 3

If you have any questions concerning this document, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With kind regards, I am

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K R Hade', written in a cursive style.

Karl R. Hade

cc: Division of Legislative Automated Systems

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Karen J. Burrell

Circuit Court
4th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 157 completed surveys for Judge Karen J. Burrell.

Evaluation of Judge Karen J. Burrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	20.4%
	Good	47.8%
	Needs Improvement	20.4%
	Unsatisfactory	9.6%
	No Opinion	1.9%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	31.9%
	Good	36.9%
	Needs Improvement	18.5%
	Unsatisfactory	11.5%
	No Opinion	1.3%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	38.9%
	Good	44.6%
	Needs Improvement	10.8%
	Unsatisfactory	4.5%
	No Opinion	1.3%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	27.4%
	Good	36.9%
	Needs Improvement	20.4%
	Unsatisfactory	14.0%
	No Opinion	1.3%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	37.6%
	Good	50.3%
	Needs Improvement	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1.9%
	No Opinion	7.0%

Evaluation of Judge Karen J. Burrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	51.6%
	Good	41.4%
	Needs Improvement	5.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1.3%
	No Opinion	0.6%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	32.1%
	Good	46.2%
	Needs Improvement	12.8%
	Unsatisfactory	6.4%
	No Opinion	2.6%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	31.4%
	Good	46.2%
	Needs Improvement	11.5%
	Unsatisfactory	4.5%
	No Opinion	6.4%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	54.1%
	Good	29.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1.3%
	No Opinion	14.0%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	45.5%
	Good	37.2%
	Needs Improvement	9.0%
	Unsatisfactory	6.4%
	No Opinion	1.9%

Evaluation of Judge Karen J. Burrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	48.4%
	Good	44.0%
	Needs Improvement	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1.3%
	No Opinion	3.2%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	19.8%
	Good	47.1%
	Needs Improvement	19.1%
	Unsatisfactory	7.6%
	No Opinion	6.4%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	39.7%
	Good	40.4%
	Needs Improvement	13.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2.6%
	No Opinion	3.9%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	39.2%
	Good	46.4%
	Needs Improvement	7.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2.0%
	No Opinion	4.6%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	35.5%
	Good	41.5%
	Needs Improvement	13.2%
	Unsatisfactory	6.6%
	No Opinion	3.3%

Evaluation of Judge Karen J. Burrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	36.6%
	Good	42.5%
	Needs Improvement	11.8%
	Unsatisfactory	3.9%
	No Opinion	5.2%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	35.5%
	Good	47.4%
	Needs Improvement	9.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2.0%
	No Opinion	5.9%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	29.1%
	Good	33.8%
	Needs Improvement	13.9%
	Unsatisfactory	6.0%
	No Opinion	17.2%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	32.2%
	Good	42.1%
	Needs Improvement	9.2%
	Unsatisfactory	5.3%
	No Opinion	11.2%
Starts court on time	Excellent	43.1%
	Good	42.5%
	Needs Improvement	5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2.0%
	No Opinion	7.2%

Evaluation of Judge Karen J. Burrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	37.3%
	Good	42.5%
	Needs Improvement	9.2%
	Unsatisfactory	8.5%
	No Opinion	2.6%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	22.5%
	Good	43.7%
	Needs Improvement	23.8%
	Unsatisfactory	7.3%
	No Opinion	2.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9.8%
	Worse	9.8%
	Stayed the Same	42.5%
	No Opinion	37.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gordon F. Willis

Circuit Court
15th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 145 completed surveys for Judge Gordon F. Willis.

Evaluation of Judge Gordon F. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	62.1%
	Good	31.7%
	Needs Improvement	4.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	75.2%
	Good	21.4%
	Needs Improvement	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	80.6%
	Good	18.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	71.3%
	Good	22.4%
	Needs Improvement	4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	75.0%
	Good	18.8%
	Needs Improvement	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.2%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon F. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	82.1%
	Good	17.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	66.2%
	Good	27.6%
	Needs Improvement	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	3.5%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	67.6%
	Good	23.5%
	Needs Improvement	4.8%
	Unsatisfactory	3.5%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	81.3%
	Good	9.7%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	9.0%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	81.3%
	Good	17.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon F. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	80.0%
	Good	17.2%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.1%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	48.6%
	Good	38.9%
	Needs Improvement	4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	7.6%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	65.0%
	Good	30.8%
	Needs Improvement	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	68.1%
	Good	28.5%
	Needs Improvement	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	72.9%
	Good	25.0%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon F. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	78.5%
	Good	17.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.2%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	75.5%
	Good	21.7%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.8%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	69.9%
	Good	17.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	11.9%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	66.7%
	Good	22.2%
	Needs Improvement	3.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	6.3%
Starts court on time	Excellent	83.5%
	Good	13.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.8%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon F. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	78.0%
	Good	17.7%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.6%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	72.4%
	Good	23.5%
	Needs Improvement	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	21.5%
	Worse	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	47.2%
	No Opinion	31.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Cheryl V. Higgins

Circuit Court
16th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 175 completed surveys for Judge Cheryl V. Higgins.

Evaluation of Judge Cheryl V. Higgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	82.9%
	Good	12.6%
	Needs Improvement	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	85.7%
	Good	10.3%
	Needs Improvement	1.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	81.7%
	Good	13.7%
	Needs Improvement	2.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.6%
	No Opinion	1.7%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	85.6%
	Good	9.8%
	Needs Improvement	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.6%
	No Opinion	2.3%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	69.1%
	Good	21.7%
	Needs Improvement	0.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.6%
	No Opinion	8.0%

Evaluation of Judge Cheryl V. Higgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	83.4%
	Good	11.4%
	Needs Improvement	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.3%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	75.4%
	Good	17.1%
	Needs Improvement	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1.7%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	68.6%
	Good	17.1%
	Needs Improvement	5.1%
	Unsatisfactory	2.3%
	No Opinion	6.9%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	74.9%
	Good	8.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.6%
	No Opinion	16.0%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	83.8%
	Good	14.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.7%

Evaluation of Judge Cheryl V. Higgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	70.9%
	Good	24.0%
	Needs Improvement	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.4%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	64.6%
	Good	25.1%
	Needs Improvement	5.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	5.1%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	62.3%
	Good	25.1%
	Needs Improvement	6.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2.3%
	No Opinion	4.0%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	63.2%
	Good	25.8%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	4.9%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	68.1%
	Good	23.9%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1.2%
	No Opinion	3.1%

Evaluation of Judge Cheryl V. Higgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	60.1%
	Good	29.5%
	Needs Improvement	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.6%
	No Opinion	5.5%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	58.9%
	Good	28.2%
	Needs Improvement	4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	5.5%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	52.2%
	Good	23.0%
	Needs Improvement	6.8%
	Unsatisfactory	3.1%
	No Opinion	14.9%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	66.7%
	Good	16.1%
	Needs Improvement	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1.9%
	No Opinion	11.1%
Starts court on time	Excellent	65.6%
	Good	25.2%
	Needs Improvement	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.9%

Evaluation of Judge Cheryl V. Higgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	57.8%
	Good	27.3%
	Needs Improvement	9.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1.2%
	No Opinion	4.4%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	69.6%
	Good	21.7%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	3.1%
	No Opinion	1.9%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	17.2%
	Worse	2.5%
	Stayed the Same	44.2%
	No Opinion	36.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable David L. Williams

General District Court
1st Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 123 completed surveys for Judge David L. Williams.

Evaluation of Judge David L. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	23.0%
	Good	33.6%
	Needs Improvement	32.0%
	Unsatisfactory	10.7%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	35.5%
	Good	37.2%
	Needs Improvement	19.0%
	Unsatisfactory	7.4%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	54.6%
	Good	38.8%
	Needs Improvement	4.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	1.7%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	31.2%
	Good	32.8%
	Needs Improvement	25.4%
	Unsatisfactory	9.8%
	No Opinion	0.8%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	51.2%
	Good	43.0%
	Needs Improvement	2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.3%

Evaluation of Judge David L. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	68.9%
	Good	29.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	47.5%
	Good	41.8%
	Needs Improvement	7.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	35.3%
	Needs Improvement	9.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1.6%
	No Opinion	3.3%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	62.3%
	Good	22.1%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	13.9%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	44.3%
	Good	36.1%
	Needs Improvement	12.3%
	Unsatisfactory	4.9%
	No Opinion	2.5%

Evaluation of Judge David L. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	58.2%
	Good	36.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	4.1%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	36.9%
	Good	41.8%
	Needs Improvement	14.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1.6%
	No Opinion	4.9%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	68.0%
	Good	27.1%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.3%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	62.3%
	Good	27.9%
	Needs Improvement	5.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1.6%
	No Opinion	2.5%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	50.8%
	Good	36.1%
	Needs Improvement	10.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	1.6%

Evaluation of Judge David L. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	61.5%
	Good	33.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.9%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	59.8%
	Good	32.0%
	Needs Improvement	2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	4.9%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	51.6%
	Good	24.6%
	Needs Improvement	6.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1.6%
	No Opinion	15.6%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	47.1%
	Good	33.9%
	Needs Improvement	7.4%
	Unsatisfactory	4.1%
	No Opinion	7.4%
Starts court on time	Excellent	61.7%
	Good	37.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge David L. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	52.9%
	Good	38.8%
	Needs Improvement	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	37.2%
	Good	42.2%
	Needs Improvement	16.5%
	Unsatisfactory	3.3%
	No Opinion	0.8%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	21.1%
	Worse	7.3%
	Stayed the Same	61.0%
	No Opinion	10.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Pamela E. Hutchens

General District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 144 completed surveys for Judge Pamela E. Hutchens.

Evaluation of Judge Pamela E. Hutchens: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	41.7%
	Good	36.8%
	Needs Improvement	15.3%
	Unsatisfactory	4.9%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	39.6%
	Good	41.0%
	Needs Improvement	9.7%
	Unsatisfactory	8.3%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	47.6%
	Good	35.7%
	Needs Improvement	11.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3.5%
	No Opinion	1.4%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	36.8%
	Good	29.2%
	Needs Improvement	18.1%
	Unsatisfactory	13.9%
	No Opinion	2.1%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	38.2%
	Needs Improvement	4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	2.1%
	No Opinion	4.9%

Evaluation of Judge Pamela E. Hutchens: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	60.4%
	Good	36.1%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	34.7%
	Good	26.4%
	Needs Improvement	15.3%
	Unsatisfactory	21.5%
	No Opinion	2.1%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	35.7%
	Good	35.0%
	Needs Improvement	17.5%
	Unsatisfactory	9.8%
	No Opinion	2.1%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	58.3%
	Good	20.8%
	Needs Improvement	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	2.1%
	No Opinion	16.7%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	53.2%
	Good	37.1%
	Needs Improvement	4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	4.2%
	No Opinion	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Pamela E. Hutchens: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	57.6%
	Good	39.6%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	35.7%
	Good	42.0%
	Needs Improvement	14.0%
	Unsatisfactory	5.6%
	No Opinion	2.8%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	56.9%
	Good	31.3%
	Needs Improvement	9.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	49.7%
	Good	29.4%
	Needs Improvement	11.9%
	Unsatisfactory	7.7%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	47.9%
	Good	36.1%
	Needs Improvement	9.7%
	Unsatisfactory	4.9%
	No Opinion	1.4%

Evaluation of Judge Pamela E. Hutchens: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	48.6%
	Good	38.9%
	Needs Improvement	6.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3.5%
	No Opinion	2.1%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	41.7%
	Needs Improvement	4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	35.4%
	Good	28.5%
	Needs Improvement	11.1%
	Unsatisfactory	10.4%
	No Opinion	14.6%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	39.2%
	Good	28.0%
	Needs Improvement	12.6%
	Unsatisfactory	14.7%
	No Opinion	5.6%
Starts court on time	Excellent	47.6%
	Good	36.4%
	Needs Improvement	8.4%
	Unsatisfactory	4.2%
	No Opinion	3.5%

Evaluation of Judge Pamela E. Hutchens: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	35.7%
	Good	28.7%
	Needs Improvement	15.4%
	Unsatisfactory	18.2%
	No Opinion	2.1%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	35.9%
	Good	29.6%
	Needs Improvement	18.3%
	Unsatisfactory	12.0%
	No Opinion	4.2%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10.4%
	Worse	9.7%
	Stayed the Same	61.8%
	No Opinion	18.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Bruce A. Wilcox

General District Court
4th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 109 completed surveys for Judge Bruce A. Wilcox.

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Wilcox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	66.1%
	Good	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	4.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.8%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	71.3%
	Good	24.1%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.9%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	64.2%
	Good	26.6%
	Needs Improvement	4.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.6%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	71.6%
	Good	21.1%
	Needs Improvement	4.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.8%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	59.6%
	Good	32.1%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.6%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Wilcox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	60.6%
	Good	31.2%
	Needs Improvement	6.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.8%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	66.7%
	Good	25.0%
	Needs Improvement	4.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.9%
	No Opinion	2.8%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	65.7%
	Good	24.1%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.9%
	No Opinion	5.6%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	63.9%
	Good	18.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	16.7%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	67.0%
	Good	29.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.8%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Wilcox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	63.9%
	Good	31.5%
	Needs Improvement	1.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.8%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	64.2%
	Good	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.6%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	63.3%
	Good	29.4%
	Needs Improvement	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.9%
	No Opinion	3.7%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	63.3%
	Good	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%
	No Opinion	3.7%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	63.9%
	Good	31.5%
	Needs Improvement	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.9%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Wilcox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	71.6%
	Good	24.8%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.7%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	67.9%
	Good	24.8%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.7%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	58.7%
	Good	22.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1.8%
	No Opinion	15.6%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	69.7%
	Good	18.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.8%
	Unsatisfactory	3.7%
	No Opinion	6.4%
Starts court on time	Excellent	64.5%
	Good	29.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.9%
	No Opinion	5.6%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Wilcox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	67.9%
	Good	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.9%
	No Opinion	3.7%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	66.7%
	Good	23.2%
	Needs Improvement	7.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.8%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6.4%
	Worse	0.9%
	Stayed the Same	77.1%
	No Opinion	15.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Alfred O. Masters, Jr.

General District Court
7th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 122 completed surveys for Judge Alfred O. Masters, Jr..

Evaluation of Judge Alfred O. Masters, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	25.4%
	Good	42.6%
	Needs Improvement	22.1%
	Unsatisfactory	9.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	36.9%
	Good	34.4%
	Needs Improvement	21.3%
	Unsatisfactory	6.6%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	39.3%
	Good	44.3%
	Needs Improvement	12.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	1.6%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	35.3%
	Good	31.2%
	Needs Improvement	23.0%
	Unsatisfactory	9.8%
	No Opinion	0.8%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	47.9%
	Good	42.2%
	Needs Improvement	5.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	3.3%

Evaluation of Judge Alfred O. Masters, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	49.6%
	Good	39.7%
	Needs Improvement	9.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	32.8%
	Good	42.6%
	Needs Improvement	15.6%
	Unsatisfactory	7.4%
	No Opinion	1.6%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	34.2%
	Good	36.7%
	Needs Improvement	20.8%
	Unsatisfactory	5.8%
	No Opinion	2.5%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	57.4%
	Good	23.8%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	17.2%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	45.1%
	Good	38.5%
	Needs Improvement	13.1%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Alfred O. Masters, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	44.3%
	Needs Improvement	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	1.6%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	30.3%
	Good	38.5%
	Needs Improvement	23.8%
	Unsatisfactory	4.1%
	No Opinion	3.3%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	46.7%
	Good	39.3%
	Needs Improvement	7.4%
	Unsatisfactory	3.3%
	No Opinion	3.3%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	40.2%
	Good	42.6%
	Needs Improvement	9.8%
	Unsatisfactory	4.9%
	No Opinion	2.5%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	39.7%
	Good	43.8%
	Needs Improvement	13.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2.5%
	No Opinion	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Alfred O. Masters, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent 58.7%
	Good 38.8%
	Needs Improvement 1.7%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.8%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent 51.6%
	Good 37.7%
	Needs Improvement 5.7%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 4.1%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent 40.5%
	Good 34.7%
	Needs Improvement 6.6%
	Unsatisfactory 2.5%
	No Opinion 15.7%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent 41.8%
	Good 41.8%
	Needs Improvement 9.0%
	Unsatisfactory 4.1%
	No Opinion 3.3%
Starts court on time	Excellent 54.9%
	Good 41.8%
	Needs Improvement 0.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 2.5%

Evaluation of Judge Alfred O. Masters, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent 48.8%
	Good 42.2%
	Needs Improvement 5.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 3.3%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent 36.4%
	Good 37.3%
	Needs Improvement 22.0%
	Unsatisfactory 4.2%
	No Opinion 0.0%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better 10.7%
	Worse 5.8%
	Stayed the Same 62.8%
	No Opinion 20.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gary A. Mills

General District Court
7th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 124 completed surveys for Judge Gary A. Mills.

Evaluation of Judge Gary A. Mills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	68.6%
	Good	29.0%
	Needs Improvement	2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	72.6%
	Good	25.0%
	Needs Improvement	2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	77.2%
	Good	22.8%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	71.8%
	Good	25.0%
	Needs Improvement	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	73.2%
	Good	24.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.6%

Evaluation of Judge Gary A. Mills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	81.5%
	Good	16.9%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	73.4%
	Good	22.6%
	Needs Improvement	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	67.7%
	Good	27.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	2.4%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	76.4%
	Good	13.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	10.6%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	79.8%
	Good	18.6%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gary A. Mills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	79.0%
	Good	19.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	71.5%
	Good	24.4%
	Needs Improvement	2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	83.6%
	Good	15.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	79.0%
	Good	19.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	80.7%
	Good	18.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gary A. Mills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	82.0%
	Good	15.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.6%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	80.7%
	Good	17.7%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	69.7%
	Good	15.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	13.9%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	75.0%
	Good	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	1.6%
Starts court on time	Excellent	78.1%
	Good	20.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Gary A. Mills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	78.2%
	Good	19.4%
	Needs Improvement	2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	77.3%
	Good	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13.0%
	Worse	0.8%
	Stayed the Same	69.9%
	No Opinion	16.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Colleen K. Killilea

General District Court
9th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 128 completed surveys for Judge Colleen K. Killilea.

Evaluation of Judge Colleen K. Killilea: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	33.6%
	Good	41.4%
	Needs Improvement	18.8%
	Unsatisfactory	6.3%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	42.5%
	Good	33.1%
	Needs Improvement	15.0%
	Unsatisfactory	9.5%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	55.5%
	Good	33.6%
	Needs Improvement	3.9%
	Unsatisfactory	7.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	40.8%
	Good	30.4%
	Needs Improvement	16.8%
	Unsatisfactory	12.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	50.8%
	Good	38.3%
	Needs Improvement	4.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	5.5%

Evaluation of Judge Colleen K. Killilea: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	58.7%
	Good	37.3%
	Needs Improvement	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	36.2%
	Good	37.8%
	Needs Improvement	14.2%
	Unsatisfactory	11.8%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	42.1%
	Good	34.1%
	Needs Improvement	13.5%
	Unsatisfactory	7.1%
	No Opinion	3.2%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	55.6%
	Good	24.6%
	Needs Improvement	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2.4%
	No Opinion	15.9%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	54.3%
	Good	33.9%
	Needs Improvement	6.3%
	Unsatisfactory	5.5%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Colleen K. Killilea: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	59.1%
	Good	35.4%
	Needs Improvement	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	1.6%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	29.1%
	Good	37.8%
	Needs Improvement	19.7%
	Unsatisfactory	12.6%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	53.5%
	Good	35.4%
	Needs Improvement	3.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3.9%
	No Opinion	3.2%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	47.2%
	Good	33.1%
	Needs Improvement	11.8%
	Unsatisfactory	6.3%
	No Opinion	1.6%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	50.4%
	Good	35.4%
	Needs Improvement	11.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1.6%
	No Opinion	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Colleen K. Killilea: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent 63.0%
	Good 36.2%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent 57.9%
	Good 36.5%
	Needs Improvement 4.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent 50.0%
	Good 27.8%
	Needs Improvement 5.6%
	Unsatisfactory 6.4%
	No Opinion 10.3%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent 44.9%
	Good 33.1%
	Needs Improvement 10.2%
	Unsatisfactory 7.1%
	No Opinion 4.7%
Starts court on time	Excellent 61.1%
	Good 34.1%
	Needs Improvement 0.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 3.2%

Evaluation of Judge Colleen K. Killilea: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	57.7%
	Good	33.3%
	Needs Improvement	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2.4%
	No Opinion	3.3%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	41.0%
	Good	36.1%
	Needs Improvement	14.8%
	Unsatisfactory	7.4%
	No Opinion	0.8%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9.5%
	Worse	6.3%
	Stayed the Same	69.3%
	No Opinion	15.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Birdie Hairston Jamison

General District Court
13th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 133 completed surveys for Judge Birdie Hairston Jamison.

Evaluation of Judge Birdie Hairston Jamison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	20.5%
	Good	41.7%
	Needs Improvement	19.7%
	Unsatisfactory	18.2%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	23.5%
	Good	32.6%
	Needs Improvement	27.3%
	Unsatisfactory	16.7%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	28.0%
	Good	40.2%
	Needs Improvement	18.9%
	Unsatisfactory	9.1%
	No Opinion	3.8%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	21.1%
	Good	31.6%
	Needs Improvement	27.1%
	Unsatisfactory	20.3%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	33.8%
	Good	46.6%
	Needs Improvement	11.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2.3%
	No Opinion	6.0%

Evaluation of Judge Birdie Hairston Jamison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent 40.2%
	Good 47.0%
	Needs Improvement 9.1%
	Unsatisfactory 3.8%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent 24.8%
	Good 31.6%
	Needs Improvement 23.3%
	Unsatisfactory 19.6%
	No Opinion 0.8%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent 28.0%
	Good 36.4%
	Needs Improvement 18.2%
	Unsatisfactory 15.9%
	No Opinion 1.5%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent 37.9%
	Good 26.5%
	Needs Improvement 0.8%
	Unsatisfactory 4.6%
	No Opinion 30.3%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent 33.3%
	Good 35.6%
	Needs Improvement 17.4%
	Unsatisfactory 12.9%
	No Opinion 0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Birdie Hairston Jamison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	38.4%
	Good	50.4%
	Needs Improvement	6.0%
	Unsatisfactory	3.0%
	No Opinion	2.3%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	23.3%
	Good	36.8%
	Needs Improvement	19.6%
	Unsatisfactory	14.3%
	No Opinion	6.0%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	29.3%
	Good	42.1%
	Needs Improvement	15.0%
	Unsatisfactory	6.0%
	No Opinion	7.5%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	26.3%
	Good	38.4%
	Needs Improvement	12.8%
	Unsatisfactory	16.5%
	No Opinion	6.0%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	30.5%
	Good	40.5%
	Needs Improvement	20.6%
	Unsatisfactory	6.1%
	No Opinion	2.3%

Evaluation of Judge Birdie Hairston Jamison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent 43.6%
	Good 49.6%
	Needs Improvement 3.0%
	Unsatisfactory 1.5%
	No Opinion 2.3%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent 35.6%
	Good 49.2%
	Needs Improvement 9.9%
	Unsatisfactory 3.8%
	No Opinion 1.5%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent 22.1%
	Good 35.1%
	Needs Improvement 17.6%
	Unsatisfactory 11.5%
	No Opinion 13.7%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent 24.1%
	Good 36.1%
	Needs Improvement 17.3%
	Unsatisfactory 15.0%
	No Opinion 7.5%
Starts court on time	Excellent 32.3%
	Good 51.9%
	Needs Improvement 9.8%
	Unsatisfactory 4.5%
	No Opinion 1.5%

Evaluation of Judge Birdie Hairston Jamison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	30.5%
	Good	44.3%
	Needs Improvement	13.0%
	Unsatisfactory	7.6%
	No Opinion	4.6%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	22.5%
	Good	33.3%
	Needs Improvement	22.5%
	Unsatisfactory	20.2%
	No Opinion	1.6%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8.3%
	Worse	6.1%
	Stayed the Same	70.5%
	No Opinion	15.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable William J. Minor, Jr.

General District Court
19th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 138 completed surveys for Judge William J. Minor, Jr..

Evaluation of Judge William J. Minor, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	51.5%
	Good	33.3%
	Needs Improvement	11.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	64.5%
	Good	26.1%
	Needs Improvement	5.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	69.3%
	Good	27.7%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	1.5%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	63.8%
	Good	25.4%
	Needs Improvement	6.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	1.5%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	67.4%
	Good	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.4%

Evaluation of Judge William J. Minor, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent 74.6%
	Good 23.2%
	Needs Improvement 1.5%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.7%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent 65.9%
	Good 23.9%
	Needs Improvement 8.7%
	Unsatisfactory 0.7%
	No Opinion 0.7%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent 63.0%
	Good 27.5%
	Needs Improvement 5.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 3.6%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent 67.4%
	Good 14.5%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.7%
	No Opinion 17.4%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent 71.0%
	Good 21.7%
	Needs Improvement 5.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.7%
	No Opinion 0.7%

Evaluation of Judge William J. Minor, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	72.5%
	Good	25.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.2%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	39.9%
	Needs Improvement	6.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.6%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	61.3%
	Good	34.3%
	Needs Improvement	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.5%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	63.8%
	Good	29.7%
	Needs Improvement	5.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	58.7%
	Good	36.2%
	Needs Improvement	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1.5%
	No Opinion	1.5%

Evaluation of Judge William J. Minor, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	76.1%
	Good	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	67.7%
	Good	27.9%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	68.6%
	Good	19.7%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	10.2%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	69.3%
	Good	19.0%
	Needs Improvement	5.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	5.8%
Starts court on time	Excellent	75.4%
	Good	22.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.5%

Evaluation of Judge William J. Minor, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	75.0%
	Good	22.8%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.5%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	65.2%
	Good	24.4%
	Needs Improvement	8.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18.1%
	Worse	2.9%
	Stayed the Same	66.7%
	No Opinion	12.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi

General District Court
23rd Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 138 completed surveys for Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi.

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	94.2%
	Good	5.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	95.7%
	Good	3.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	92.0%
	Good	8.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	94.9%
	Good	5.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	83.9%
	Good	12.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.7%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent 90.6%
	Good 8.7%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.7%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent 89.9%
	Good 9.4%
	Needs Improvement 0.7%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent 84.8%
	Good 10.9%
	Needs Improvement 1.5%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 2.9%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent 86.8%
	Good 3.7%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 9.6%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent 93.5%
	Good 6.5%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	86.2%
	Good	13.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	84.1%
	Good	14.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.5%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	87.6%
	Good	11.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	84.8%
	Good	12.3%
	Needs Improvement	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	88.4%
	Good	10.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	85.5%
	Good	9.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.6%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	86.1%
	Good	10.2%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.2%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	76.8%
	Good	9.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	12.3%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	87.0%
	Good	9.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Starts court on time	Excellent	83.3%
	Good	12.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	2.9%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent 81.8%
	Good 14.6%
	Needs Improvement 1.5%
	Unsatisfactory 0.7%
	No Opinion 1.5%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent 90.4%
	Good 9.6%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better 12.3%
	Worse 0.0%
	Stayed the Same 74.6%
	No Opinion 13.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gino W. Williams

General District Court
27th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 122 completed surveys for Judge Gino W. Williams.

Evaluation of Judge Gino W. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	87.7%
	Good	12.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	91.7%
	Good	8.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	90.9%
	Good	7.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	94.2%
	Good	5.8%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	84.3%
	Good	14.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.7%

Evaluation of Judge Gino W. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	91.7%
	Good	8.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	91.7%
	Good	7.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	87.6%
	Good	11.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	88.4%
	Good	6.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	5.0%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	91.7%
	Good	7.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gino W. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	86.7%
	Good	13.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	86.0%
	Good	13.2%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	88.4%
	Good	8.3%
	Needs Improvement	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.7%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	84.3%
	Good	13.2%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.7%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	86.8%
	Good	13.2%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gino W. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	90.1%
	Good	9.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	86.0%
	Good	14.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	74.4%
	Good	14.9%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	10.7%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	88.3%
	Good	9.2%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.7%
Starts court on time	Excellent	76.9%
	Good	21.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gino W. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	82.5%
	Good	15.8%
	Needs Improvement	0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.8%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	91.7%
	Good	8.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9.1%
	Worse	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	73.6%
	No Opinion	17.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Deborah L. Rawls

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 141 completed surveys for Judge Deborah L. Rawls.

Evaluation of Judge Deborah L. Rawls: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	57.5%
	Good	34.0%
	Needs Improvement	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	63.1%
	Good	27.0%
	Needs Improvement	6.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	71.4%
	Good	24.3%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2.1%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	63.6%
	Good	25.0%
	Needs Improvement	7.1%
	Unsatisfactory	3.6%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	64.5%
	Good	32.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.1%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah L. Rawls: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	73.8%
	Good	24.8%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	70.2%
	Good	22.7%
	Needs Improvement	3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	68.8%
	Good	21.3%
	Needs Improvement	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2.1%
	No Opinion	2.8%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	66.7%
	Good	20.6%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	11.4%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	71.6%
	Good	25.5%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah L. Rawls: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	69.3%
	Good	28.6%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	56.0%
	Good	37.6%
	Needs Improvement	3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2.1%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	75.2%
	Good	21.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	68.1%
	Good	27.0%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	2.1%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	70.9%
	Good	23.4%
	Needs Improvement	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah L. Rawls: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent 72.3%
	Good 24.8%
	Needs Improvement 1.4%
	Unsatisfactory 0.7%
	No Opinion 0.7%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent 75.8%
	Good 21.2%
	Needs Improvement 1.5%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 0.8%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent 64.1%
	Good 21.4%
	Needs Improvement 2.3%
	Unsatisfactory 0.8%
	No Opinion 11.5%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent 71.8%
	Good 17.6%
	Needs Improvement 3.8%
	Unsatisfactory 1.5%
	No Opinion 5.3%
Starts court on time	Excellent 31.1%
	Good 31.1%
	Needs Improvement 24.2%
	Unsatisfactory 11.4%
	No Opinion 2.3%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah L. Rawls: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent 57.3%
	Good 29.0%
	Needs Improvement 6.1%
	Unsatisfactory 5.3%
	No Opinion 2.3%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent 66.9%
	Good 25.2%
	Needs Improvement 5.0%
	Unsatisfactory 2.2%
	No Opinion 0.7%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better 7.1%
	Worse 3.6%
	Stayed the Same 75.9%
	No Opinion 13.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jacqueline R. Waymack

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
6th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 70 completed surveys for Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack.

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	52.9%
	Good	38.6%
	Needs Improvement	7.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	52.9%
	Good	38.6%
	Needs Improvement	7.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	38.6%
	Needs Improvement	11.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	58.6%
	Good	32.9%
	Needs Improvement	5.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	48.6%
	Good	38.6%
	Needs Improvement	7.1%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	2.9%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	54.3%
	Good	41.4%
	Needs Improvement	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	45.7%
	Good	44.3%
	Needs Improvement	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	4.3%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	42.9%
	Good	41.4%
	Needs Improvement	8.6%
	Unsatisfactory	5.7%
	No Opinion	1.4%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	54.3%
	Good	34.3%
	Needs Improvement	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	8.6%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	50.0%
	Good	42.9%
	Needs Improvement	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.9%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	42.9%
	Good	47.1%
	Needs Improvement	5.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	4.3%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	45.7%
	Good	47.1%
	Needs Improvement	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	42.9%
	Good	35.7%
	Needs Improvement	17.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	47.1%
	Good	32.9%
	Needs Improvement	15.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	2.9%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	45.7%
	Good	40.0%
	Needs Improvement	11.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	1.4%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	46.4%
	Good	43.5%
	Needs Improvement	5.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	1.5%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	52.5%
	Good	35.6%
	Needs Improvement	8.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1.7%
	No Opinion	1.7%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	44.1%
	Good	27.1%
	Needs Improvement	17.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1.7%
	No Opinion	10.2%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	49.1%
	Good	28.1%
	Needs Improvement	10.5%
	Unsatisfactory	7.0%
	No Opinion	5.3%
Starts court on time	Excellent	34.5%
	Good	37.9%
	Needs Improvement	19.0%
	Unsatisfactory	3.5%
	No Opinion	5.2%

Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent 36.2%
	Good 44.8%
	Needs Improvement 10.3%
	Unsatisfactory 3.5%
	No Opinion 5.2%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent 37.3%
	Good 43.3%
	Needs Improvement 16.4%
	Unsatisfactory 1.5%
	No Opinion 1.5%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better 21.4%
	Worse 7.1%
	Stayed the Same 58.6%
	No Opinion 12.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Judith Anne Kline

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
7th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 136 completed surveys for Judge Judith Anne Kline.

Evaluation of Judge Judith Anne Kline: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	79.4%
	Good	19.1%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	79.1%
	Good	18.7%
	Needs Improvement	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	81.2%
	Good	15.8%
	Needs Improvement	2.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0.8%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	79.4%
	Good	16.2%
	Needs Improvement	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2.2%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	62.5%
	Good	33.8%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Judith Anne Kline: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent 80.2%
	Good 16.9%
	Needs Improvement 2.9%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent 66.9%
	Good 24.3%
	Needs Improvement 5.9%
	Unsatisfactory 2.9%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent 64.4%
	Good 25.9%
	Needs Improvement 5.9%
	Unsatisfactory 1.5%
	No Opinion 2.2%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent 73.5%
	Good 19.9%
	Needs Improvement 1.5%
	Unsatisfactory 0.7%
	No Opinion 4.4%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent 72.1%
	Good 25.0%
	Needs Improvement 2.9%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Judith Anne Kline: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	73.3%
	Good	21.5%
	Needs Improvement	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0.7%
	No Opinion	0.7%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	69.6%
	Good	28.2%
	Needs Improvement	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	70.6%
	Good	22.8%
	Needs Improvement	5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1.5%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	66.2%
	Good	25.7%
	Needs Improvement	4.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2.9%
	No Opinion	0.7%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	66.9%
	Good	27.2%
	Needs Improvement	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1.5%
	No Opinion	2.2%

Evaluation of Judge Judith Anne Kline: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent 64.7%
	Good 31.6%
	Needs Improvement 2.2%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 1.5%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent 66.1%
	Good 26.6%
	Needs Improvement 4.6%
	Unsatisfactory 1.8%
	No Opinion 0.9%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent 62.4%
	Good 22.0%
	Needs Improvement 2.8%
	Unsatisfactory 2.8%
	No Opinion 10.1%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent 70.6%
	Good 21.1%
	Needs Improvement 5.5%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 2.8%
Starts court on time	Excellent 65.7%
	Good 30.6%
	Needs Improvement 2.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.9%

Evaluation of Judge Judith Anne Kline: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent 60.6%
	Good 35.8%
	Needs Improvement 3.7%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent 69.6%
	Good 23.0%
	Needs Improvement 4.4%
	Unsatisfactory 2.2%
	No Opinion 0.7%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better 16.2%
	Worse 2.2%
	Stayed the Same 71.3%
	No Opinion 10.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable S. Anderson Nelson

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
10th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 74 completed surveys for Judge S. Anderson Nelson.

Evaluation of Judge S. Anderson Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	48.7%
	Good	39.2%
	Needs Improvement	10.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	60.8%
	Good	29.7%
	Needs Improvement	6.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2.7%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	64.4%
	Good	31.5%
	Needs Improvement	4.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	51.4%
	Good	39.2%
	Needs Improvement	5.4%
	Unsatisfactory	4.1%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	63.5%
	Good	29.7%
	Needs Improvement	2.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	2.7%

Evaluation of Judge S. Anderson Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent	66.2%
	Good	29.7%
	Needs Improvement	4.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent	59.5%
	Good	33.8%
	Needs Improvement	5.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent	54.8%
	Good	37.0%
	Needs Improvement	6.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent	71.6%
	Good	21.6%
	Needs Improvement	4.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.7%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent	63.5%
	Good	35.1%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge S. Anderson Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	60.8%
	Good	33.8%
	Needs Improvement	5.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	62.2%
	Good	33.8%
	Needs Improvement	4.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	73.0%
	Good	25.7%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	62.2%
	Good	32.4%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2.7%
	No Opinion	1.4%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	68.9%
	Good	29.7%
	Needs Improvement	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge S. Anderson Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent 75.7%
	Good 21.6%
	Needs Improvement 1.4%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 1.4%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent 82.1%
	Good 16.1%
	Needs Improvement 1.8%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 0.0%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent 69.1%
	Good 20.0%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 10.9%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent 64.3%
	Good 23.2%
	Needs Improvement 8.9%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 3.6%
Starts court on time	Excellent 67.9%
	Good 21.4%
	Needs Improvement 7.1%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 3.6%

Evaluation of Judge S. Anderson Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	71.4%
	Good	21.4%
	Needs Improvement	5.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	1.8%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	67.1%
	Good	26.0%
	Needs Improvement	5.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1.4%
	No Opinion	0.0%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20.3%
	Worse	2.7%
	Stayed the Same	68.9%
	No Opinion	8.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert C. Viar, Jr.

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
27th Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice
Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

on behalf of the
Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Supreme Court of Virginia

2014



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial reelection process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the reelection process.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

For judges in juvenile and domestic relations district courts, staff of the local Department of Social Services and staff employed by the Department of Juvenile Justice in court service units completed a survey that included 18 of the 23 performance-based factors. Like the attorney surveys, these surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these percentages.

This report reflects a total of 99 completed surveys for Judge Robert C. Viar, Jr..

Evaluation of Judge Robert C. Viar, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Patience displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	86.9%
	Good	11.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
Dignity and courtesy displayed in the courtroom	Excellent	90.8%
	Good	7.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
Conscientiousness and diligence in the performance of judicial duties	Excellent	85.9%
	Good	11.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.0%
The respect shown by the judge for all court participants	Excellent	87.9%
	Good	10.1%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
The respect that the judge demands court participants to display towards one another	Excellent	76.0%
	Good	19.8%
	Needs Improvement	1.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.1%

Evaluation of Judge Robert C. Viar, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses
Attentiveness to proceedings	Excellent 82.8%
	Good 15.2%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 2.0%
Fairness exhibited to all parties	Excellent 80.8%
	Good 16.2%
	Needs Improvement 1.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 2.0%
Consistency in treatment for all parties	Excellent 82.7%
	Good 13.3%
	Needs Improvement 1.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 3.1%
The absence of inappropriate ex parte communications	Excellent 83.7%
	Good 7.1%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 9.2%
The order, decorum, and civility maintained by the judge	Excellent 85.7%
	Good 12.2%
	Needs Improvement 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory 0.0%
	No Opinion 2.0%

Evaluation of Judge Robert C. Viar, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Professional behavior the judge expects of court participants	Excellent	79.8%
	Good	17.2%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.0%
The latitude that the judge allows lawyers in presentation of the case	Excellent	78.6%
	Good	19.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
Knowledge of the law	Excellent	82.7%
	Good	14.3%
	Needs Improvement	1.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
Faithfulness to the law	Excellent	82.7%
	Good	15.3%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
Effectiveness of communications	Excellent	76.8%
	Good	18.2%
	Needs Improvement	3.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%

Evaluation of Judge Robert C. Viar, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
Promptness in rendering decisions	Excellent	78.6%
	Good	19.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.0%
Clarity of decisions	Excellent	80.0%
	Good	17.5%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.5%
Competence as a judicial administrator	Excellent	66.7%
	Good	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	12.4%
The judge's freedom from bias for, or prejudice against, any person or group	Excellent	80.3%
	Good	13.6%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	6.2%
Starts court on time	Excellent	75.3%
	Good	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	3.7%

Evaluation of Judge Robert C. Viar, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses
Uses courtroom time efficiently	Excellent	79.5%
	Good	18.0%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.6%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	87.5%
	Good	10.4%
	Needs Improvement	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0.0%
	No Opinion	2.1%
In general, over the last two years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6.1%
	Worse	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	76.5%
	No Opinion	17.4%