

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARY**  
KARL R. MADE

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

**COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**  
SANDRA L. KARISON, DIRECTOR

**EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**  
CAROLINE E. KIRKPATRICK, DIRECTOR

**FISCAL SERVICES**  
JOHN B. RICKMAN, DIRECTOR

**HUMAN RESOURCES**  
RENEE FLEMING MILLS, DIRECTOR

## SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA



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

**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

**MAGISTRATE SERVICES**  
MASON L. BYRD, DIRECTOR

December 1, 2016

DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL

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

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

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

Dear Chairmen Obenshain and Albo:

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.

The attached document includes the evaluation reports prepared for judges, listed below, who are eligible for reelection during the 2017 session of the General Assembly. These judges each have had at least one interim evaluation conducted during their terms.

**Circuit Court Judges**

1. Honorable Leslie L. Lilley, Judge (2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit)
2. Honorable John R. Doyle, III, Judge (4<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
3. Honorable Mary Jane Hall, Judge (4<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
4. Honorable Jerrauld C. Jones, Judge (4<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
5. Honorable Bonnie L. Jones, Judge (8<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
6. Honorable Timothy J. Hauler, Judge (12<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
7. Honorable Charles S. Sharp, Judge (15<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
8. Honorable William T. Newman, Jr., Judge (17<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
9. Honorable Jan L. Brodie, Judge (19<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
10. Honorable Jeffrey W. Parker, Judge (20<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
11. Honorable Joseph W. Milam, Jr., Judge (22<sup>nd</sup> Circuit)
12. Honorable James R. Swanson, Judge (23<sup>rd</sup> Circuit)
13. Honorable C. Randall Lowe, Judge (28<sup>th</sup> Circuit)
14. Honorable Craig D. Johnston, Judge (31<sup>st</sup> Circuit)

**General District Court Judges**

15. Honorable Alfred W. Bates, III, Judge (5<sup>th</sup> District)
16. Honorable James J. O'Connell, III, Judge (12<sup>th</sup> District)
17. Honorable Michael Joseph Cassidy, Judge (19<sup>th</sup> District)
18. Honorable J. Gregory Ashwell, Judge (20<sup>th</sup> District)

**Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges**

19. Honorable Rufus A. Banks, Jr., Judge (1<sup>st</sup> District)
20. Honorable Larry D. Willis, Sr., Judge (1<sup>st</sup> District)
21. Honorable M. Randolph Carlson, II, Judge (4<sup>th</sup> District)
22. Honorable Thomas W. Carpenter, Judge (7<sup>th</sup> District)
23. Honorable Shannon O. Hoehl, Judge (15<sup>th</sup> District)
24. Honorable Julian W. Johnson, Judge (15<sup>th</sup> District)
25. Honorable Constance H. Frogale, Judge (18<sup>th</sup> District)
26. Honorable Pamela L. Brooks, Judge (20<sup>th</sup> District)
27. Honorable Jonathan S. Lynn, Judge (20<sup>th</sup> District)
28. Honorable Paul A. Tucker, Judge (25<sup>th</sup> District)

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

With kind regards, I am

Very truly yours,



Karl R. Hade

Attachment

cc: Division of Legislative Automated Systems  
Mary Kate Felch, Division of Legislative Services

## Judicial Performance Evaluation Program

### Information for General Assembly Members – 2016

The following information is provided to assist General Assembly members in understanding the Judicial Performance Evaluation Reports and the methods used to conduct the evaluations.

**Please note that each judge's evaluation is unique, and is not directly comparable to other judges' evaluation reports.**

Here are some factors you may wish to consider:

- Due to the nature of the court there are different respondent groups for different types of court.
  - General District Court judges and Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court judges were evaluated only by attorneys.
  - Circuit Court judges were evaluated by jurors in addition to attorneys; however, some judges did not receive any juror survey responses -- either because no jury trials were conducted during the relevant time period, or the jurors chose not to respond. When applicable, the juror responses were submitted with attorney responses.
- For Circuit Court judges, respondents are asked to rate the judge based on experiences with the judge during the previous **three years**. For District Court judges, respondents are asked to rate the judge based on experiences with the judge during the previous **one year**.
- Efforts are made to survey a large number of individuals; however, this is a voluntary process. While the responses received are not necessarily representative of all potential respondents, each judge's report accurately reflects the actual responses received for that judge.
- Judges receive evaluations from attorneys who have appeared before the specific judge. Thus, the judges within a single circuit or district may be evaluated by different attorneys, and there will be individual differences in how attorneys rate judges. Also, there may be regional differences in how groups of attorneys tend to rate judges.
- The number of attorneys surveyed is not uniform. Generally, there are fewer attorneys to survey for judges who preside in rural areas. Each judge's report lists how many total surveys were completed for that judge.
- For judges who have a very high number of potential attorney respondents, only a sample of those respondents is surveyed (approximately 250). For judges in more rural jurisdictions, all identified eligible attorneys may be surveyed if there are less than 250 potential respondents identified.
- In order to be eligible to complete an evaluation, an attorney must have appeared before the evaluated judge at least one time in the applicable time period.
- Judges preside in different environments.
  - Some sit every day in one location; others travel to several different courts during the week.
  - Judges in different districts or circuits may hear very different types of cases. Even within a single district or circuit, some judges may hear a certain type of case (i.e., criminal) more than other judges do.

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Leslie L. Lilley**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
2nd Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 160 completed surveys for Judge Leslie L. Lilley.

**Evaluation of Judge Leslie L. Lilley: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	71 44.9%
	Frequently	58 36.7%
	Some of the Time	25 15.8%
	Rarely	4 2.5%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	100 62.5%
	Frequently	44 27.5%
	Some of the Time	15 9.4%
	Rarely	1 0.6%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	108 69.2%
	Frequently	38 24.4%
	Some of the Time	9 5.8%
	Rarely	1 0.6%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	100 64.5%
	Frequently	46 29.7%
	Some of the Time	7 4.5%
	Rarely	2 1.3%
	Never	0 0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Leslie L. Lilley: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	103	65.2%
	Frequently	38	24.1%
	Some of the Time	15	9.5%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	119	75.8%
	Frequently	33	21.0%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	124	78.0%
	Frequently	29	18.2%
	Some of the Time	4	2.5%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	98	61.6%
	Frequently	43	27.0%
	Some of the Time	15	9.4%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	105	66.0%
	Frequently	40	25.2%
	Some of the Time	11	6.9%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Leslie L. Lilley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	111	78.7%
	Frequently	26	18.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	122	79.2%
	Frequently	29	18.8%
	Some of the Time	3	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	125	79.1%
	Frequently	31	19.6%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	89	57.4%
	Frequently	44	28.4%
	Some of the Time	17	11.0%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	2	1.3%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	91	58.0%
	Frequently	48	30.6%
	Some of the Time	12	7.6%
	Rarely	5	3.2%
	Never	1	0.6%



### Evaluation of Judge Leslie L. Lilley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	94	59.9%
	Frequently	48	30.6%
	Some of the Time	13	8.3%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	100	64.1%
	Frequently	36	23.1%
	Some of the Time	16	10.3%
	Rarely	4	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	103	66.5%
	Frequently	29	18.7%
	Some of the Time	19	12.3%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	99	62.7%
	Frequently	41	26.0%
	Some of the Time	13	8.2%
	Rarely	4	2.5%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	111	69.8%
	Frequently	38	23.9%
	Some of the Time	6	3.8%
	Rarely	4	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Leslie L. Lilley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	105	66.9%
	Frequently	43	27.4%
	Some of the Time	7	4.5%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	101	63.9%
	Frequently	40	25.3%
	Some of the Time	13	8.2%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	2	1.3%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	86	54.4%
	Good	54	34.2%
	Needs Improvement	14	8.9%
	Unsatisfactory	4	2.5%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	15.2%
	Worse	3	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	103	82.4%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable John R. Doyle, III**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
4th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 182 completed surveys for Judge John R. Doyle, III.

### Evaluation of Judge John R. Doyle, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	149	84.2%
	Frequently	26	14.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	157	88.7%
	Frequently	20	11.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	137	89.5%
	Frequently	15	9.8%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	136	88.9%
	Frequently	17	11.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge John R. Doyle, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	160	90.4%
	Frequently	16	9.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	145	85.8%
	Frequently	23	13.6%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	159	90.3%
	Frequently	17	9.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	153	86.4%
	Frequently	22	12.4%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	148	84.6%
	Frequently	24	13.7%
	Some of the Time	3	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge John R. Doyle, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	132	93.0%
	Frequently	9	6.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	139	90.9%
	Frequently	14	9.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	158	91.9%
	Frequently	14	8.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	121	80.7%
	Frequently	28	18.7%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	132	86.3%
	Frequently	19	12.4%
	Some of the Time	2	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge John R. Doyle, III: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	135	88.2%
	Frequently	15	9.8%
	Some of the Time	3	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	133	86.4%
	Frequently	21	13.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	131	87.3%
	Frequently	19	12.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	155	88.1%
	Frequently	19	10.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	160	90.9%
	Frequently	13	7.4%
	Some of the Time	3	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%



### Evaluation of Judge John R. Doyle, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	139	79.0%
	Frequently	35	19.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	150	84.8%
	Frequently	25	14.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	163	89.6%
	Good	19	10.4%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	21	16.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	106	83.5%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Mary Jane Hall**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
4th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 167 completed surveys for Judge Mary Jane Hall.

**Evaluation of Judge Mary Jane Hall: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	126 75.5%
	Frequently	35 21.0%
	Some of the Time	6 3.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	139 83.7%
	Frequently	24 14.5%
	Some of the Time	3 1.8%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	117 77.0%
	Frequently	28 18.4%
	Some of the Time	6 4.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	119 78.8%
	Frequently	25 16.6%
	Some of the Time	7 4.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Mary Jane Hall: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	136	82.4%
	Frequently	22	13.3%
	Some of the Time	6	3.6%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	129	79.1%
	Frequently	27	16.6%
	Some of the Time	5	3.1%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	139	83.2%
	Frequently	22	13.2%
	Some of the Time	5	3.0%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	129	77.3%
	Frequently	26	15.6%
	Some of the Time	9	5.4%
	Rarely	3	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	131	78.4%
	Frequently	23	13.8%
	Some of the Time	9	5.4%
	Rarely	4	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Mary Jane Hall: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	115	82.7%
	Frequently	14	10.1%
	Some of the Time	7	5.0%
	Rarely	3	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	116	76.8%
	Frequently	27	17.9%
	Some of the Time	6	4.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	136	82.4%
	Frequently	20	12.1%
	Some of the Time	8	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	121	80.1%
	Frequently	20	13.3%
	Some of the Time	9	6.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	109	71.2%
	Frequently	25	16.3%
	Some of the Time	14	9.2%
	Rarely	5	3.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Mary Jane Hall: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	110	71.9%
	Frequently	22	14.4%
	Some of the Time	16	10.5%
	Rarely	5	3.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	114	74.5%
	Frequently	31	20.3%
	Some of the Time	7	4.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	119	77.8%
	Frequently	26	17.0%
	Some of the Time	7	4.6%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	126	76.4%
	Frequently	29	17.6%
	Some of the Time	8	4.9%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	132	79.0%
	Frequently	24	14.4%
	Some of the Time	7	4.2%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	2	1.2%

**Evaluation of Judge Mary Jane Hall: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	112 67.5%
	Frequently	43 25.9%
	Some of the Time	9 5.4%
	Rarely	2 1.2%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	120 73.6%
	Frequently	31 19.0%
	Some of the Time	10 6.1%
	Rarely	2 1.2%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	117 71.8%
	Good	33 20.3%
	Needs Improvement	11 6.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2 1.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19 17.3%
	Worse	2 1.8%
	Stayed the Same	89 80.9%



---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jerrauld C. Jones**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
4th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 167 completed surveys for Judge Jerrauld C. Jones.

### Evaluation of Judge Jerrauld C. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	137	82.5%
	Frequently	27	16.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	151	91.0%
	Frequently	15	9.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	138	86.8%
	Frequently	18	11.3%
	Some of the Time	3	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	134	83.8%
	Frequently	18	11.3%
	Some of the Time	8	5.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Jerrauld C. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	150	89.8%
	Frequently	16	9.6%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	141	86.5%
	Frequently	21	12.9%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	140	84.3%
	Frequently	24	14.5%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	142	86.1%
	Frequently	18	10.9%
	Some of the Time	5	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	143	86.7%
	Frequently	16	9.7%
	Some of the Time	6	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Jerrauld C. Jones: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	125	87.4%
	Frequently	13	9.1%
	Some of the Time	4	2.8%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	134	85.4%
	Frequently	22	14.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	145	87.4%
	Frequently	20	12.1%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	135	86.0%
	Frequently	18	11.5%
	Some of the Time	3	1.9%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	129	80.6%
	Frequently	24	15.0%
	Some of the Time	6	3.8%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Jerrauld C. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	125	78.1%
	Frequently	29	18.1%
	Some of the Time	5	3.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	134	84.3%
	Frequently	19	12.0%
	Some of the Time	5	3.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	116	72.5%
	Frequently	31	19.4%
	Some of the Time	12	7.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	138	83.6%
	Frequently	18	10.9%
	Some of the Time	9	5.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	143	88.3%
	Frequently	13	8.0%
	Some of the Time	5	3.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Jerrauld C. Jones: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	109 66.9%
	Frequently	44 27.0%
	Some of the Time	9 5.5%
	Rarely	1 0.6%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	109 67.3%
	Frequently	32 19.8%
	Some of the Time	17 10.5%
	Rarely	3 1.9%
	Never	1 0.6%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	140 85.4%
	Good	18 11.0%
	Needs Improvement	6 3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15 11.6%
	Worse	1 0.8%
	Stayed the Same	113 87.6%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Bonnie L. Jones**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
8th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016





## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 152 completed surveys for Judge Bonnie L. Jones.

**Evaluation of Judge Bonnie L. Jones: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	115	75.7%
	Frequently	30	19.7%
	Some of the Time	6	4.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	125	82.2%
	Frequently	20	13.2%
	Some of the Time	7	4.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	112	76.2%
	Frequently	27	18.4%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	113	77.4%
	Frequently	26	17.8%
	Some of the Time	4	2.7%
	Rarely	3	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Bonnie L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	126	82.9%
	Frequently	20	13.2%
	Some of the Time	5	3.3%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	126	84.0%
	Frequently	21	14.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.3%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	126	82.9%
	Frequently	21	13.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.3%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	120	79.5%
	Frequently	24	15.9%
	Some of the Time	5	3.3%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	116	77.3%
	Frequently	26	17.3%
	Some of the Time	6	4.0%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Bonnie L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	115	87.1%
	Frequently	15	11.4%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	124	84.9%
	Frequently	18	12.3%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	129	86.0%
	Frequently	17	11.3%
	Some of the Time	4	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	113	77.4%
	Frequently	26	17.8%
	Some of the Time	5	3.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	97	66.0%
	Frequently	35	23.8%
	Some of the Time	12	8.2%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	1	0.7%

### Evaluation of Judge Bonnie L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	99	67.4%
	Frequently	38	25.9%
	Some of the Time	8	5.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	114	77.6%
	Frequently	26	17.7%
	Some of the Time	4	2.7%
	Rarely	3	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	119	82.6%
	Frequently	20	13.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	110	72.4%
	Frequently	35	23.0%
	Some of the Time	5	3.3%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	113	76.4%
	Frequently	26	17.6%
	Some of the Time	7	4.7%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Bonnie L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	110	74.3%
	Frequently	29	19.6%
	Some of the Time	8	5.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	113	76.9%
	Frequently	26	17.7%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	106	70.7%
	Good	38	25.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	2.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.3%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	16.2%
	Worse	2	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	91	82.0%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Timothy J. Hauler**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
12th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 152 completed surveys for Judge Timothy J. Hauler.



**Evaluation of Judge Timothy J. Hauler: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	100 65.8%
	Frequently	44 29.0%
	Some of the Time	5 3.3%
	Rarely	2 1.3%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	121 79.6%
	Frequently	26 17.1%
	Some of the Time	5 3.3%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	111 77.6%
	Frequently	23 16.1%
	Some of the Time	7 4.9%
	Rarely	2 1.4%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	112 78.3%
	Frequently	20 14.0%
	Some of the Time	10 7.0%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	0 0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Timothy J. Hauler: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	125	82.8%
	Frequently	15	9.9%
	Some of the Time	11	7.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	117	81.3%
	Frequently	23	16.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	113	74.3%
	Frequently	34	22.4%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	115	76.2%
	Frequently	22	14.6%
	Some of the Time	10	6.6%
	Rarely	4	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	119	78.8%
	Frequently	17	11.3%
	Some of the Time	12	8.0%
	Rarely	3	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Timothy J. Hauler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	108	87.1%
	Frequently	13	10.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	123	87.2%
	Frequently	16	11.4%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	133	87.5%
	Frequently	14	9.2%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	109	76.8%
	Frequently	24	16.9%
	Some of the Time	9	6.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	106	74.1%
	Frequently	27	18.9%
	Some of the Time	8	5.6%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%

## Evaluation of Judge Timothy J. Hauler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	99	69.7%
	Frequently	29	20.4%
	Some of the Time	12	8.5%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	114	79.7%
	Frequently	21	14.7%
	Some of the Time	7	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	114	80.3%
	Frequently	24	16.9%
	Some of the Time	4	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	117	77.0%
	Frequently	28	18.4%
	Some of the Time	6	4.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	117	78.5%
	Frequently	20	13.4%
	Some of the Time	7	4.7%
	Rarely	3	2.0%
	Never	2	1.3%

**Evaluation of Judge Timothy J. Hauler: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	106 71.6%
	Frequently	38 25.7%
	Some of the Time	4 2.7%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	119 79.3%
	Frequently	24 16.0%
	Some of the Time	7 4.7%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	117 78.0%
	Good	23 15.3%
	Needs Improvement	7 4.7%
	Unsatisfactory	3 2.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7 5.7%
	Worse	3 2.4%
	Stayed the Same	114 91.9%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Charles S. Sharp**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
15th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 157 completed surveys for Judge Charles S. Sharp.

**Evaluation of Judge Charles S. Sharp: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	109	69.4%
	Frequently	39	24.8%
	Some of the Time	8	5.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	123	78.3%
	Frequently	30	19.1%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	109	82.6%
	Frequently	15	11.4%
	Some of the Time	5	3.8%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	105	79.6%
	Frequently	20	15.2%
	Some of the Time	5	3.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	1	0.8%



### Evaluation of Judge Charles S. Sharp: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	129	82.2%
	Frequently	24	15.3%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	117	80.1%
	Frequently	24	16.4%
	Some of the Time	4	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	134	85.4%
	Frequently	22	14.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	122	77.7%
	Frequently	26	16.6%
	Some of the Time	8	5.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	123	78.3%
	Frequently	26	16.6%
	Some of the Time	7	4.5%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Charles S. Sharp: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	95	81.2%
	Frequently	17	14.5%
	Some of the Time	5	4.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	109	84.5%
	Frequently	19	14.7%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	129	83.8%
	Frequently	22	14.3%
	Some of the Time	3	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	88	68.2%
	Frequently	32	24.8%
	Some of the Time	8	6.2%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	95	72.0%
	Frequently	28	21.2%
	Some of the Time	8	6.1%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Charles S. Sharp: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	96	73.3%
	Frequently	26	19.9%
	Some of the Time	8	6.1%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	98	74.2%
	Frequently	26	19.7%
	Some of the Time	7	5.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	96	73.3%
	Frequently	27	20.6%
	Some of the Time	4	3.1%
	Rarely	3	2.3%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	119	76.8%
	Frequently	31	20.0%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	125	81.2%
	Frequently	22	14.3%
	Some of the Time	7	4.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Charles S. Sharp: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	116 74.8%
	Frequently	35 22.6%
	Some of the Time	4 2.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	123 78.9%
	Frequently	30 19.2%
	Some of the Time	2 1.3%
	Rarely	1 0.6%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	131 83.4%
	Good	17 10.8%
	Needs Improvement	8 5.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.6%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12 12.1%
	Worse	4 4.0%
	Stayed the Same	83 83.8%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable William T. Newman, Jr.**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
17th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 177 completed surveys for Judge William T. Newman, Jr.

**Evaluation of Judge William T. Newman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	134	76.1%
	Frequently	35	19.9%
	Some of the Time	7	4.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	158	89.8%
	Frequently	15	8.5%
	Some of the Time	3	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	92	76.7%
	Frequently	18	15.0%
	Some of the Time	8	6.7%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	83	69.8%
	Frequently	25	21.0%
	Some of the Time	9	7.6%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	1	0.8%

## Evaluation of Judge William T. Newman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	158	89.8%
	Frequently	14	8.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	140	83.8%
	Frequently	20	12.0%
	Some of the Time	5	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	2	1.2%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	139	78.5%
	Frequently	30	17.0%
	Some of the Time	5	2.8%
	Rarely	2	1.1%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	153	86.9%
	Frequently	18	10.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	2	1.1%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	155	87.6%
	Frequently	16	9.0%
	Some of the Time	4	2.3%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	1	0.6%



**Evaluation of Judge William T. Newman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	93	93.9%
	Frequently	4	4.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	102	86.4%
	Frequently	14	11.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	156	89.7%
	Frequently	14	8.1%
	Some of the Time	3	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	81	70.4%
	Frequently	25	21.7%
	Some of the Time	7	6.1%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	86	71.7%
	Frequently	25	20.8%
	Some of the Time	6	5.0%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge William T. Newman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	88	73.3%
	Frequently	25	20.8%
	Some of the Time	4	3.3%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	88	74.0%
	Frequently	27	22.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	78	67.2%
	Frequently	28	24.1%
	Some of the Time	8	6.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	137	79.2%
	Frequently	28	16.2%
	Some of the Time	6	3.5%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	154	89.5%
	Frequently	13	7.6%
	Some of the Time	3	1.7%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	1	0.6%

**Evaluation of Judge William T. Newman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	85 48.9%
	Frequently	47 27.0%
	Some of the Time	31 17.8%
	Rarely	7 4.0%
	Never	4 2.3%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	113 65.7%
	Frequently	45 26.2%
	Some of the Time	9 5.2%
	Rarely	3 1.7%
	Never	2 1.2%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	138 78.4%
	Good	33 18.8%
	Needs Improvement	3 1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2 1.1%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8 8.3%
	Worse	2 2.1%
	Stayed the Same	87 89.7%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jan L. Brodie**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
19th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 166 completed surveys for Judge Jan L. Brodie.

### Evaluation of Judge Jan L. Brodie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	98	59.4%
	Frequently	53	32.1%
	Some of the Time	12	7.3%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	119	72.1%
	Frequently	37	22.4%
	Some of the Time	7	4.2%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	104	75.4%
	Frequently	31	22.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	106	76.8%
	Frequently	28	20.3%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Jan L. Brodie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	130	78.3%
	Frequently	28	16.9%
	Some of the Time	4	2.4%
	Rarely	4	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	116	76.3%
	Frequently	31	20.4%
	Some of the Time	4	2.6%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	138	83.1%
	Frequently	23	13.9%
	Some of the Time	4	2.4%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	126	76.4%
	Frequently	28	17.0%
	Some of the Time	8	4.9%
	Rarely	3	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	127	77.4%
	Frequently	27	16.5%
	Some of the Time	7	4.3%
	Rarely	3	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Jan L. Brodie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	101	84.9%
	Frequently	17	14.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	104	77.6%
	Frequently	30	22.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	131	81.4%
	Frequently	29	18.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	87	64.9%
	Frequently	37	27.6%
	Some of the Time	9	6.7%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	81	60.5%
	Frequently	33	24.6%
	Some of the Time	18	13.4%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	1	0.8%



### Evaluation of Judge Jan L. Brodie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	88	65.2%
	Frequently	29	21.5%
	Some of the Time	16	11.9%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	91	66.9%
	Frequently	32	23.5%
	Some of the Time	10	7.4%
	Rarely	3	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	87	65.4%
	Frequently	35	26.3%
	Some of the Time	9	6.8%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	120	72.7%
	Frequently	30	18.2%
	Some of the Time	13	7.9%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	132	82.0%
	Frequently	20	12.4%
	Some of the Time	6	3.7%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Jan L. Brodie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	113	72.9%
	Frequently	41	26.5%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	113	69.8%
	Frequently	43	26.5%
	Some of the Time	3	1.9%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	115	69.3%
	Good	38	22.9%
	Needs Improvement	11	6.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	21	20.2%
	Worse	2	1.9%
	Stayed the Same	81	77.9%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jeffrey W. Parker**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
20th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 155 completed surveys for Judge Jeffrey W. Parker.

**Evaluation of Judge Jeffrey W. Parker: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	60 39.0%
	Frequently	61 39.6%
	Some of the Time	28 18.2%
	Rarely	5 3.3%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	82 52.9%
	Frequently	50 32.3%
	Some of the Time	17 11.0%
	Rarely	6 3.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	90 63.4%
	Frequently	38 26.8%
	Some of the Time	11 7.8%
	Rarely	3 2.1%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	92 65.7%
	Frequently	36 25.7%
	Some of the Time	9 6.4%
	Rarely	3 2.1%
	Never	0 0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Jeffrey W. Parker: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	89 57.4%
	Frequently	40 25.8%
	Some of the Time	16 10.3%
	Rarely	8 5.2%
	Never	2 1.3%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	92 64.3%
	Frequently	40 28.0%
	Some of the Time	9 6.3%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	2 1.4%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	105 67.7%
	Frequently	40 25.8%
	Some of the Time	9 5.8%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	90 58.4%
	Frequently	42 27.3%
	Some of the Time	15 9.7%
	Rarely	6 3.9%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	91 59.5%
	Frequently	37 24.2%
	Some of the Time	17 11.1%
	Rarely	7 4.6%
	Never	1 0.7%

### Evaluation of Judge Jeffrey W. Parker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	87	76.3%
	Frequently	23	20.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	104	72.7%
	Frequently	36	25.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	113	74.8%
	Frequently	35	23.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	75	53.6%
	Frequently	42	30.0%
	Some of the Time	18	12.9%
	Rarely	5	3.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	80	56.3%
	Frequently	41	28.9%
	Some of the Time	16	11.3%
	Rarely	5	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Jeffrey W. Parker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	83	58.0%
	Frequently	39	27.3%
	Some of the Time	18	12.6%
	Rarely	3	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	92	63.9%
	Frequently	35	24.3%
	Some of the Time	15	10.4%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	86	62.8%
	Frequently	45	32.9%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	92	61.7%
	Frequently	42	28.2%
	Some of the Time	12	8.1%
	Rarely	3	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	96	64.0%
	Frequently	37	24.7%
	Some of the Time	10	6.7%
	Rarely	6	4.0%
	Never	1	0.7%



**Evaluation of Judge Jeffrey W. Parker: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	102 67.6%
	Frequently	46 30.5%
	Some of the Time	3 2.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	100 65.8%
	Frequently	41 27.0%
	Some of the Time	8 5.3%
	Rarely	3 2.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	85 55.6%
	Good	48 31.4%
	Needs Improvement	15 9.8%
	Unsatisfactory	5 3.3%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11 10.0%
	Worse	5 4.6%
	Stayed the Same	94 85.5%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Joseph W. Milam, Jr.**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
22nd Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 116 completed surveys for Judge Joseph W. Milam, Jr.

**Evaluation of Judge Joseph W. Milam, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	77 67.0%
	Frequently	32 27.8%
	Some of the Time	5 4.4%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	91 79.1%
	Frequently	21 18.3%
	Some of the Time	3 2.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	79 80.6%
	Frequently	18 18.4%
	Some of the Time	1 1.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	78 79.6%
	Frequently	20 20.4%
	Some of the Time	0 0.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Joseph W. Milam, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	88	76.5%
	Frequently	24	20.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	86	78.9%
	Frequently	19	17.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.8%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	95	81.9%
	Frequently	18	15.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	90	77.6%
	Frequently	18	15.5%
	Some of the Time	8	6.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	89	76.7%
	Frequently	21	18.1%
	Some of the Time	6	5.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Joseph W. Milam, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	72	80.9%
	Frequently	16	18.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	82	83.7%
	Frequently	15	15.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	95	82.6%
	Frequently	17	14.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	71	71.7%
	Frequently	23	23.2%
	Some of the Time	5	5.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	69	69.7%
	Frequently	26	26.3%
	Some of the Time	4	4.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Joseph W. Milam, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	71	71.7%
	Frequently	22	22.2%
	Some of the Time	6	6.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	72	72.7%
	Frequently	24	24.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	73	75.3%
	Frequently	22	22.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	89	77.4%
	Frequently	18	15.7%
	Some of the Time	7	6.1%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	91	80.5%
	Frequently	16	14.2%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Joseph W. Milam, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	94 81.7%
	Frequently	20 17.4%
	Some of the Time	1 0.9%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	91 79.8%
	Frequently	19 16.7%
	Some of the Time	3 2.6%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	86 74.1%
	Good	25 21.6%
	Needs Improvement	5 4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8 10.4%
	Worse	1 1.3%
	Stayed the Same	68 88.3%



---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable James R. Swanson**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
23rd Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 167 completed surveys for Judge James R. Swanson.

**Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	121	73.3%
	Frequently	38	23.0%
	Some of the Time	6	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	128	76.7%
	Frequently	35	21.0%
	Some of the Time	4	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	135	83.9%
	Frequently	23	14.3%
	Some of the Time	3	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	131	81.4%
	Frequently	27	16.8%
	Some of the Time	3	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	138	82.6%
	Frequently	24	14.4%
	Some of the Time	5	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	121	75.2%
	Frequently	38	23.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	143	85.6%
	Frequently	23	13.8%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	130	78.3%
	Frequently	28	16.9%
	Some of the Time	7	4.2%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	132	80.0%
	Frequently	26	15.8%
	Some of the Time	6	3.6%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	132	89.2%
	Frequently	15	10.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	137	85.6%
	Frequently	23	14.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	142	86.6%
	Frequently	21	12.8%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	123	75.9%
	Frequently	35	21.6%
	Some of the Time	4	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	124	76.5%
	Frequently	36	22.2%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	123	75.9%
	Frequently	31	19.1%
	Some of the Time	7	4.3%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	129	79.6%
	Frequently	31	19.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	127	79.4%
	Frequently	32	20.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	132	79.0%
	Frequently	32	19.2%
	Some of the Time	3	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	139	84.2%
	Frequently	20	12.1%
	Some of the Time	4	2.4%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	119	72.1%
	Frequently	43	26.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	132	80.0%
	Frequently	30	18.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	137	83.0%
	Good	23	13.9%
	Needs Improvement	3	1.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	5.4%
	Worse	3	2.3%
	Stayed the Same	120	92.3%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable C. Randall Lowe**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
28th Judicial Circuit

*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

2016





## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 120 completed surveys for Judge C. Randall Lowe.

### Evaluation of Judge C. Randall Lowe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	108	93.1%
	Frequently	7	6.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	115	98.3%
	Frequently	2	1.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	93	89.4%
	Frequently	8	7.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	89	86.4%
	Frequently	10	9.7%
	Some of the Time	4	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge C. Randall Lowe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	115	95.8%
	Frequently	4	3.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	104	92.0%
	Frequently	9	8.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	109	90.8%
	Frequently	10	8.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	114	95.0%
	Frequently	4	3.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	110	91.7%
	Frequently	8	6.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge C. Randall Lowe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	92	93.9%
	Frequently	5	5.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	94	92.2%
	Frequently	8	7.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	111	94.1%
	Frequently	7	5.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	90	89.1%
	Frequently	11	10.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	86	83.5%
	Frequently	13	12.6%
	Some of the Time	4	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge C. Randall Lowe: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	89 86.4%
	Frequently	10 9.7%
	Some of the Time	4 3.9%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	90 86.5%
	Frequently	11 10.6%
	Some of the Time	3 2.9%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	83 82.2%
	Frequently	11 10.9%
	Some of the Time	4 4.0%
	Rarely	3 3.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	105 88.2%
	Frequently	10 8.4%
	Some of the Time	4 3.4%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	115 95.8%
	Frequently	3 2.5%
	Some of the Time	2 1.7%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge C. Randall Lowe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	95	80.5%
	Frequently	21	17.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	104	88.9%
	Frequently	12	10.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	107	89.2%
	Good	11	9.2%
	Needs Improvement	2	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	12.8%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	75	87.2%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Craig D. Johnston**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
31st Judicial Circuit

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 145 completed surveys for Judge Craig D. Johnston.



**Evaluation of Judge Craig D. Johnston: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	125 86.8%
	Frequently	15 10.4%
	Some of the Time	3 2.1%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	134 92.4%
	Frequently	9 6.2%
	Some of the Time	1 0.7%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	123 87.2%
	Frequently	12 8.5%
	Some of the Time	3 2.1%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	2 1.4%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	119 85.0%
	Frequently	12 8.6%
	Some of the Time	6 4.3%
	Rarely	2 1.4%
	Never	1 0.7%

**Evaluation of Judge Craig D. Johnston: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	127	88.2%
	Frequently	11	7.6%
	Some of the Time	6	4.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	103	77.4%
	Frequently	21	15.8%
	Some of the Time	6	4.5%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	126	86.9%
	Frequently	11	7.6%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	122	84.1%
	Frequently	12	8.3%
	Some of the Time	7	4.8%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	3	2.1%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	120	82.8%
	Frequently	14	9.7%
	Some of the Time	7	4.8%
	Rarely	3	2.1%
	Never	1	0.7%

## Evaluation of Judge Craig D. Johnston: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	104	91.2%
	Frequently	7	6.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	111	80.4%
	Frequently	23	16.7%
	Some of the Time	4	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	107	77.5%
	Frequently	22	15.9%
	Some of the Time	7	5.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	108	80.0%
	Frequently	18	13.3%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	3	2.2%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	105	75.5%
	Frequently	24	17.3%
	Some of the Time	8	5.8%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%

**Evaluation of Judge Craig D. Johnston: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	103 74.1%
	Frequently	21 15.1%
	Some of the Time	12 8.6%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	2 1.4%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	100 71.4%
	Frequently	25 17.9%
	Some of the Time	13 9.3%
	Rarely	2 1.4%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	89 65.0%
	Frequently	26 19.0%
	Some of the Time	18 13.1%
	Rarely	3 2.2%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	96 67.6%
	Frequently	31 21.8%
	Some of the Time	12 8.5%
	Rarely	2 1.4%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	118 84.9%
	Frequently	13 9.4%
	Some of the Time	4 2.9%
	Rarely	3 2.2%
	Never	1 0.7%

### Evaluation of Judge Craig D. Johnston: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	99	71.2%
	Frequently	29	20.9%
	Some of the Time	8	5.8%
	Rarely	3	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	81	57.0%
	Frequently	32	22.5%
	Some of the Time	24	16.9%
	Rarely	5	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	111	76.6%
	Good	25	17.2%
	Needs Improvement	5	3.5%
	Unsatisfactory	4	2.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	16.8%
	Worse	2	1.9%
	Stayed the Same	87	81.3%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Alfred W. Bates, III**

Judge of the General District Court  
5th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 97 completed surveys for Judge Alfred W. Bates, III.

### Evaluation of Judge Alfred W. Bates, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	75	77.3%
	Frequently	18	18.6%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	82	84.5%
	Frequently	12	12.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	82	84.5%
	Frequently	13	13.4%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	83	85.6%
	Frequently	10	10.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%



**Evaluation of Judge Alfred W. Bates, III: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	82 84.5%
	Frequently	11 11.3%
	Some of the Time	4 4.1%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	80 82.5%
	Frequently	16 16.5%
	Some of the Time	1 1.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	86 88.7%
	Frequently	8 8.3%
	Some of the Time	3 3.1%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	77 80.2%
	Frequently	15 15.6%
	Some of the Time	4 4.2%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	81 83.5%
	Frequently	12 12.4%
	Some of the Time	4 4.1%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Alfred W. Bates, III: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	87	95.6%
	Frequently	4	4.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	85	87.6%
	Frequently	12	12.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	84	87.5%
	Frequently	12	12.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	80	82.5%
	Frequently	12	12.4%
	Some of the Time	4	4.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	69	71.1%
	Frequently	15	15.5%
	Some of the Time	10	10.3%
	Rarely	2	2.1%
	Never	1	1.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Alfred W. Bates, III: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	71	73.2%
	Frequently	16	16.5%
	Some of the Time	8	8.3%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	76	78.4%
	Frequently	15	15.5%
	Some of the Time	4	4.1%
	Rarely	2	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	81	83.5%
	Frequently	15	15.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	79	81.4%
	Frequently	14	14.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	79	81.4%
	Frequently	14	14.4%
	Some of the Time	4	4.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Alfred W. Bates, III: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	83	85.6%
	Frequently	13	13.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	79	81.4%
	Frequently	15	15.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	72	75.8%
	Good	19	20.0%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	12.6%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	76	87.4%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable James J. O'Connell, III**

Judge of the General District Court  
12th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 136 completed surveys for Judge James J. O'Connell, III.

**Evaluation of Judge James J. O'Connell, III: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	110	80.9%
	Frequently	23	16.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	120	88.2%
	Frequently	14	10.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	115	85.2%
	Frequently	17	12.6%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	114	84.4%
	Frequently	20	14.8%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge James J. O'Connell, III: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	115	84.6%
	Frequently	17	12.5%
	Some of the Time	4	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	112	83.6%
	Frequently	22	16.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	121	89.6%
	Frequently	12	8.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	110	81.5%
	Frequently	18	13.3%
	Some of the Time	6	4.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	112	83.6%
	Frequently	13	9.7%
	Some of the Time	8	6.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%



### Evaluation of Judge James J. O'Connell, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	103	89.6%
	Frequently	10	8.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	123	90.4%
	Frequently	13	9.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	118	87.4%
	Frequently	17	12.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	117	86.0%
	Frequently	15	11.0%
	Some of the Time	4	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	107	78.7%
	Frequently	22	16.2%
	Some of the Time	7	5.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge James J. O'Connell, III: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	109	80.2%
	Frequently	20	14.7%
	Some of the Time	6	4.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	117	86.0%
	Frequently	17	12.5%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	123	90.4%
	Frequently	13	9.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	124	91.2%
	Frequently	9	6.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	113	83.7%
	Frequently	16	11.9%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge James J. O'Connell, III: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	98 73.7%
	Frequently	33 24.8%
	Some of the Time	1 0.8%
	Rarely	1 0.8%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	107 81.1%
	Frequently	23 17.4%
	Some of the Time	2 1.5%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	110 82.1%
	Good	21 15.7%
	Needs Improvement	3 2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13 10.4%
	Worse	3 2.4%
	Stayed the Same	109 87.2%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Michael Joseph Cassidy**

Judge of the General District Court  
19th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 100 completed surveys for Judge Michael Joseph Cassidy.

### Evaluation of Judge Michael Joseph Cassidy: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	67	67.0%
	Frequently	28	28.0%
	Some of the Time	5	5.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	80	80.8%
	Frequently	18	18.2%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	80	81.6%
	Frequently	15	15.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	79	81.4%
	Frequently	16	16.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Michael Joseph Cassidy: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	74	74.8%
	Frequently	20	20.2%
	Some of the Time	5	5.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	69	71.9%
	Frequently	27	28.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	81	81.8%
	Frequently	15	15.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	71	71.0%
	Frequently	20	20.0%
	Some of the Time	8	8.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	68	68.7%
	Frequently	22	22.2%
	Some of the Time	7	7.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Michael Joseph Cassidy: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	72	84.7%
	Frequently	11	12.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	88	88.0%
	Frequently	11	11.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	82	83.7%
	Frequently	15	15.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	62	62.6%
	Frequently	29	29.3%
	Some of the Time	6	6.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	68	68.7%
	Frequently	23	23.2%
	Some of the Time	6	6.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%



**Evaluation of Judge Michael Joseph Cassidy: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	67 67.7%
	Frequently	24 24.2%
	Some of the Time	5 5.1%
	Rarely	2 2.0%
	Never	1 1.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	78 78.8%
	Frequently	16 16.2%
	Some of the Time	4 4.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	1 1.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	79 79.8%
	Frequently	19 19.2%
	Some of the Time	1 1.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	77 77.8%
	Frequently	20 20.2%
	Some of the Time	1 1.0%
	Rarely	1 1.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	75 77.3%
	Frequently	13 13.4%
	Some of the Time	6 6.2%
	Rarely	2 2.1%
	Never	1 1.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Michael Joseph Cassidy: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	76	76.0%
	Frequently	24	24.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	80	80.8%
	Frequently	19	19.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	68.7%
	Good	26	26.3%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	6.9%
	Worse	2	2.3%
	Stayed the Same	79	90.8%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable J. Gregory Ashwell**

Judge of the General District Court  
20th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 117 completed surveys for Judge J. Gregory Ashwell.

**Evaluation of Judge J. Gregory Ashwell: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	65	55.6%
	Frequently	40	34.2%
	Some of the Time	11	9.4%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	77	65.8%
	Frequently	28	23.9%
	Some of the Time	12	10.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	83	70.9%
	Frequently	30	25.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	88	75.2%
	Frequently	27	23.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge J. Gregory Ashwell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	79	68.1%
	Frequently	20	17.2%
	Some of the Time	13	11.2%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	86	74.8%
	Frequently	24	20.9%
	Some of the Time	5	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	93	79.5%
	Frequently	21	18.0%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	71	61.7%
	Frequently	25	21.7%
	Some of the Time	15	13.0%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	72	62.6%
	Frequently	26	22.6%
	Some of the Time	12	10.4%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	1	0.9%

### Evaluation of Judge J. Gregory Ashwell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	73	73.0%
	Frequently	20	20.0%
	Some of the Time	5	5.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	99	84.6%
	Frequently	17	14.5%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	95	81.9%
	Frequently	20	17.2%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	67	58.8%
	Frequently	32	28.1%
	Some of the Time	11	9.7%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	83	71.6%
	Frequently	26	22.4%
	Some of the Time	5	4.3%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge J. Gregory Ashwell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	74	64.4%
	Frequently	33	28.7%
	Some of the Time	6	5.2%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	78	66.7%
	Frequently	32	27.4%
	Some of the Time	7	6.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	93	80.2%
	Frequently	23	19.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	85	73.3%
	Frequently	27	23.3%
	Some of the Time	4	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	74	63.8%
	Frequently	24	20.7%
	Some of the Time	13	11.2%
	Rarely	5	4.3%
	Never	0	0.0%



### Evaluation of Judge J. Gregory Ashwell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	96	82.1%
	Frequently	19	16.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	90	76.9%
	Frequently	24	20.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64	55.7%
	Good	35	30.4%
	Needs Improvement	15	13.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	20.4%
	Worse	2	2.2%
	Stayed the Same	72	77.4%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Rufus A. Banks, Jr.**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
1st Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 143 completed surveys for Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.

**Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	124	86.7%
	Frequently	14	9.8%
	Some of the Time	4	2.8%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	130	90.9%
	Frequently	9	6.3%
	Some of the Time	4	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	127	89.4%
	Frequently	11	7.8%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	126	88.1%
	Frequently	14	9.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	128	89.5%
	Frequently	11	7.7%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	115	80.4%
	Frequently	25	17.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	126	88.1%
	Frequently	15	10.5%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	119	84.4%
	Frequently	17	12.1%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	121	85.2%
	Frequently	17	12.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	118	86.8%
	Frequently	15	11.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	119	83.2%
	Frequently	21	14.7%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	122	85.3%
	Frequently	19	13.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	118	82.5%
	Frequently	21	14.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	121	84.6%
	Frequently	17	11.9%
	Some of the Time	4	2.8%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	119	84.4%
	Frequently	15	10.6%
	Some of the Time	6	4.3%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	124	86.7%
	Frequently	15	10.5%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	123	86.0%
	Frequently	17	11.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	122	85.3%
	Frequently	17	11.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	119	86.2%
	Frequently	15	10.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	121	85.2%
	Frequently	18	12.7%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	113	80.1%
	Frequently	23	16.3%
	Some of the Time	4	2.8%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	125	87.4%
	Good	14	9.8%
	Needs Improvement	4	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	5.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	127	94.1%



---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Larry D. Willis, Sr.**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
1st Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 99 completed surveys for Judge Larry D. Willis, Sr.

**Evaluation of Judge Larry D. Willis, Sr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	62	62.6%
	Frequently	26	26.3%
	Some of the Time	9	9.1%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	67	67.7%
	Frequently	24	24.2%
	Some of the Time	8	8.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	64	64.7%
	Frequently	28	28.3%
	Some of the Time	5	5.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	63	63.6%
	Frequently	30	30.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	1	1.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Larry D. Willis, Sr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	64	64.7%
	Frequently	23	23.2%
	Some of the Time	9	9.1%
	Rarely	3	3.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	63	63.6%
	Frequently	30	30.3%
	Some of the Time	6	6.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	69	69.7%
	Frequently	25	25.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	55	55.6%
	Frequently	31	31.3%
	Some of the Time	10	10.1%
	Rarely	3	3.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	56	56.6%
	Frequently	26	26.3%
	Some of the Time	14	14.1%
	Rarely	3	3.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Larry D. Willis, Sr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	68 72.3%
	Frequently	25 26.6%
	Some of the Time	1 1.1%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	75 75.8%
	Frequently	23 23.2%
	Some of the Time	1 1.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	76 76.8%
	Frequently	21 21.2%
	Some of the Time	2 2.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	57 57.6%
	Frequently	27 27.3%
	Some of the Time	9 9.1%
	Rarely	3 3.0%
	Never	3 3.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	66 66.7%
	Frequently	24 24.2%
	Some of the Time	7 7.1%
	Rarely	1 1.0%
	Never	1 1.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Larry D. Willis, Sr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	55	56.1%
	Frequently	32	32.7%
	Some of the Time	8	8.2%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	65	65.7%
	Frequently	32	32.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	70	70.7%
	Frequently	29	29.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	64	65.3%
	Frequently	32	32.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	56	59.6%
	Frequently	27	28.7%
	Some of the Time	9	9.6%
	Rarely	2	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Larry D. Willis, Sr.: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	64	67.4%
	Frequently	29	30.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	62	62.6%
	Frequently	29	29.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	60	62.5%
	Good	28	29.2%
	Needs Improvement	5	5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	3	3.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	6.2%
	Worse	5	6.2%
	Stayed the Same	71	87.7%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable M. Randolph Carlson, II**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
4th Judicial District

*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

2016





## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 139 completed surveys for Judge M. Randolph Carlson, II.

**Evaluation of Judge M. Randolph Carlson, II: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	66 47.5%
	Frequently	43 30.9%
	Some of the Time	24 17.3%
	Rarely	5 3.6%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	93 66.9%
	Frequently	33 23.7%
	Some of the Time	10 7.2%
	Rarely	3 2.2%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	98 70.5%
	Frequently	32 23.0%
	Some of the Time	8 5.8%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	92 67.2%
	Frequently	35 25.6%
	Some of the Time	8 5.8%
	Rarely	2 1.5%
	Never	0 0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge M. Randolph Carlson, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	92	66.2%
	Frequently	30	21.6%
	Some of the Time	12	8.6%
	Rarely	5	3.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	97	71.3%
	Frequently	32	23.5%
	Some of the Time	7	5.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	92	66.7%
	Frequently	34	24.6%
	Some of the Time	11	8.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	95	68.4%
	Frequently	30	21.6%
	Some of the Time	10	7.2%
	Rarely	4	2.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	101	72.7%
	Frequently	23	16.6%
	Some of the Time	9	6.5%
	Rarely	6	4.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge M. Randolph Carlson, II: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	93 74.4%
	Frequently	25 20.0%
	Some of the Time	4 3.2%
	Rarely	2 1.6%
	Never	1 0.8%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	105 75.5%
	Frequently	29 20.9%
	Some of the Time	5 3.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	108 77.7%
	Frequently	22 15.8%
	Some of the Time	8 5.8%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	74 53.6%
	Frequently	39 28.3%
	Some of the Time	19 13.8%
	Rarely	5 3.6%
	Never	1 0.7%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	98 71.5%
	Frequently	32 23.4%
	Some of the Time	6 4.4%
	Rarely	1 0.7%
	Never	0 0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge M. Randolph Carlson, II: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	94	69.1%
	Frequently	30	22.1%
	Some of the Time	9	6.6%
	Rarely	3	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	104	75.4%
	Frequently	29	21.0%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	107	78.7%
	Frequently	26	19.1%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	106	76.3%
	Frequently	29	20.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	99	72.8%
	Frequently	23	16.9%
	Some of the Time	8	5.9%
	Rarely	5	3.7%
	Never	1	0.7%

## Evaluation of Judge M. Randolph Carlson, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	70	51.9%
	Frequently	44	32.6%
	Some of the Time	14	10.4%
	Rarely	5	3.7%
	Never	2	1.5%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	97	70.3%
	Frequently	31	22.5%
	Some of the Time	10	7.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	89	65.4%
	Good	37	27.2%
	Needs Improvement	7	5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	7.3%
	Worse	6	5.5%
	Stayed the Same	95	87.2%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Thomas W. Carpenter**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
7th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 101 completed surveys for Judge Thomas W. Carpenter.



### Evaluation of Judge Thomas W. Carpenter: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	77	76.2%
	Frequently	19	18.8%
	Some of the Time	4	4.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	85	84.2%
	Frequently	13	12.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	88	88.0%
	Frequently	12	12.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	85	85.0%
	Frequently	15	15.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Thomas W. Carpenter: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	83	82.2%
	Frequently	15	14.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	87	86.1%
	Frequently	12	11.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	84	83.2%
	Frequently	17	16.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	87	86.1%
	Frequently	12	11.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	85	84.2%
	Frequently	14	13.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Thomas W. Carpenter: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	80	85.1%
	Frequently	11	11.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	88	87.1%
	Frequently	13	12.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	84	83.2%
	Frequently	16	15.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	83	82.2%
	Frequently	13	12.9%
	Some of the Time	4	4.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	83	82.2%
	Frequently	17	16.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Thomas W. Carpenter: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	76	76.0%
	Frequently	22	22.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	85	84.2%
	Frequently	14	13.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	85	84.2%
	Frequently	13	12.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	84	83.2%
	Frequently	14	13.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	85	85.9%
	Frequently	11	11.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Thomas W. Carpenter: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	68 70.1%
	Frequently	23 23.7%
	Some of the Time	6 6.2%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	80 80.0%
	Frequently	13 13.0%
	Some of the Time	7 7.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	89 89.0%
	Good	11 11.0%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4 4.6%
	Worse	1 1.1%
	Stayed the Same	83 94.3%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Shannon O. Hoehl**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
15th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 113 completed surveys for Judge Shannon O. Hoehl.

**Evaluation of Judge Shannon O. Hoehl: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	55 48.7%
	Frequently	46 40.7%
	Some of the Time	8 7.1%
	Rarely	3 2.7%
	Never	1 0.9%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	80 70.8%
	Frequently	26 23.0%
	Some of the Time	5 4.4%
	Rarely	2 1.8%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	90 79.7%
	Frequently	18 15.9%
	Some of the Time	5 4.4%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	87 77.7%
	Frequently	21 18.8%
	Some of the Time	4 3.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%



**Evaluation of Judge Shannon O. Hoehl: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	76 67.3%
	Frequently	24 21.2%
	Some of the Time	10 8.9%
	Rarely	3 2.7%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	85 76.6%
	Frequently	22 19.8%
	Some of the Time	4 3.6%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	93 82.3%
	Frequently	16 14.2%
	Some of the Time	4 3.5%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	78 69.6%
	Frequently	22 19.6%
	Some of the Time	9 8.0%
	Rarely	3 2.7%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	77 68.1%
	Frequently	23 20.4%
	Some of the Time	10 8.9%
	Rarely	3 2.7%
	Never	0 0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Shannon O. Hoehl: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	88	90.7%
	Frequently	8	8.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	97	85.8%
	Frequently	15	13.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	93	83.8%
	Frequently	18	16.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	72	63.7%
	Frequently	30	26.6%
	Some of the Time	8	7.1%
	Rarely	3	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	81	71.7%
	Frequently	26	23.0%
	Some of the Time	4	3.5%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Shannon O. Hoehl: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	81 71.7%
	Frequently	21 18.6%
	Some of the Time	10 8.9%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	85 75.2%
	Frequently	25 22.1%
	Some of the Time	2 1.8%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	95 84.1%
	Frequently	15 13.3%
	Some of the Time	2 1.8%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	87 77.0%
	Frequently	22 19.5%
	Some of the Time	3 2.7%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	85 75.9%
	Frequently	17 15.2%
	Some of the Time	9 8.0%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Shannon O. Hoehl: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	78	69.6%
	Frequently	28	25.0%
	Some of the Time	5	4.5%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	89	78.8%
	Frequently	19	16.8%
	Some of the Time	5	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	77	68.8%
	Good	27	24.1%
	Needs Improvement	7	6.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	16	16.2%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	82	82.8%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Julian W. Johnson**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
15th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 83 completed surveys for Judge Julian W. Johnson.

**Evaluation of Judge Julian W. Johnson: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	51	62.2%
	Frequently	26	31.7%
	Some of the Time	5	6.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	66	79.5%
	Frequently	14	16.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	65	79.3%
	Frequently	14	17.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	68	81.9%
	Frequently	12	14.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Julian W. Johnson: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	63 76.8%
	Frequently	14 17.1%
	Some of the Time	4 4.9%
	Rarely	1 1.2%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	66 81.5%
	Frequently	14 17.3%
	Some of the Time	1 1.2%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	68 81.9%
	Frequently	11 13.3%
	Some of the Time	4 4.8%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	56 67.5%
	Frequently	18 21.7%
	Some of the Time	8 9.6%
	Rarely	1 1.2%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	59 72.0%
	Frequently	15 18.3%
	Some of the Time	7 8.5%
	Rarely	1 1.2%
	Never	0 0.0%



### Evaluation of Judge Julian W. Johnson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	70	89.7%
	Frequently	7	9.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	74	90.2%
	Frequently	8	9.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	73	89.0%
	Frequently	9	11.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	57	68.7%
	Frequently	16	19.3%
	Some of the Time	9	10.8%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	66	79.5%
	Frequently	13	15.7%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Julian W. Johnson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	60	73.2%
	Frequently	14	17.1%
	Some of the Time	7	8.5%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	62	74.7%
	Frequently	14	16.9%
	Some of the Time	7	8.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	68	81.9%
	Frequently	13	15.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	63	76.8%
	Frequently	14	17.1%
	Some of the Time	5	6.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	64	79.0%
	Frequently	13	16.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Julian W. Johnson: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	57 71.3%
	Frequently	17 21.3%
	Some of the Time	5 6.3%
	Rarely	1 1.3%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	59 72.8%
	Frequently	18 22.2%
	Some of the Time	4 4.9%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64 77.1%
	Good	17 20.5%
	Needs Improvement	2 2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 8.5%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	65 91.6%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Constance H. Frogale**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
18th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 106 completed surveys for Judge Constance H. Frogale.

**Evaluation of Judge Constance H. Frogale: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	76	72.4%
	Frequently	25	23.8%
	Some of the Time	3	2.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	87	82.9%
	Frequently	13	12.4%
	Some of the Time	5	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	83	79.1%
	Frequently	17	16.2%
	Some of the Time	4	3.8%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	84	80.0%
	Frequently	16	15.2%
	Some of the Time	4	3.8%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

**Evaluation of Judge Constance H. Frogale: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	90 86.5%
	Frequently	10 9.6%
	Some of the Time	4 3.9%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	82 79.6%
	Frequently	20 19.4%
	Some of the Time	1 1.0%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	79 75.2%
	Frequently	22 21.0%
	Some of the Time	3 2.9%
	Rarely	1 1.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	64 61.0%
	Frequently	31 29.5%
	Some of the Time	8 7.6%
	Rarely	2 1.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	72 68.6%
	Frequently	21 20.0%
	Some of the Time	10 9.5%
	Rarely	2 1.9%
	Never	0 0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Constance H. Frogale: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	81	86.2%
	Frequently	12	12.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	77	73.3%
	Frequently	24	22.9%
	Some of the Time	4	3.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	77	74.0%
	Frequently	24	23.1%
	Some of the Time	3	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	71	67.6%
	Frequently	25	23.8%
	Some of the Time	7	6.7%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	67	63.8%
	Frequently	26	24.8%
	Some of the Time	8	7.6%
	Rarely	4	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%



## Evaluation of Judge Constance H. Frogale: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	69	65.7%
	Frequently	24	22.9%
	Some of the Time	7	6.7%
	Rarely	5	4.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	64	61.0%
	Frequently	30	28.6%
	Some of the Time	10	9.5%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	78	74.3%
	Frequently	25	23.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	68	64.8%
	Frequently	28	26.7%
	Some of the Time	9	8.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	71	68.9%
	Frequently	23	22.3%
	Some of the Time	6	5.8%
	Rarely	3	2.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Constance H. Frogale: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	57	55.9%
	Frequently	34	33.3%
	Some of the Time	9	8.8%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	51	50.0%
	Frequently	33	32.4%
	Some of the Time	12	11.8%
	Rarely	6	5.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	73	68.9%
	Good	23	21.7%
	Needs Improvement	7	6.6%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	16	16.8%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	79	83.2%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Pamela L. Brooks**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
20th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response "Not Applicable" or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 117 completed surveys for Judge Pamela L. Brooks.

**Evaluation of Judge Pamela L. Brooks: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	25 21.4%
	Frequently	33 28.2%
	Some of the Time	44 37.6%
	Rarely	10 8.6%
	Never	5 4.3%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	36 30.8%
	Frequently	35 29.9%
	Some of the Time	33 28.2%
	Rarely	8 6.8%
	Never	5 4.3%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	62 53.5%
	Frequently	33 28.5%
	Some of the Time	12 10.3%
	Rarely	6 5.2%
	Never	3 2.6%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	69 59.0%
	Frequently	25 21.4%
	Some of the Time	13 11.1%
	Rarely	6 5.1%
	Never	4 3.4%

**Evaluation of Judge Pamela L. Brooks: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	36	30.8%
	Frequently	36	30.8%
	Some of the Time	26	22.2%
	Rarely	13	11.1%
	Never	6	5.1%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	60	53.1%
	Frequently	39	34.5%
	Some of the Time	12	10.6%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	78	67.2%
	Frequently	23	19.8%
	Some of the Time	10	8.6%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	2	1.7%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	46	39.7%
	Frequently	31	26.7%
	Some of the Time	25	21.6%
	Rarely	6	5.2%
	Never	8	6.9%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	46	39.7%
	Frequently	32	27.6%
	Some of the Time	25	21.6%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	9	7.8%

### Evaluation of Judge Pamela L. Brooks: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	76 72.4%
	Frequently	22 21.0%
	Some of the Time	5 4.8%
	Rarely	1 1.0%
	Never	1 1.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	82 71.9%
	Frequently	28 24.6%
	Some of the Time	2 1.8%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	1 0.9%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	86 75.4%
	Frequently	24 21.1%
	Some of the Time	3 2.6%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	40 34.8%
	Frequently	29 25.2%
	Some of the Time	33 28.7%
	Rarely	6 5.2%
	Never	7 6.1%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	60 51.7%
	Frequently	29 25.0%
	Some of the Time	17 14.7%
	Rarely	4 3.5%
	Never	6 5.2%

**Evaluation of Judge Pamela L. Brooks: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	56	48.3%
	Frequently	29	25.0%
	Some of the Time	20	17.2%
	Rarely	5	4.3%
	Never	6	5.2%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	60	51.7%
	Frequently	32	27.6%
	Some of the Time	17	14.7%
	Rarely	7	6.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	80	70.2%
	Frequently	27	23.7%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	68	59.1%
	Frequently	33	28.7%
	Some of the Time	11	9.6%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	53	46.1%
	Frequently	30	26.1%
	Some of the Time	17	14.8%
	Rarely	6	5.2%
	Never	9	7.8%



**Evaluation of Judge Pamela L. Brooks: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	54 47.4%
	Frequently	39 34.2%
	Some of the Time	13 11.4%
	Rarely	8 7.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	62 53.9%
	Frequently	38 33.0%
	Some of the Time	11 9.6%
	Rarely	4 3.5%
	Never	0 0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48 41.4%
	Good	30 25.9%
	Needs Improvement	24 20.7%
	Unsatisfactory	14 12.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13 13.8%
	Worse	7 7.5%
	Stayed the Same	74 78.7%

---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jonathan S. Lynn**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
20th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 87 completed surveys for Judge Jonathan S. Lynn.

**Evaluation of Judge Jonathan S. Lynn: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	51 58.6%
	Frequently	26 29.9%
	Some of the Time	8 9.2%
	Rarely	2 2.3%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	62 71.3%
	Frequently	17 19.5%
	Some of the Time	6 6.9%
	Rarely	2 2.3%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	64 75.3%
	Frequently	16 18.8%
	Some of the Time	2 2.4%
	Rarely	3 3.5%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	63 74.1%
	Frequently	12 14.1%
	Some of the Time	6 7.1%
	Rarely	4 4.7%
	Never	0 0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Jonathan S. Lynn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	68	79.1%
	Frequently	12	14.0%
	Some of the Time	5	5.8%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	61	75.3%
	Frequently	17	21.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	2	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	66	75.9%
	Frequently	17	19.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.5%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	57	65.5%
	Frequently	16	18.4%
	Some of the Time	12	13.8%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	58	66.7%
	Frequently	16	18.4%
	Some of the Time	10	11.5%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	1	1.2%

**Evaluation of Judge Jonathan S. Lynn: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	65	82.3%
	Frequently	9	11.4%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	68	79.1%
	Frequently	17	19.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	63	74.1%
	Frequently	20	23.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	58	68.2%
	Frequently	19	22.4%
	Some of the Time	6	7.1%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	65	75.6%
	Frequently	15	17.4%
	Some of the Time	5	5.8%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Jonathan S. Lynn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	56	66.7%
	Frequently	22	26.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	54	62.8%
	Frequently	20	23.3%
	Some of the Time	8	9.3%
	Rarely	4	4.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	38	44.7%
	Frequently	16	18.8%
	Some of the Time	17	20.0%
	Rarely	10	11.8%
	Never	4	4.7%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	52	60.5%
	Frequently	23	26.7%
	Some of the Time	7	8.1%
	Rarely	3	3.5%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	58	69.9%
	Frequently	14	16.9%
	Some of the Time	9	10.8%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Jonathan S. Lynn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	44	51.2%
	Frequently	29	33.7%
	Some of the Time	8	9.3%
	Rarely	5	5.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	40	46.5%
	Frequently	22	25.6%
	Some of the Time	16	18.6%
	Rarely	5	5.8%
	Never	3	3.5%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	58.1%
	Good	22	25.6%
	Needs Improvement	8	9.3%
	Unsatisfactory	6	7.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	9.3%
	Worse	4	5.3%
	Stayed the Same	64	85.3%



---

---

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Paul A. Tucker**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
25th Judicial District

*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

2016



## **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 re-election process. Code of Virginia §17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election 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 six 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.

## **III. Report Content**

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. The responses of all surveyed groups are combined in these figures. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 93 completed surveys for Judge Paul A. Tucker.

**Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Tucker: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	73	78.5%
	Frequently	19	20.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	83	89.3%
	Frequently	10	10.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	73	79.4%
	Frequently	15	16.3%
	Some of the Time	4	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	72	77.4%
	Frequently	16	17.2%
	Some of the Time	5	5.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Tucker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	85	91.4%
	Frequently	8	8.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	66	72.5%
	Frequently	22	24.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	74	80.4%
	Frequently	15	16.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	72	77.4%
	Frequently	18	19.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	70	75.3%
	Frequently	20	21.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Tucker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	Every Time	78	91.8%
	Frequently	6	7.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	77	82.8%
	Frequently	14	15.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	74	80.4%
	Frequently	17	18.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	73	78.5%
	Frequently	19	20.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	67	72.0%
	Frequently	18	19.4%
	Some of the Time	7	7.5%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

### Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Tucker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	67	72.8%
	Frequently	19	20.7%
	Some of the Time	5	5.4%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	64	68.8%
	Frequently	25	26.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	73	78.5%
	Frequently	16	17.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	68	73.1%
	Frequently	17	18.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	76	83.5%
	Frequently	14	15.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

## Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Tucker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	62	67.4%
	Frequently	25	27.2%
	Some of the Time	5	5.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	60	65.9%
	Frequently	24	26.4%
	Some of the Time	7	7.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	62	67.4%
	Good	26	28.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	4.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	6.3%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	74	93.7%