

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

**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
RENÉE 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, 2017

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 2018 session of the General Assembly. These judges each have had at least one interim evaluation conducted during their terms.

The Honorable Mark D. Obenshain, Chairman

The Honorable David B. Albo, Chairman

December 1, 2017

Page 2

Circuit Court Judges

1. Honorable Stephen C. Mahan, 2nd Circuit
2. Honorable Kenneth R. Melvin, 3rd Circuit
3. Honorable Frederick G. Rockwell, III, 12th Circuit
4. Honorable Beverly W. Snukals, 13th Circuit
5. Honorable Michael F. Devine, 19th Circuit
6. Honorable Brett A. Kassabian, 19th Circuit
7. Honorable William D. Broadhurst, 23rd Circuit
8. Honorable Charles N. Dorsey, 23rd Circuit
9. Honorable Michael Lee Moore, 29th Circuit
10. Honorable Henry A. Vanover, 29th Circuit

General District Court Judges

11. Honorable Michael R. Katchmark, 1st District
12. Honorable Daniel R. Lahne, 2nd District
13. Honorable Roxie O. Holder, 3rd District
14. Honorable S. Clark Daugherty, 4th District
15. Honorable Bruce A. Clark, Jr., 6th District
16. Honorable Thomas L. Vaughn, 12th District
17. Honorable L. Neil Steverson, 14th District
18. Honorable Lisa A. Mayne, 19th District
19. Honorable Mark C. Simmons, 19th District
20. Honorable J. Frank Buttery, Jr., 20th District
21. Honorable Deborah C. Welsh, 20th District
22. Honorable George A. Jones, Jr., 22nd District
23. Honorable Sam D. Eggleston, III, 24th District
24. Honorable W. Dale Houff, 26th District
25. Honorable J. D. Bolt, 27th District
26. Honorable V. Blake McKinney, 28th District
27. Honorable Clarence E. Phillips, 30th District
28. Honorable William E. Jarvis, 31st District
29. Honorable Gordon S. Vincent, 32nd District

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges

30. Honorable Tanya Bullock, 2nd District
31. Honorable Barry G. Logsdon, 7th District
32. Honorable Wade A. Bowie, 9th District
33. Honorable Cressondra B. Conyers, 9th District
34. Honorable Valentine W. Southall, Jr., 11th District
35. Honorable J. David Rigler, 12th District
36. Honorable Ashley K. Tunner, 13th District
37. Honorable Margaret W. Deglau, 14th District
38. Honorable Rondelle D. Herman, 14th District
39. Honorable Randall G. Johnson, Jr., 14th District

The Honorable Mark D. Obenshain, Chairman
The Honorable David B. Albo, Chairman
December 1, 2017
Page 3

40. Honorable Frank W. Somerville, 16th District
41. Honorable Gayl Branum Carr, 19th District
42. Honorable Glenn L. Clayton, II, 19th District
43. Honorable Sarah A. Rice, 22nd District
44. Honorable Brian H. Turpin, 22nd District
45. Honorable H. Cary Payne, 24th District
46. Honorable H. Lee Chitwood, 27th District
47. Honorable Monica D. Cox, 27th District

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

With kind regards, I am

Very truly yours,

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

Karl R. Hade

Attachment

cc: Division of Legislative Automated Systems
Shannon C. Heard, Division of Legislative Services

Judicial Performance Evaluation Program Information for General Assembly Members – 2017

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:

- All judges were evaluated by attorneys. However, depending on the type of court, there are additional respondent groups. All responses are aggregated in the reports. There is no breakout by type of respondent.
 - Judges at all levels were also evaluated by bailiffs who served in their courtrooms. Some judges had only one or two bailiffs; others had several. A few judges did not have any bailiffs surveyed because the local sheriff did not provide contact information for bailiffs.
 - Circuit Court judges were evaluated by jurors; 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.
 - Circuit Court judges were also evaluated by in-court clerk's office staff. There was variability in numbers of staff surveyed because of the way the clerk's offices are managed. A few clerks did not provide any staff contact information.
- 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 responses actually 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 Stephen C. Mahan

Judge of the Circuit Court
2nd Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 Stephen C. Mahan.

Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	101	72.7%
	Frequently	33	23.7%
	Some of the Time	5	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	113	81.3%
	Frequently	21	15.1%
	Some of the Time	4	2.9%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	108	82.4%
	Frequently	19	14.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	99	76.2%
	Frequently	25	19.2%
	Some of the Time	4	3.1%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	112	80.6%
	Frequently	18	13.0%
	Some of the Time	8	5.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	108	81.2%
	Frequently	23	17.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	121	87.7%
	Frequently	14	10.1%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	99	71.7%
	Frequently	24	17.4%
	Some of the Time	14	10.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	95	68.4%
	Frequently	28	20.1%
	Some of the Time	14	10.1%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	105	89.7%
	Frequently	10	8.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	108	83.1%
	Frequently	21	16.2%
	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	120	87.0%
	Frequently	15	10.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	90	69.8%
	Frequently	27	20.9%
	Some of the Time	11	8.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	94	72.3%
	Frequently	29	22.3%
	Some of the Time	5	3.9%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	83	64.3%
	Frequently	34	26.4%
	Some of the Time	11	8.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	85	64.9%
	Frequently	34	26.0%
	Some of the Time	10	7.6%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	67	51.5%
	Frequently	35	26.9%
	Some of the Time	14	10.8%
	Rarely	14	10.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	90	65.7%
	Frequently	36	26.3%
	Some of the Time	9	6.6%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	93	68.4%
	Frequently	29	21.3%
	Some of the Time	12	8.8%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	68	49.6%
	Frequently	46	33.6%
	Some of the Time	14	10.2%
	Rarely	7	5.1%
	Never	2	1.5%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	66	48.2%
	Frequently	40	29.2%
	Some of the Time	17	12.4%
	Rarely	12	8.8%
	Never	2	1.5%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	93	67.9%
	Good	31	22.6%
	Needs Improvement	13	9.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	5.7%
	Worse	3	2.9%
	Stayed the Same	96	91.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kenneth R. Melvin

Judge of the Circuit Court
3rd Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 119 completed surveys for Judge Kenneth R. Melvin.

Evaluation of Judge Kenneth R. Melvin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	81	68.6%
	Frequently	24	20.3%
	Some of the Time	10	8.5%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	92	77.3%
	Frequently	21	17.7%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	56	68.3%
	Frequently	18	22.0%
	Some of the Time	6	7.3%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	55	67.9%
	Frequently	19	23.5%
	Some of the Time	6	7.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Kenneth R. Melvin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	94	80.3%
	Frequently	14	12.0%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	4	3.4%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	91	80.5%
	Frequently	19	16.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.8%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	99	83.9%
	Frequently	14	11.9%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	92	78.6%
	Frequently	15	12.8%
	Some of the Time	5	4.3%
	Rarely	4	3.4%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	91	77.8%
	Frequently	14	12.0%
	Some of the Time	6	5.1%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	3	2.6%

Evaluation of Judge Kenneth R. Melvin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	57	77.0%
	Frequently	13	17.6%
	Some of the Time	3	4.1%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	67	84.8%
	Frequently	11	13.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	102	87.2%
	Frequently	13	11.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	55	67.9%
	Frequently	16	19.8%
	Some of the Time	9	11.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	47	59.5%
	Frequently	20	25.3%
	Some of the Time	9	11.4%
	Rarely	3	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Kenneth R. Melvin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	47	59.5%
	Frequently	20	25.3%
	Some of the Time	8	10.1%
	Rarely	4	5.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	54	66.7%
	Frequently	17	21.0%
	Some of the Time	9	11.1%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	51	63.8%
	Frequently	20	25.0%
	Some of the Time	8	10.0%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	83	71.6%
	Frequently	21	18.1%
	Some of the Time	10	8.6%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	92	78.6%
	Frequently	12	10.3%
	Some of the Time	8	6.8%
	Rarely	4	3.4%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge Kenneth R. Melvin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	84	73.0%
	Frequently	27	23.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	91	79.1%
	Frequently	19	16.5%
	Some of the Time	5	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	84	71.2%
	Good	21	17.8%
	Needs Improvement	10	8.5%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.5%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	3.5%
	Worse	4	6.9%
	Stayed the Same	52	89.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Frederick G. Rockwell, III

Judge of the Circuit Court
12th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 138 completed surveys for Judge Frederick G. Rockwell, III.

Evaluation of Judge Frederick G. Rockwell, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	88	64.2%
	Frequently	38	27.7%
	Some of the Time	9	6.6%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	116	85.3%
	Frequently	15	11.0%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	105	87.5%
	Frequently	13	10.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	104	87.4%
	Frequently	13	10.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Frederick G. Rockwell, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	120	87.6%
	Frequently	10	7.3%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	106	82.2%
	Frequently	20	15.5%
	Some of the Time	2	1.6%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	125	91.2%
	Frequently	9	6.6%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	117	84.8%
	Frequently	14	10.1%
	Some of the Time	5	3.6%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	117	85.4%
	Frequently	14	10.2%
	Some of the Time	4	2.9%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Frederick G. Rockwell, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	95	93.1%
	Frequently	7	6.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	107	89.2%
	Frequently	12	10.0%
	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	121	89.6%
	Frequently	11	8.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	89	78.8%
	Frequently	16	14.2%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	95	82.6%
	Frequently	16	13.9%
	Some of the Time	4	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Frederick G. Rockwell, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	95	81.9%
	Frequently	16	13.8%
	Some of the Time	4	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	103	85.8%
	Frequently	16	13.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	94	80.3%
	Frequently	23	19.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	117	87.3%
	Frequently	16	11.9%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	121	89.0%
	Frequently	8	5.9%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	1	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge Frederick G. Rockwell, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	107	79.9%
	Frequently	27	20.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	122	91.0%
	Frequently	11	8.2%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	120	87.6%
	Good	10	7.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.2%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	2.2%
	Worse	4	4.4%
	Stayed the Same	86	93.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Beverly W. Snukals

Judge of the Circuit Court
13th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 132 completed surveys for Judge Beverly W. Snukals.

Evaluation of Judge Beverly W. Snukals: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	72	54.6%
	Frequently	45	34.1%
	Some of the Time	12	9.1%
	Rarely	3	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	97	74.1%
	Frequently	24	18.3%
	Some of the Time	7	5.3%
	Rarely	3	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	96	82.1%
	Frequently	18	15.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	99	83.9%
	Frequently	14	11.9%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Beverly W. Snukals: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	93	70.5%
	Frequently	30	22.7%
	Some of the Time	6	4.6%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	92	75.4%
	Frequently	27	22.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	113	85.6%
	Frequently	17	12.9%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	95	72.0%
	Frequently	28	21.2%
	Some of the Time	7	5.3%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	91	70.0%
	Frequently	28	21.5%
	Some of the Time	9	6.9%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Beverly W. Snukals: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	86	84.3%
	Frequently	14	13.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	105	89.7%
	Frequently	12	10.3%
	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	115	89.8%
	Frequently	12	9.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	77	66.4%
	Frequently	31	26.7%
	Some of the Time	6	5.2%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	82	69.5%
	Frequently	27	22.9%
	Some of the Time	6	5.1%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Beverly W. Snukals: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	87	75.0%
	Frequently	26	22.4%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	89	75.4%
	Frequently	22	18.6%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	95	81.2%
	Frequently	20	17.1%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	100	77.5%
	Frequently	22	17.1%
	Some of the Time	5	3.9%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	102	79.1%
	Frequently	21	16.3%
	Some of the Time	4	3.1%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Beverly W. Snukals: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	93	73.2%
	Frequently	28	22.1%
	Some of the Time	4	3.2%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	97	74.6%
	Frequently	22	16.9%
	Some of the Time	9	6.9%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	105	80.2%
	Good	19	14.5%
	Needs Improvement	5	3.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.5%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	12.7%
	Worse	1	1.3%
	Stayed the Same	68	86.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael F. Devine

Judge of the Circuit Court
19th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 171 completed surveys for Judge Michael F. Devine.

Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	109	64.5%
	Frequently	50	29.6%
	Some of the Time	9	5.3%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	126	74.6%
	Frequently	37	21.9%
	Some of the Time	5	3.0%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	114	77.0%
	Frequently	27	18.2%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	119	81.0%
	Frequently	21	14.3%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	134	78.8%
	Frequently	28	16.5%
	Some of the Time	7	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	117	74.5%
	Frequently	34	21.7%
	Some of the Time	5	3.2%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	140	82.8%
	Frequently	26	15.4%
	Some of the Time	3	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	132	77.2%
	Frequently	27	15.8%
	Some of the Time	10	5.9%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	128	76.7%
	Frequently	28	16.8%
	Some of the Time	10	6.0%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	102	85.7%
	Frequently	12	10.1%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	118	80.3%
	Frequently	26	17.7%
	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	138	82.6%
	Frequently	26	15.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	100	69.9%
	Frequently	36	25.2%
	Some of the Time	5	3.5%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	104	70.8%
	Frequently	28	19.1%
	Some of the Time	12	8.2%
	Rarely	3	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	104	70.8%
	Frequently	25	17.0%
	Some of the Time	15	10.2%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	110	73.8%
	Frequently	30	20.1%
	Some of the Time	8	5.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	103	71.5%
	Frequently	36	25.0%
	Some of the Time	5	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	123	73.2%
	Frequently	34	20.2%
	Some of the Time	9	5.4%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	131	79.4%
	Frequently	22	13.3%
	Some of the Time	10	6.1%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	123	76.4%
	Frequently	38	23.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	132	79.5%
	Frequently	32	19.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	128	75.3%
	Good	31	18.2%
	Needs Improvement	10	5.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.6%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	16.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	94	83.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Brett A. Kassabian

Judge of the Circuit Court
19th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 Brett A. Kassabian.

Evaluation of Judge Brett A. Kassabian: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	112	61.5%
	Frequently	55	30.2%
	Some of the Time	14	7.7%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	143	78.6%
	Frequently	28	15.4%
	Some of the Time	11	6.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	103	70.6%
	Frequently	32	21.9%
	Some of the Time	10	6.9%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	101	69.7%
	Frequently	33	22.8%
	Some of the Time	11	7.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Brett A. Kassabian: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	141	77.9%
	Frequently	27	14.9%
	Some of the Time	12	6.6%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	141	79.2%
	Frequently	32	18.0%
	Some of the Time	3	1.7%
	Rarely	2	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	148	81.3%
	Frequently	27	14.8%
	Some of the Time	7	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	127	70.2%
	Frequently	34	18.8%
	Some of the Time	16	8.8%
	Rarely	2	1.1%
	Never	2	1.1%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	126	69.6%
	Frequently	34	18.8%
	Some of the Time	16	8.8%
	Rarely	3	1.7%
	Never	2	1.1%

Evaluation of Judge Brett A. Kassabian: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	105	86.8%
	Frequently	14	11.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	116	80.6%
	Frequently	26	18.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	151	83.9%
	Frequently	27	15.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	84	59.6%
	Frequently	41	29.1%
	Some of the Time	11	7.8%
	Rarely	4	2.8%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	77	53.5%
	Frequently	47	32.6%
	Some of the Time	14	9.7%
	Rarely	6	4.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Brett A. Kassabian: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	80	55.9%
	Frequently	38	26.6%
	Some of the Time	20	14.0%
	Rarely	5	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	92	63.9%
	Frequently	44	30.6%
	Some of the Time	5	3.5%
	Rarely	3	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	100	70.9%
	Frequently	34	24.1%
	Some of the Time	6	4.3%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	126	69.6%
	Frequently	45	24.9%
	Some of the Time	9	5.0%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	128	71.5%
	Frequently	29	16.2%
	Some of the Time	14	7.8%
	Rarely	7	3.9%
	Never	1	0.6%

Evaluation of Judge Brett A. Kassabian: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	131	73.6%
	Frequently	45	25.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	140	77.8%
	Frequently	37	20.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	117	65.4%
	Good	43	24.0%
	Needs Improvement	17	9.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.1%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	28	25.5%
	Worse	6	5.5%
	Stayed the Same	76	69.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable William D. Broadhurst

Judge of the Circuit Court
23rd Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 148 completed surveys for Judge William D. Broadhurst.

Evaluation of Judge William D. Broadhurst: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	89	60.5%
	Frequently	47	32.0%
	Some of the Time	11	7.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	107	72.8%
	Frequently	36	24.5%
	Some of the Time	4	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	115	81.6%
	Frequently	24	17.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	110	78.6%
	Frequently	26	18.6%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.7%

Evaluation of Judge William D. Broadhurst: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	111	75.5%
	Frequently	29	19.7%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	110	77.5%
	Frequently	31	21.8%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	128	86.5%
	Frequently	17	11.5%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	119	80.4%
	Frequently	23	15.5%
	Some of the Time	6	4.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	117	79.6%
	Frequently	25	17.0%
	Some of the Time	5	3.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge William D. Broadhurst: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	109	89.3%
	Frequently	13	10.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	116	85.9%
	Frequently	19	14.1%
	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	126	86.9%
	Frequently	19	13.1%
	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	96	76.8%
	Frequently	23	18.4%
	Some of the Time	5	4.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	92	71.9%
	Frequently	29	22.7%
	Some of the Time	6	4.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge William D. Broadhurst: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	92	71.9%
	Frequently	27	21.1%
	Some of the Time	8	6.3%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	106	75.2%
	Frequently	28	19.9%
	Some of the Time	7	5.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	102	72.9%
	Frequently	34	24.3%
	Some of the Time	3	2.1%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	114	77.0%
	Frequently	27	18.2%
	Some of the Time	7	4.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	114	78.1%
	Frequently	29	19.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.4%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge William D. Broadhurst: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	102	71.3%
	Frequently	40	28.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	116	79.5%
	Frequently	28	19.2%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	116	78.9%
	Good	27	18.4%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	5.9%
	Worse	4	3.4%
	Stayed the Same	108	90.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Charles N. Dorsey

Judge of the Circuit Court
23rd Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 172 completed surveys for Judge Charles N. Dorsey.

Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	62	36.3%
	Frequently	68	39.8%
	Some of the Time	35	20.5%
	Rarely	6	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	85	49.4%
	Frequently	60	34.9%
	Some of the Time	24	14.0%
	Rarely	3	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	103	63.2%
	Frequently	47	28.8%
	Some of the Time	12	7.4%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	101	62.4%
	Frequently	44	27.2%
	Some of the Time	15	9.3%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	94	54.7%
	Frequently	48	27.9%
	Some of the Time	22	12.8%
	Rarely	8	4.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	123	74.6%
	Frequently	37	22.4%
	Some of the Time	5	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	123	72.4%
	Frequently	39	22.9%
	Some of the Time	7	4.1%
	Rarely	1	0.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	111	64.5%
	Frequently	42	24.4%
	Some of the Time	15	8.7%
	Rarely	3	1.7%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	112	65.1%
	Frequently	42	24.4%
	Some of the Time	13	7.6%
	Rarely	3	1.7%
	Never	2	1.2%

Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	116	83.5%
	Frequently	18	13.0%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	2	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	136	84.0%
	Frequently	24	14.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	141	83.9%
	Frequently	24	14.3%
	Some of the Time	3	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	72	48.7%
	Frequently	53	35.8%
	Some of the Time	14	9.5%
	Rarely	8	5.4%
	Never	1	0.7%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	94	63.1%
	Frequently	43	28.9%
	Some of the Time	8	5.4%
	Rarely	4	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	93	62.4%
	Frequently	43	28.9%
	Some of the Time	11	7.4%
	Rarely	2	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	95	59.0%
	Frequently	54	33.5%
	Some of the Time	9	5.6%
	Rarely	3	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	90	56.3%
	Frequently	46	28.8%
	Some of the Time	16	10.0%
	Rarely	7	4.4%
	Never	1	0.6%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	109	64.5%
	Frequently	45	26.6%
	Some of the Time	11	6.5%
	Rarely	4	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	122	73.1%
	Frequently	30	18.0%
	Some of the Time	10	6.0%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	3	1.8%

Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	102	60.4%
	Frequently	53	31.4%
	Some of the Time	12	7.1%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	116	68.6%
	Frequently	39	23.1%
	Some of the Time	12	7.1%
	Rarely	2	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	105	61.8%
	Good	41	24.1%
	Needs Improvement	20	11.8%
	Unsatisfactory	4	2.4%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	29	21.2%
	Worse	6	4.4%
	Stayed the Same	102	74.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael Lee Moore

Judge of the Circuit Court
29th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 79 completed surveys for Judge Michael Lee Moore.

Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	64	81.0%
	Frequently	13	16.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	68	87.2%
	Frequently	9	11.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	64	86.5%
	Frequently	7	9.5%
	Some of the Time	3	4.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	62	83.8%
	Frequently	11	14.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	73	92.4%
	Frequently	3	3.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	64	82.1%
	Frequently	11	14.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	69	87.3%
	Frequently	9	11.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	63	79.8%
	Frequently	10	12.7%
	Some of the Time	5	6.3%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	61	77.2%
	Frequently	13	16.5%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	47	78.3%
	Frequently	7	11.7%
	Some of the Time	4	6.7%
	Rarely	1	1.7%
	Never	1	1.7%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	62	84.9%
	Frequently	10	13.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	69	87.3%
	Frequently	8	10.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	51	76.1%
	Frequently	11	16.4%
	Some of the Time	4	6.0%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	52	77.6%
	Frequently	12	17.9%
	Some of the Time	3	4.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	50	74.6%
	Frequently	14	20.9%
	Some of the Time	3	4.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	59	79.7%
	Frequently	13	17.6%
	Some of the Time	2	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	55	76.4%
	Frequently	15	20.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	66	84.6%
	Frequently	9	11.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	61	79.2%
	Frequently	11	14.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.9%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	1	1.3%

Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	60	76.9%
	Frequently	17	21.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	67	84.8%
	Frequently	9	11.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	86.1%
	Good	7	8.9%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.3%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	9.2%
	Worse	1	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	58	89.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Henry A. Vanover

Judge of the Circuit Court
29th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 90 completed surveys for Judge Henry A. Vanover.

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Vanover: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	57	64.0%
	Frequently	27	30.3%
	Some of the Time	5	5.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	68	75.6%
	Frequently	20	22.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	60	81.1%
	Frequently	7	9.5%
	Some of the Time	5	6.8%
	Rarely	2	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	58	77.3%
	Frequently	10	13.3%
	Some of the Time	4	5.3%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	2	2.7%

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Vanover: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	72	80.0%
	Frequently	16	17.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	78	87.6%
	Frequently	10	11.2%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	77	85.6%
	Frequently	11	12.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	71	78.9%
	Frequently	11	12.2%
	Some of the Time	6	6.7%
	Rarely	2	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	71	78.9%
	Frequently	11	12.2%
	Some of the Time	7	7.8%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Vanover: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	57	85.1%
	Frequently	6	9.0%
	Some of the Time	3	4.5%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	66	89.2%
	Frequently	7	9.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	78	87.6%
	Frequently	9	10.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	55	76.4%
	Frequently	13	18.1%
	Some of the Time	3	4.2%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	53	73.6%
	Frequently	14	19.4%
	Some of the Time	4	5.6%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Vanover: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	52	72.2%
	Frequently	14	19.4%
	Some of the Time	5	6.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.4%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	59	78.7%
	Frequently	10	13.3%
	Some of the Time	4	5.3%
	Rarely	2	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	45	60.8%
	Frequently	16	21.6%
	Some of the Time	6	8.1%
	Rarely	3	4.1%
	Never	4	5.4%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	70	77.8%
	Frequently	12	13.3%
	Some of the Time	7	7.8%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	73	82.0%
	Frequently	10	11.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.4%
	Rarely	3	3.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Vanover: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	57	63.3%
	Frequently	23	25.6%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	5	5.6%
	Never	2	2.2%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	69	77.5%
	Frequently	14	15.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.3%
	Rarely	3	3.4%
	Never	1	1.1%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71	78.9%
	Good	11	12.2%
	Needs Improvement	5	5.6%
	Unsatisfactory	3	3.3%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	15.9%
	Worse	3	4.8%
	Stayed the Same	50	79.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael R. Katchmark

Judge of the General District Court
1st Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 123 completed surveys for Judge Michael R. Katchmark.

Evaluation of Judge Michael R. Katchmark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	83	67.5%
	Frequently	33	26.8%
	Some of the Time	6	4.9%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	90	73.8%
	Frequently	27	22.1%
	Some of the Time	4	3.3%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	90	73.8%
	Frequently	28	23.0%
	Some of the Time	3	2.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	87	71.3%
	Frequently	31	25.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Michael R. Katchmark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	87	70.7%
	Frequently	28	22.8%
	Some of the Time	6	4.9%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	80	66.7%
	Frequently	34	28.3%
	Some of the Time	4	3.3%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	93	75.6%
	Frequently	27	22.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	83	68.0%
	Frequently	25	20.5%
	Some of the Time	9	7.4%
	Rarely	5	4.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	84	68.9%
	Frequently	25	20.5%
	Some of the Time	9	7.4%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	1	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Michael R. Katchmark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	83	83.8%
	Frequently	13	13.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	89	72.4%
	Frequently	31	25.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.6%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	90	73.8%
	Frequently	27	22.1%
	Some of the Time	4	3.3%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	77	67.0%
	Frequently	27	23.5%
	Some of the Time	7	6.1%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	71	61.2%
	Frequently	28	24.1%
	Some of the Time	12	10.3%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge Michael R. Katchmark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	71	61.2%
	Frequently	29	25.0%
	Some of the Time	10	8.6%
	Rarely	5	4.3%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	81	66.9%
	Frequently	27	22.3%
	Some of the Time	9	7.4%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	89	74.2%
	Frequently	25	20.8%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	86	70.5%
	Frequently	24	19.7%
	Some of the Time	9	7.4%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	81	66.4%
	Frequently	32	26.2%
	Some of the Time	6	4.9%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	1	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge Michael R. Katchmark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	88	72.7%
	Frequently	32	26.5%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	72	60.0%
	Frequently	40	33.3%
	Some of the Time	8	6.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	74	62.2%
	Good	32	26.9%
	Needs Improvement	12	10.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.8%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	22	20.2%
	Worse	1	0.9%
	Stayed the Same	86	78.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Daniel Roger Lahne

Judge of the General District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 96 completed surveys for Judge Daniel Roger Lahne.

Evaluation of Judge Daniel Roger Lahne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	52	54.2%
	Frequently	36	37.5%
	Some of the Time	7	7.3%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	61	63.5%
	Frequently	31	32.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	83	87.4%
	Frequently	9	9.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	85	88.5%
	Frequently	8	8.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Daniel Roger Lahne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	70	72.9%
	Frequently	19	19.8%
	Some of the Time	6	6.3%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	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 attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	90	93.8%
	Frequently	4	4.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	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	3	3.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	80	83.3%
	Frequently	12	12.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Daniel Roger Lahne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	79	96.3%
	Frequently	3	3.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	93	97.9%
	Frequently	2	2.1%
	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	92	96.8%
	Frequently	3	3.2%
	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	69	73.4%
	Frequently	22	23.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	2	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	76	80.0%
	Frequently	17	17.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Daniel Roger Lahne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	80	85.1%
	Frequently	11	11.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	83	86.5%
	Frequently	12	12.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	90	93.8%
	Frequently	6	6.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	89	92.7%
	Frequently	7	7.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	81	85.3%
	Frequently	10	10.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Daniel Roger Lahne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	87	92.6%
	Frequently	7	7.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	85	89.5%
	Frequently	8	8.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	78	83.0%
	Good	13	13.8%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.1%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	13.4%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	71	86.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Roxie O. Holder

Judge of the General District Court
3rd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 Roxie O. Holder.

Evaluation of Judge Roxie O. Holder: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	48	57.8%
	Frequently	21	25.3%
	Some of the Time	11	13.3%
	Rarely	3	3.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	50	60.2%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	15	18.1%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	58	69.9%
	Frequently	14	16.9%
	Some of the Time	10	12.1%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	56	67.5%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	11	13.3%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Roxie O. Holder: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	49	59.0%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	11	13.3%
	Rarely	8	9.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	58	70.7%
	Frequently	19	23.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	60	73.2%
	Frequently	15	18.3%
	Some of the Time	6	7.3%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	58	69.9%
	Frequently	8	9.6%
	Some of the Time	10	12.1%
	Rarely	6	7.2%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	56	67.5%
	Frequently	12	14.5%
	Some of the Time	9	10.8%
	Rarely	5	6.0%
	Never	1	1.2%

Evaluation of Judge Roxie O. Holder: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	64	86.5%
	Frequently	7	9.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	2	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	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 expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	70	84.3%
	Frequently	9	10.8%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	53	64.6%
	Frequently	12	14.6%
	Some of the Time	11	13.4%
	Rarely	5	6.1%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	55	66.3%
	Frequently	18	21.7%
	Some of the Time	6	7.2%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	2	2.4%

Evaluation of Judge Roxie O. Holder: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	57	69.5%
	Frequently	16	19.5%
	Some of the Time	5	6.1%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	2	2.4%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	54	65.1%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	9	10.8%
	Rarely	5	6.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	67	80.7%
	Frequently	12	14.5%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	61	73.5%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	5	6.0%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	61	74.4%
	Frequently	7	8.5%
	Some of the Time	8	9.8%
	Rarely	4	4.9%
	Never	2	2.4%

Evaluation of Judge Roxie O. Holder: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	53	64.6%
	Frequently	19	23.2%
	Some of the Time	8	9.8%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	55	66.3%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	7	8.4%
	Rarely	5	6.0%
	Never	1	1.2%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48	58.5%
	Good	17	20.7%
	Needs Improvement	13	15.9%
	Unsatisfactory	4	4.9%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	7.9%
	Worse	3	4.0%
	Stayed the Same	67	88.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable S. Clark Daugherty

Judge of the General District Court
4th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 109 completed surveys for Judge S. Clark Daugherty.

Evaluation of Judge S. Clark Daugherty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	51	47.2%
	Frequently	35	32.4%
	Some of the Time	15	13.9%
	Rarely	5	4.6%
	Never	2	1.9%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	68	63.0%
	Frequently	21	19.4%
	Some of the Time	15	13.9%
	Rarely	3	2.8%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	82	75.2%
	Frequently	22	20.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.8%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	80	73.4%
	Frequently	24	22.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.8%
	Rarely	3	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge S. Clark Daugherty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	69	63.9%
	Frequently	19	17.6%
	Some of the Time	16	14.8%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	3	2.8%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	75	71.4%
	Frequently	22	21.0%
	Some of the Time	6	5.7%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	81	74.3%
	Frequently	20	18.4%
	Some of the Time	6	5.5%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	62	57.4%
	Frequently	20	18.5%
	Some of the Time	19	17.6%
	Rarely	6	5.6%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	65	60.8%
	Frequently	19	17.8%
	Some of the Time	16	15.0%
	Rarely	7	6.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge S. Clark Daugherty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	83	87.4%
	Frequently	10	10.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	83	78.3%
	Frequently	20	18.9%
	Some of the Time	3	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	83	77.6%
	Frequently	22	20.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	59	56.7%
	Frequently	29	27.9%
	Some of the Time	11	10.6%
	Rarely	4	3.9%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	80	75.5%
	Frequently	18	17.0%
	Some of the Time	7	6.6%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge S. Clark Daugherty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	66	62.3%
	Frequently	23	21.7%
	Some of the Time	15	14.2%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	60	56.1%
	Frequently	27	25.2%
	Some of the Time	8	7.5%
	Rarely	11	10.3%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	83	78.3%
	Frequently	21	19.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	75	70.8%
	Frequently	22	20.8%
	Some of the Time	5	4.7%
	Rarely	4	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	71	66.4%
	Frequently	17	15.9%
	Some of the Time	13	12.2%
	Rarely	4	3.7%
	Never	2	1.9%

Evaluation of Judge S. Clark Daugherty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	75	70.8%
	Frequently	26	24.5%
	Some of the Time	5	4.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	76	71.0%
	Frequently	22	20.6%
	Some of the Time	6	5.6%
	Rarely	3	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	63	57.8%
	Good	28	25.7%
	Needs Improvement	10	9.2%
	Unsatisfactory	8	7.3%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	6.3%
	Worse	13	13.7%
	Stayed the Same	76	80.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Bruce A. Clark, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
6th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 92 completed surveys for Judge Bruce A. Clark, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Clark, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	72	78.3%
	Frequently	18	19.6%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	80	88.9%
	Frequently	9	10.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	72	80.0%
	Frequently	15	16.7%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	69	76.7%
	Frequently	17	18.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	1	1.1%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Clark, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	79	85.9%
	Frequently	11	12.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	72	79.1%
	Frequently	16	17.6%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	76	82.6%
	Frequently	13	14.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	74	82.2%
	Frequently	12	13.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	71	78.9%
	Frequently	16	17.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Clark, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	70	88.6%
	Frequently	9	11.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	73	80.2%
	Frequently	16	17.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	72	79.1%
	Frequently	15	16.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	71	81.6%
	Frequently	12	13.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.3%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	64	73.6%
	Frequently	20	23.0%
	Some of the Time	3	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Clark, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	64	72.7%
	Frequently	18	20.5%
	Some of the Time	4	4.6%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	71	77.2%
	Frequently	19	20.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	70	77.8%
	Frequently	17	18.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	70	76.9%
	Frequently	18	19.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	73	81.1%
	Frequently	13	14.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.1%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Bruce A. Clark, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	56	61.5%
	Frequently	23	25.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.8%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	51	56.7%
	Frequently	23	25.6%
	Some of the Time	10	11.1%
	Rarely	6	6.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	74.7%
	Good	20	22.0%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	8.3%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	77	91.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Thomas L. Vaughn

Judge of the General District Court
12th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 82 completed surveys for Judge Thomas L. Vaughn.

Evaluation of Judge Thomas L. Vaughn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	50	61.0%
	Frequently	21	25.6%
	Some of the Time	11	13.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	56	68.3%
	Frequently	21	25.6%
	Some of the Time	5	6.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	62	75.6%
	Frequently	18	22.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	64	78.1%
	Frequently	17	20.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Thomas L. Vaughn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	57	69.5%
	Frequently	21	25.6%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	63	78.8%
	Frequently	16	20.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	68	82.9%
	Frequently	13	15.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	58	70.7%
	Frequently	20	24.4%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	61	75.3%
	Frequently	18	22.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Thomas L. Vaughn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	66	89.2%
	Frequently	7	9.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	71	86.6%
	Frequently	11	13.4%
	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	68	84.0%
	Frequently	12	14.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	50	63.3%
	Frequently	18	22.8%
	Some of the Time	11	13.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	53	65.4%
	Frequently	24	29.6%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Thomas L. Vaughn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	56	69.1%
	Frequently	22	27.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	57	69.5%
	Frequently	23	28.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	64	78.1%
	Frequently	13	15.9%
	Some of the Time	5	6.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	60	73.2%
	Frequently	18	22.0%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	66	81.5%
	Frequently	12	14.8%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Thomas L. Vaughn: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	61	75.3%
	Frequently	17	21.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	52	65.0%
	Frequently	23	28.8%
	Some of the Time	4	5.0%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	47	58.0%
	Good	28	34.6%
	Needs Improvement	6	7.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	16.4%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	56	83.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable L. Neil Steverson

Judge of the General District Court
14th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 115 completed surveys for Judge L. Neil Steverson.

Evaluation of Judge L. Neil Steverson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	48	41.7%
	Frequently	41	35.7%
	Some of the Time	17	14.8%
	Rarely	9	7.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	64	55.7%
	Frequently	36	31.3%
	Some of the Time	12	10.4%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	77	67.5%
	Frequently	26	22.8%
	Some of the Time	8	7.0%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	79	68.7%
	Frequently	21	18.3%
	Some of the Time	10	8.7%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge L. Neil Steverson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	66	57.9%
	Frequently	29	25.4%
	Some of the Time	11	9.7%
	Rarely	8	7.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	85	74.6%
	Frequently	20	17.5%
	Some of the Time	7	6.1%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	85	74.6%
	Frequently	17	14.9%
	Some of the Time	9	7.9%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	67	58.3%
	Frequently	30	26.1%
	Some of the Time	11	9.6%
	Rarely	6	5.2%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	70	60.9%
	Frequently	26	22.6%
	Some of the Time	12	10.4%
	Rarely	6	5.2%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge L. Neil Steverson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	86	83.5%
	Frequently	13	12.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	96	83.5%
	Frequently	17	14.8%
	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	95	84.1%
	Frequently	15	13.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.8%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	67	59.3%
	Frequently	24	21.2%
	Some of the Time	16	14.2%
	Rarely	5	4.4%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	74	65.5%
	Frequently	30	26.6%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	3	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge L. Neil Steverson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	71	62.8%
	Frequently	29	25.7%
	Some of the Time	10	8.9%
	Rarely	3	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	81	70.4%
	Frequently	24	20.9%
	Some of the Time	8	7.0%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	96	84.2%
	Frequently	16	14.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	94	81.7%
	Frequently	14	12.2%
	Some of the Time	6	5.2%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	77	67.5%
	Frequently	21	18.4%
	Some of the Time	9	7.9%
	Rarely	6	5.3%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge L. Neil Steverson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	82	73.2%
	Frequently	26	23.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	86	76.8%
	Frequently	22	19.6%
	Some of the Time	3	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.9%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64	56.1%
	Good	37	32.5%
	Needs Improvement	8	7.0%
	Unsatisfactory	5	4.4%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	7.3%
	Worse	2	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	87	90.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Lisa A. Mayne

Judge of the General District Court
19th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 114 completed surveys for Judge Lisa A. Mayne.

Evaluation of Judge Lisa A. Mayne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	61	53.5%
	Frequently	35	30.7%
	Some of the Time	17	14.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	66	57.9%
	Frequently	35	30.7%
	Some of the Time	13	11.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	86	76.1%
	Frequently	25	22.1%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	86	76.8%
	Frequently	22	19.6%
	Some of the Time	3	2.7%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Lisa A. Mayne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	79	69.9%
	Frequently	24	21.2%
	Some of the Time	9	8.0%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	76	71.0%
	Frequently	26	24.3%
	Some of the Time	5	4.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	93	82.3%
	Frequently	18	15.9%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	77	68.8%
	Frequently	22	19.6%
	Some of the Time	12	10.7%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	77	68.1%
	Frequently	25	22.1%
	Some of the Time	9	8.0%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Lisa A. Mayne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	84	87.5%
	Frequently	9	9.4%
	Some of the Time	2	2.1%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	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 expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	87	77.7%
	Frequently	24	21.4%
	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	65	60.2%
	Frequently	35	32.4%
	Some of the Time	5	4.6%
	Rarely	3	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	78	69.6%
	Frequently	25	22.3%
	Some of the Time	8	7.1%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Lisa A. Mayne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	75	67.6%
	Frequently	21	18.9%
	Some of the Time	14	12.6%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	85	75.2%
	Frequently	21	18.6%
	Some of the Time	7	6.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	86	77.5%
	Frequently	23	20.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	85	76.6%
	Frequently	21	18.9%
	Some of the Time	5	4.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	80	74.1%
	Frequently	16	14.8%
	Some of the Time	10	9.3%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Lisa A. Mayne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	78	69.6%
	Frequently	31	27.7%
	Some of the Time	3	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	80	71.4%
	Frequently	25	22.3%
	Some of the Time	7	6.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71	62.8%
	Good	34	30.1%
	Needs Improvement	7	6.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	7.9%
	Worse	2	2.3%
	Stayed the Same	80	89.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Mark C. Simmons

Judge of the General District Court
19th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 Mark C. Simmons.

Evaluation of Judge Mark C. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	56	60.2%
	Frequently	26	28.0%
	Some of the Time	7	7.5%
	Rarely	4	4.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	66	71.0%
	Frequently	21	22.6%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	3	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	65	70.7%
	Frequently	18	19.6%
	Some of the Time	4	4.4%
	Rarely	5	5.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	65	71.4%
	Frequently	16	17.6%
	Some of the Time	6	6.6%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	1	1.1%

Evaluation of Judge Mark C. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	67	72.0%
	Frequently	14	15.1%
	Some of the Time	6	6.5%
	Rarely	6	6.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	66	72.5%
	Frequently	20	22.0%
	Some of the Time	4	4.4%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	71	76.3%
	Frequently	18	19.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	58	62.4%
	Frequently	15	16.1%
	Some of the Time	9	9.7%
	Rarely	9	9.7%
	Never	2	2.2%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	58	62.4%
	Frequently	15	16.1%
	Some of the Time	8	8.6%
	Rarely	10	10.8%
	Never	2	2.2%

Evaluation of Judge Mark C. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	58	79.5%
	Frequently	11	15.1%
	Some of the Time	3	4.1%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	72	77.4%
	Frequently	17	18.3%
	Some of the Time	4	4.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	70	76.1%
	Frequently	19	20.7%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	58	63.7%
	Frequently	16	17.6%
	Some of the Time	10	11.0%
	Rarely	7	7.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	59	64.8%
	Frequently	15	16.5%
	Some of the Time	10	11.0%
	Rarely	5	5.5%
	Never	2	2.2%

Evaluation of Judge Mark C. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	58	64.4%
	Frequently	12	13.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.9%
	Rarely	10	11.1%
	Never	2	2.2%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	65	69.9%
	Frequently	17	18.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.6%
	Rarely	3	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	71	76.3%
	Frequently	16	17.2%
	Some of the Time	5	5.4%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	64	69.6%
	Frequently	19	20.7%
	Some of the Time	8	8.7%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	57	62.0%
	Frequently	15	16.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.7%
	Rarely	9	9.8%
	Never	3	3.3%

Evaluation of Judge Mark C. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	60	64.5%
	Frequently	21	22.6%
	Some of the Time	7	7.5%
	Rarely	3	3.2%
	Never	2	2.2%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	64	70.3%
	Frequently	19	20.9%
	Some of the Time	6	6.6%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	1	1.1%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	57	61.3%
	Good	19	20.4%
	Needs Improvement	8	8.6%
	Unsatisfactory	9	9.7%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	13.1%
	Worse	3	3.6%
	Stayed the Same	70	83.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable J. Frank Buttery, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
20th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 124 completed surveys for Judge J. Frank BATTERY, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge J. Frank Buttery, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	101	81.5%
	Frequently	22	17.7%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	108	87.8%
	Frequently	14	11.4%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	100	80.7%
	Frequently	20	16.1%
	Some of the Time	2	1.6%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	95	79.2%
	Frequently	20	16.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	1	0.8%

Evaluation of Judge J. Frank Buttery, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	107	87.0%
	Frequently	14	11.4%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	93	80.9%
	Frequently	20	17.4%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	107	86.3%
	Frequently	15	12.1%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	91	73.4%
	Frequently	24	19.4%
	Some of the Time	7	5.7%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	91	74.6%
	Frequently	20	16.4%
	Some of the Time	9	7.4%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. Frank Buttery, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	87	90.6%
	Frequently	9	9.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	103	84.4%
	Frequently	18	14.8%
	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	98	82.4%
	Frequently	21	17.7%
	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	82	71.3%
	Frequently	31	27.0%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	79	67.0%
	Frequently	27	22.9%
	Some of the Time	8	6.8%
	Rarely	4	3.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. Frank Buttery, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	74	62.7%
	Frequently	31	26.3%
	Some of the Time	10	8.5%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	96	77.4%
	Frequently	22	17.7%
	Some of the Time	5	4.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	106	87.6%
	Frequently	13	10.7%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	94	79.0%
	Frequently	18	15.1%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	93	75.0%
	Frequently	21	16.9%
	Some of the Time	9	7.3%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. Frank Buttery, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	92	76.7%
	Frequently	26	21.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	91	74.6%
	Frequently	26	21.3%
	Some of the Time	3	2.5%
	Rarely	2	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	87	72.5%
	Good	28	23.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.8%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	8.4%
	Worse	1	0.9%
	Stayed the Same	97	90.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Deborah C. Welsh

Judge of the General District Court
20th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 107 completed surveys for Judge Deborah C. Welsh.

Evaluation of Judge Deborah C. Welsh: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	58	54.7%
	Frequently	41	38.7%
	Some of the Time	3	2.8%
	Rarely	4	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	81	75.7%
	Frequently	23	21.5%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	74	69.8%
	Frequently	26	24.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.8%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	73	68.9%
	Frequently	26	24.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.8%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah C. Welsh: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	78	72.9%
	Frequently	25	23.4%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	77	74.8%
	Frequently	21	20.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	84	79.3%
	Frequently	19	17.9%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	71	66.4%
	Frequently	28	26.2%
	Some of the Time	5	4.7%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	69	65.1%
	Frequently	27	25.5%
	Some of the Time	7	6.6%
	Rarely	3	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah C. Welsh: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	72	81.8%
	Frequently	16	18.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	82	77.4%
	Frequently	18	17.0%
	Some of the Time	6	5.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	80	76.9%
	Frequently	20	19.2%
	Some of the Time	4	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	62	61.4%
	Frequently	29	28.7%
	Some of the Time	7	6.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	2	2.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	48	48.0%
	Frequently	31	31.0%
	Some of the Time	11	11.0%
	Rarely	9	9.0%
	Never	1	1.0%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah C. Welsh: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	54	54.0%
	Frequently	28	28.0%
	Some of the Time	12	12.0%
	Rarely	4	4.0%
	Never	2	2.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	68	64.2%
	Frequently	31	29.3%
	Some of the Time	7	6.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	78	75.0%
	Frequently	23	22.1%
	Some of the Time	3	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	66	63.5%
	Frequently	33	31.7%
	Some of the Time	5	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	75	71.4%
	Frequently	21	20.0%
	Some of the Time	6	5.7%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	1	1.0%

Evaluation of Judge Deborah C. Welsh: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	70	67.3%
	Frequently	31	29.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	69	65.7%
	Frequently	26	24.8%
	Some of the Time	7	6.7%
	Rarely	3	2.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	61	58.1%
	Good	33	31.4%
	Needs Improvement	9	8.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.9%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	20.8%
	Worse	4	4.2%
	Stayed the Same	72	75.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable George A. Jones, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
22nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 85 completed surveys for Judge George A. Jones, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge George A. Jones, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	23	27.1%
	Frequently	32	37.7%
	Some of the Time	24	28.2%
	Rarely	6	7.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	39	45.9%
	Frequently	30	35.3%
	Some of the Time	13	15.3%
	Rarely	3	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	62	72.9%
	Frequently	18	21.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.7%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	60	71.4%
	Frequently	19	22.6%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge George A. Jones, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	42	49.4%
	Frequently	29	34.1%
	Some of the Time	11	12.9%
	Rarely	3	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	59	71.1%
	Frequently	21	25.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	64	75.3%
	Frequently	19	22.4%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	58	69.1%
	Frequently	15	17.9%
	Some of the Time	10	11.9%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	61	71.8%
	Frequently	18	21.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.7%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge George A. Jones, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	64	88.9%
	Frequently	6	8.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	76	89.4%
	Frequently	7	8.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	69	83.1%
	Frequently	12	14.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	37	46.3%
	Frequently	26	32.5%
	Some of the Time	14	17.5%
	Rarely	3	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	57	71.3%
	Frequently	20	25.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge George A. Jones, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	58	74.4%
	Frequently	15	19.2%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	52	61.2%
	Frequently	24	28.2%
	Some of the Time	8	9.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	70	82.4%
	Frequently	13	15.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	65	76.5%
	Frequently	16	18.8%
	Some of the Time	3	3.5%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	66	77.7%
	Frequently	14	16.5%
	Some of the Time	4	4.7%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge George A. Jones, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	73	86.9%
	Frequently	8	9.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	75	89.3%
	Frequently	7	8.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	55	64.7%
	Good	21	24.7%
	Needs Improvement	7	8.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.4%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	5.3%
	Worse	4	5.3%
	Stayed the Same	68	89.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Sam D. Eggleston, III

Judge of the General District Court
24th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 137 completed surveys for Judge Sam D. Eggleston, III.

Evaluation of Judge Sam D. Eggleston, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	125	91.2%
	Frequently	12	8.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	123	89.8%
	Frequently	13	9.5%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	127	92.7%
	Frequently	10	7.3%
	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	126	92.0%
	Frequently	11	8.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sam D. Eggleston, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	125	92.6%
	Frequently	9	6.7%
	Some of the Time	1	0.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	111	84.1%
	Frequently	17	12.9%
	Some of the Time	4	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	125	91.9%
	Frequently	11	8.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	117	88.0%
	Frequently	15	11.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	120	88.2%
	Frequently	14	10.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sam D. Eggleston, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	106	93.0%
	Frequently	8	7.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	115	85.8%
	Frequently	18	13.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	112	83.0%
	Frequently	21	15.6%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	107	87.0%
	Frequently	16	13.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	105	84.7%
	Frequently	19	15.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sam D. Eggleston, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	103	83.1%
	Frequently	19	15.3%
	Some of the Time	2	1.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	116	85.3%
	Frequently	16	11.8%
	Some of the Time	4	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	120	88.2%
	Frequently	16	11.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	117	87.3%
	Frequently	16	11.9%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	124	91.2%
	Frequently	12	8.8%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sam D. Eggleston, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	113	84.3%
	Frequently	21	15.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	114	83.8%
	Frequently	17	12.5%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	121	89.6%
	Good	14	10.4%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	7.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	105	92.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable W. Dale Houff

Judge of the General District Court
26th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 W. Dale Houff.

Evaluation of Judge W. Dale Houff: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	72	61.5%
	Frequently	37	31.6%
	Some of the Time	8	6.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	96	82.1%
	Frequently	16	13.7%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	102	87.2%
	Frequently	10	8.6%
	Some of the Time	5	4.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	101	87.1%
	Frequently	11	9.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge W. Dale Houff: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	88	75.2%
	Frequently	22	18.8%
	Some of the Time	5	4.3%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	89	78.1%
	Frequently	19	16.7%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	104	88.9%
	Frequently	13	11.1%
	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	75.0%
	Frequently	17	14.7%
	Some of the Time	9	7.8%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	83	71.6%
	Frequently	21	18.1%
	Some of the Time	8	6.9%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge W. Dale Houff: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	93	90.3%
	Frequently	8	7.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	103	88.8%
	Frequently	13	11.2%
	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	100	85.5%
	Frequently	16	13.7%
	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	85	74.6%
	Frequently	22	19.3%
	Some of the Time	4	3.5%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	94	82.5%
	Frequently	14	12.3%
	Some of the Time	5	4.4%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge W. Dale Houff: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	86	76.1%
	Frequently	19	16.8%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	93	79.5%
	Frequently	22	18.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	102	87.9%
	Frequently	11	9.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	100	85.5%
	Frequently	15	12.8%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	91	78.5%
	Frequently	16	13.8%
	Some of the Time	5	4.3%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge W. Dale Houff: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	96	85.0%
	Frequently	16	14.2%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	101	87.8%
	Frequently	13	11.3%
	Some of the Time	1	0.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	96	82.8%
	Good	13	11.2%
	Needs Improvement	6	5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	3.9%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	98	95.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable J.D. Bolt

Judge of the General District Court
27th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 82 completed surveys for Judge J.D. Bolt.

Evaluation of Judge J.D. Bolt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	70	85.4%
	Frequently	11	13.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	72	87.8%
	Frequently	9	11.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	75	92.6%
	Frequently	6	7.4%
	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	71	87.7%
	Frequently	8	9.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J.D. Bolt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	74	90.2%
	Frequently	7	8.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	64	79.0%
	Frequently	17	21.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	70	85.4%
	Frequently	10	12.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	68	82.9%
	Frequently	12	14.6%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	69	84.2%
	Frequently	12	14.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J.D. Bolt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	72	92.3%
	Frequently	5	6.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.3%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	67	82.7%
	Frequently	12	14.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	69	85.2%
	Frequently	9	11.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	71	87.7%
	Frequently	8	9.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	69	85.2%
	Frequently	11	13.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J.D. Bolt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	68	84.0%
	Frequently	11	13.6%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	63	77.8%
	Frequently	15	18.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	57	70.4%
	Frequently	18	22.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	67	83.8%
	Frequently	12	15.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	67	82.7%
	Frequently	13	16.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J.D. Bolt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	57	70.4%
	Frequently	17	21.0%
	Some of the Time	7	8.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	30	36.6%
	Frequently	25	30.5%
	Some of the Time	19	23.2%
	Rarely	5	6.1%
	Never	3	3.7%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	61	75.3%
	Good	19	23.5%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	6.7%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	70	93.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable V. Blake McKinney

Judge of the General District Court
28th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 79 completed surveys for Judge V. Blake McKinney.

Evaluation of Judge V. Blake McKinney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	58	73.4%
	Frequently	18	22.8%
	Some of the Time	3	3.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	64	81.0%
	Frequently	14	17.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	59	75.6%
	Frequently	15	19.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.9%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	58	74.4%
	Frequently	16	20.5%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge V. Blake McKinney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	62	79.5%
	Frequently	14	18.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	61	79.2%
	Frequently	14	18.2%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	61	77.2%
	Frequently	14	17.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	2	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	55	69.6%
	Frequently	16	20.3%
	Some of the Time	8	10.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	55	70.5%
	Frequently	16	20.5%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	3	3.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge V. Blake McKinney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	58	87.9%
	Frequently	7	10.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	63	80.8%
	Frequently	13	16.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	60	79.0%
	Frequently	15	19.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	49	67.1%
	Frequently	21	28.8%
	Some of the Time	3	4.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	44	58.7%
	Frequently	21	28.0%
	Some of the Time	8	10.7%
	Rarely	2	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge V. Blake McKinney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	44	60.3%
	Frequently	19	26.0%
	Some of the Time	7	9.6%
	Rarely	3	4.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	60	76.0%
	Frequently	15	19.0%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	62	78.5%
	Frequently	14	17.7%
	Some of the Time	3	3.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	60	77.9%
	Frequently	15	19.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	58	75.3%
	Frequently	14	18.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.9%
	Rarely	2	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge V. Blake McKinney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	40	52.0%
	Frequently	26	33.8%
	Some of the Time	9	11.7%
	Rarely	2	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	47	60.3%
	Frequently	26	33.3%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	65.8%
	Good	20	26.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	5.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.6%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	26.4%
	Worse	1	1.4%
	Stayed the Same	52	72.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Clarence E. Phillips

Judge of the General District Court
30th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 63 completed surveys for Judge Clarence E. Phillips.

Evaluation of Judge Clarence E. Phillips: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	52	82.5%
	Frequently	7	11.1%
	Some of the Time	4	6.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	54	85.7%
	Frequently	6	9.5%
	Some of the Time	3	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	55	87.3%
	Frequently	5	7.9%
	Some of the Time	3	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	53	84.1%
	Frequently	6	9.5%
	Some of the Time	4	6.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Clarence E. Phillips: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	52	82.5%
	Frequently	6	9.5%
	Some of the Time	4	6.4%
	Rarely	1	1.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	52	82.5%
	Frequently	9	14.3%
	Some of the Time	2	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	56	88.9%
	Frequently	7	11.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	45	71.4%
	Frequently	9	14.3%
	Some of the Time	7	11.1%
	Rarely	2	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	45	71.4%
	Frequently	10	15.9%
	Some of the Time	6	9.5%
	Rarely	2	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Clarence E. Phillips: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	47	79.7%
	Frequently	8	13.6%
	Some of the Time	3	5.1%
	Rarely	1	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	55	87.3%
	Frequently	8	12.7%
	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	52	83.9%
	Frequently	10	16.1%
	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	43	70.5%
	Frequently	11	18.0%
	Some of the Time	7	11.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	37	60.7%
	Frequently	14	23.0%
	Some of the Time	7	11.5%
	Rarely	3	4.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Clarence E. Phillips: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	34	56.7%
	Frequently	14	23.3%
	Some of the Time	9	15.0%
	Rarely	3	5.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	49	77.8%
	Frequently	12	19.1%
	Some of the Time	2	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	52	82.5%
	Frequently	11	17.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	52	82.5%
	Frequently	9	14.3%
	Some of the Time	2	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	46	73.0%
	Frequently	5	7.9%
	Some of the Time	10	15.9%
	Rarely	2	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Clarence E. Phillips: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	53	84.1%
	Frequently	10	15.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	51	81.0%
	Frequently	11	17.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	41	65.1%
	Good	13	20.6%
	Needs Improvement	8	12.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.6%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	12.3%
	Worse	1	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	49	86.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable William E. Jarvis

Judge of the General District Court
31st Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 119 completed surveys for Judge William E. Jarvis.

Evaluation of Judge William E. Jarvis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	49	41.2%
	Frequently	45	37.8%
	Some of the Time	23	19.3%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	60	50.4%
	Frequently	42	35.3%
	Some of the Time	16	13.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	75	63.0%
	Frequently	36	30.3%
	Some of the Time	7	5.9%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	81	68.1%
	Frequently	33	27.7%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge William E. Jarvis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	70 58.8%
	Frequently	29 24.4%
	Some of the Time	18 15.1%
	Rarely	2 1.7%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	74 63.8%
	Frequently	36 31.0%
	Some of the Time	5 4.3%
	Rarely	1 0.9%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	83 69.8%
	Frequently	32 26.9%
	Some of the Time	4 3.4%
	Rarely	0 0.0%
	Never	0 0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	61 51.3%
	Frequently	32 26.9%
	Some of the Time	22 18.5%
	Rarely	3 2.5%
	Never	1 0.8%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	67 56.3%
	Frequently	28 23.5%
	Some of the Time	17 14.3%
	Rarely	6 5.0%
	Never	1 0.8%

Evaluation of Judge William E. Jarvis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	66	65.4%
	Frequently	19	18.8%
	Some of the Time	10	9.9%
	Rarely	4	4.0%
	Never	2	2.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	96	81.4%
	Frequently	22	18.6%
	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	93	80.2%
	Frequently	20	17.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	65	55.6%
	Frequently	34	29.1%
	Some of the Time	14	12.0%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	76	64.4%
	Frequently	29	24.6%
	Some of the Time	12	10.2%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge William E. Jarvis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	73	61.9%
	Frequently	27	22.9%
	Some of the Time	15	12.7%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	81	68.1%
	Frequently	28	23.5%
	Some of the Time	8	6.7%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	1	0.8%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	93	78.2%
	Frequently	24	20.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	85	72.0%
	Frequently	28	23.7%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	73	62.4%
	Frequently	21	18.0%
	Some of the Time	17	14.5%
	Rarely	5	4.3%
	Never	1	0.9%

Evaluation of Judge William E. Jarvis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	81	68.6%
	Frequently	34	28.8%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	85	71.4%
	Frequently	31	26.1%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	57.6%
	Good	30	25.4%
	Needs Improvement	15	12.7%
	Unsatisfactory	5	4.2%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	21	20.2%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	82	78.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gordon S. Vincent

Judge of the General District Court
32nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 72 completed surveys for Judge Gordon S. Vincent.

Evaluation of Judge Gordon S. Vincent: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	57	79.2%
	Frequently	14	19.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	65	91.6%
	Frequently	5	7.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	68	94.4%
	Frequently	4	5.6%
	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	65	92.9%
	Frequently	5	7.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon S. Vincent: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	65	90.3%
	Frequently	6	8.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	66	93.0%
	Frequently	5	7.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	67	93.1%
	Frequently	5	6.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	61	87.1%
	Frequently	7	10.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	63	88.7%
	Frequently	6	8.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon S. Vincent: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	57	93.4%
	Frequently	4	6.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	66	91.7%
	Frequently	6	8.3%
	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	66	94.3%
	Frequently	4	5.7%
	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	79.2%
	Frequently	12	16.7%
	Some of the Time	3	4.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	63	88.7%
	Frequently	7	9.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon S. Vincent: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	60	84.5%
	Frequently	10	14.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	63	87.5%
	Frequently	8	11.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	62	89.9%
	Frequently	7	10.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	64	91.4%
	Frequently	6	8.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	60	85.7%
	Frequently	9	12.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gordon S. Vincent: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	54	78.3%
	Frequently	15	21.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	56	81.2%
	Frequently	12	17.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	60	83.3%
	Good	10	13.9%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	1	1.8%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	54	98.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Tanya Bullock

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 135 completed surveys for Judge Tanya Bullock.

Evaluation of Judge Tanya Bullock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	103	76.3%
	Frequently	28	20.7%
	Some of the Time	4	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	117	86.7%
	Frequently	16	11.9%
	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	115	85.8%
	Frequently	16	11.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	118	87.4%
	Frequently	13	9.6%
	Some of the Time	4	3.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Tanya Bullock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	112	83.0%
	Frequently	19	14.1%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	109	82.6%
	Frequently	21	15.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	118	88.7%
	Frequently	12	9.0%
	Some of the Time	3	2.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	106	79.1%
	Frequently	24	17.9%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	104	78.2%
	Frequently	23	17.3%
	Some of the Time	5	3.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Tanya Bullock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	106	87.6%
	Frequently	13	10.7%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	115	85.2%
	Frequently	15	11.1%
	Some of the Time	4	3.0%
	Rarely	1	0.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	111	82.8%
	Frequently	19	14.2%
	Some of the Time	3	2.2%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	107	81.7%
	Frequently	18	13.7%
	Some of the Time	3	2.3%
	Rarely	3	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	104	77.6%
	Frequently	23	17.2%
	Some of the Time	5	3.7%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Tanya Bullock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	106	79.1%
	Frequently	20	14.9%
	Some of the Time	7	5.2%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	109	82.0%
	Frequently	20	15.0%
	Some of the Time	2	1.5%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	116	87.9%
	Frequently	14	10.6%
	Some of the Time	1	0.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	109	82.6%
	Frequently	18	13.6%
	Some of the Time	4	3.0%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	113	85.0%
	Frequently	14	10.5%
	Some of the Time	5	3.8%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Tanya Bullock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	92	70.2%
	Frequently	33	25.2%
	Some of the Time	4	3.1%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	100	75.2%
	Frequently	25	18.8%
	Some of the Time	6	4.5%
	Rarely	2	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	117	88.6%
	Good	11	8.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	26	24.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	80	75.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Barry G. Logsdon

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

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 103 completed surveys for Judge Barry G. Logsdon.

Evaluation of Judge Barry G. Logsdon: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	62	60.2%
	Frequently	34	33.0%
	Some of the Time	7	6.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	71	69.6%
	Frequently	26	25.5%
	Some of the Time	5	4.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	72	70.6%
	Frequently	22	21.6%
	Some of the Time	7	6.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	73	71.6%
	Frequently	20	19.6%
	Some of the Time	6	5.9%
	Rarely	3	2.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Barry G. Logsdon: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	73	71.6%
	Frequently	18	17.7%
	Some of the Time	10	9.8%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	72	70.6%
	Frequently	26	25.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	78	76.5%
	Frequently	17	16.7%
	Some of the Time	7	6.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	65	63.1%
	Frequently	25	24.3%
	Some of the Time	11	10.7%
	Rarely	2	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	65	64.4%
	Frequently	22	21.8%
	Some of the Time	11	10.9%
	Rarely	3	3.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Barry G. Logsdon: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	75	83.3%
	Frequently	11	12.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.3%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	71	69.6%
	Frequently	25	24.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.9%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	80	78.4%
	Frequently	19	18.6%
	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	60	61.9%
	Frequently	23	23.7%
	Some of the Time	13	13.4%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	63	64.3%
	Frequently	25	25.5%
	Some of the Time	6	6.1%
	Rarely	4	4.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Barry G. Logsdon: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	58	59.2%
	Frequently	32	32.7%
	Some of the Time	5	5.1%
	Rarely	3	3.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	65	63.7%
	Frequently	23	22.6%
	Some of the Time	10	9.8%
	Rarely	4	3.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	65	63.7%
	Frequently	27	26.5%
	Some of the Time	9	8.8%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	65	63.7%
	Frequently	28	27.5%
	Some of the Time	8	7.8%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	67	66.3%
	Frequently	23	22.8%
	Some of the Time	8	7.9%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	1	1.0%

Evaluation of Judge Barry G. Logsdon: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	43	42.6%
	Frequently	27	26.7%
	Some of the Time	16	15.8%
	Rarely	10	9.9%
	Never	5	5.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	47	46.1%
	Frequently	33	32.4%
	Some of the Time	12	11.8%
	Rarely	9	8.8%
	Never	1	1.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	55	53.9%
	Good	34	33.3%
	Needs Improvement	12	11.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	9.9%
	Worse	2	2.2%
	Stayed the Same	80	87.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Wade A. Bowie

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
9th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 85 completed surveys for Judge Wade A. Bowie.

Evaluation of Judge Wade A. Bowie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	29	34.9%
	Frequently	35	42.2%
	Some of the Time	15	18.1%
	Rarely	3	3.6%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	51	60.7%
	Frequently	21	25.0%
	Some of the Time	10	11.9%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	66	78.6%
	Frequently	15	17.9%
	Some of the Time	3	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	68	81.9%
	Frequently	11	13.3%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Wade A. Bowie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	58	69.1%
	Frequently	17	20.2%
	Some of the Time	6	7.1%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	61	73.5%
	Frequently	17	20.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	3	3.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	74	88.1%
	Frequently	8	9.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	63	75.9%
	Frequently	16	19.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	62	75.6%
	Frequently	16	19.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Wade A. Bowie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	63	91.3%
	Frequently	5	7.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	73	86.9%
	Frequently	9	10.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	74	88.1%
	Frequently	9	10.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	49	64.5%
	Frequently	22	29.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	2	2.6%
	Never	1	1.3%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	62	81.6%
	Frequently	12	15.8%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Wade A. Bowie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	64	83.1%
	Frequently	11	14.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	69	82.1%
	Frequently	12	14.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	74	88.1%
	Frequently	9	10.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	75	88.2%
	Frequently	9	10.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	67	80.7%
	Frequently	12	14.5%
	Some of the Time	4	4.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Wade A. Bowie: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	71	83.5%
	Frequently	11	12.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	70	82.4%
	Frequently	12	14.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	2	2.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	62	75.6%
	Good	14	17.1%
	Needs Improvement	5	6.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	24	33.8%
	Worse	2	2.8%
	Stayed the Same	45	63.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Cressondra B. Conyers

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
9th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 72 completed surveys for Judge Cressondra B. Conyers.

Evaluation of Judge Cressondra B. Conyers: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	34	47.9%
	Frequently	25	35.2%
	Some of the Time	11	15.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.4%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	42	59.2%
	Frequently	18	25.4%
	Some of the Time	10	14.1%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	46	63.9%
	Frequently	22	30.6%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	2	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	45	62.5%
	Frequently	22	30.6%
	Some of the Time	4	5.6%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Cressondra B. Conyers: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	46	65.7%
	Frequently	13	18.6%
	Some of the Time	8	11.4%
	Rarely	2	2.9%
	Never	1	1.4%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	49	69.0%
	Frequently	17	23.9%
	Some of the Time	4	5.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.4%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	53	75.7%
	Frequently	14	20.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.9%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	44	61.1%
	Frequently	14	19.4%
	Some of the Time	8	11.1%
	Rarely	4	5.6%
	Never	2	2.8%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	43	59.7%
	Frequently	16	22.2%
	Some of the Time	8	11.1%
	Rarely	3	4.2%
	Never	2	2.8%

Evaluation of Judge Cressondra B. Conyers: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	47	74.6%
	Frequently	4	6.4%
	Some of the Time	9	14.3%
	Rarely	2	3.2%
	Never	1	1.6%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	53	74.7%
	Frequently	16	22.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	52	73.2%
	Frequently	15	21.1%
	Some of the Time	3	4.2%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	37	55.2%
	Frequently	16	23.9%
	Some of the Time	11	16.4%
	Rarely	3	4.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	35	51.5%
	Frequently	15	22.1%
	Some of the Time	12	17.7%
	Rarely	4	5.9%
	Never	2	2.9%

Evaluation of Judge Cressondra B. Conyers: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	38	55.9%
	Frequently	11	16.2%
	Some of the Time	13	19.1%
	Rarely	6	8.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	45	63.4%
	Frequently	13	18.3%
	Some of the Time	9	12.7%
	Rarely	4	5.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	46	64.8%
	Frequently	20	28.2%
	Some of the Time	5	7.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	45	63.4%
	Frequently	18	25.4%
	Some of the Time	5	7.0%
	Rarely	3	4.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	47	66.2%
	Frequently	12	16.9%
	Some of the Time	8	11.3%
	Rarely	2	2.8%
	Never	2	2.8%

Evaluation of Judge Cressondra B. Conyers: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	47	67.1%
	Frequently	18	25.7%
	Some of the Time	5	7.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	37	52.9%
	Frequently	21	30.0%
	Some of the Time	8	11.4%
	Rarely	2	2.9%
	Never	2	2.9%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	42	58.3%
	Good	17	23.6%
	Needs Improvement	10	13.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3	4.2%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	19.3%
	Worse	2	3.5%
	Stayed the Same	44	77.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Valentine W. Southall, Jr.

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
11th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 96 completed surveys for Judge Valentine W. Southall, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Valentine W. Southall, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	21	21.9%
	Frequently	32	33.3%
	Some of the Time	34	35.4%
	Rarely	9	9.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	34	35.4%
	Frequently	26	27.1%
	Some of the Time	31	32.3%
	Rarely	4	4.2%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	43	45.3%
	Frequently	31	32.6%
	Some of the Time	18	19.0%
	Rarely	3	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	46	47.9%
	Frequently	29	30.2%
	Some of the Time	16	16.7%
	Rarely	5	5.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Valentine W. Southall, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	33	34.4%
	Frequently	28	29.2%
	Some of the Time	24	25.0%
	Rarely	9	9.4%
	Never	2	2.1%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	54	56.8%
	Frequently	30	31.6%
	Some of the Time	10	10.5%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	48	50.0%
	Frequently	24	25.0%
	Some of the Time	20	20.8%
	Rarely	4	4.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	36	37.5%
	Frequently	26	27.1%
	Some of the Time	28	29.2%
	Rarely	6	6.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	39	41.1%
	Frequently	22	23.2%
	Some of the Time	26	27.4%
	Rarely	8	8.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Valentine W. Southall, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	54	68.4%
	Frequently	18	22.8%
	Some of the Time	4	5.1%
	Rarely	3	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	68	70.8%
	Frequently	23	24.0%
	Some of the Time	5	5.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	66	68.8%
	Frequently	25	26.0%
	Some of the Time	4	4.2%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	37	41.1%
	Frequently	15	16.7%
	Some of the Time	28	31.1%
	Rarely	8	8.9%
	Never	2	2.2%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	43	47.8%
	Frequently	31	34.4%
	Some of the Time	14	15.6%
	Rarely	2	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Valentine W. Southall, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	42	46.7%
	Frequently	25	27.8%
	Some of the Time	19	21.1%
	Rarely	4	4.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	40	41.7%
	Frequently	33	34.4%
	Some of the Time	14	14.6%
	Rarely	8	8.3%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	57	59.4%
	Frequently	29	30.2%
	Some of the Time	10	10.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	51	53.7%
	Frequently	27	28.4%
	Some of the Time	13	13.7%
	Rarely	3	3.2%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	50	53.2%
	Frequently	17	18.1%
	Some of the Time	18	19.2%
	Rarely	9	9.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Valentine W. Southall, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	38	40.0%
	Frequently	23	24.2%
	Some of the Time	20	21.1%
	Rarely	9	9.5%
	Never	5	5.3%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	43	44.8%
	Frequently	33	34.4%
	Some of the Time	10	10.4%
	Rarely	8	8.3%
	Never	2	2.1%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	36	37.9%
	Good	25	26.3%
	Needs Improvement	29	30.5%
	Unsatisfactory	5	5.3%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	4.4%
	Worse	4	4.4%
	Stayed the Same	82	91.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable J. David Rigler

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
12th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 86 completed surveys for Judge J. David Rigler.

Evaluation of Judge J. David Rigler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	33	38.4%
	Frequently	30	34.9%
	Some of the Time	21	24.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	42	48.8%
	Frequently	29	33.7%
	Some of the Time	12	14.0%
	Rarely	3	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	60	69.8%
	Frequently	21	24.4%
	Some of the Time	5	5.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	61	70.9%
	Frequently	20	23.3%
	Some of the Time	5	5.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. David Rigler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	47	54.7%
	Frequently	25	29.1%
	Some of the Time	13	15.1%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	62	73.8%
	Frequently	20	23.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	63	73.3%
	Frequently	21	24.4%
	Some of the Time	2	2.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	53	61.6%
	Frequently	23	26.7%
	Some of the Time	10	11.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	53	61.6%
	Frequently	23	26.7%
	Some of the Time	9	10.5%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. David Rigler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	59	83.1%
	Frequently	11	15.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	69	80.2%
	Frequently	16	18.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	65	76.5%
	Frequently	19	22.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	43	51.8%
	Frequently	29	34.9%
	Some of the Time	10	12.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.2%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	54	64.3%
	Frequently	24	28.6%
	Some of the Time	5	6.0%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. David Rigler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	51	61.5%
	Frequently	24	28.9%
	Some of the Time	7	8.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	56	65.1%
	Frequently	26	30.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	64	75.3%
	Frequently	21	24.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	63	73.3%
	Frequently	19	22.1%
	Some of the Time	4	4.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	53	63.9%
	Frequently	27	32.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.4%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge J. David Rigler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	58	69.1%
	Frequently	22	26.2%
	Some of the Time	3	3.6%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	60	71.4%
	Frequently	18	21.4%
	Some of the Time	6	7.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	47	55.3%
	Good	30	35.3%
	Needs Improvement	7	8.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	13.7%
	Worse	3	4.1%
	Stayed the Same	60	82.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Ashley K. Tunner

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
13th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 94 completed surveys for Judge Ashley K. Tunner.

Evaluation of Judge Ashley K. Tunner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	51	54.3%
	Frequently	28	29.8%
	Some of the Time	13	13.8%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	69	73.4%
	Frequently	18	19.2%
	Some of the Time	5	5.3%
	Rarely	2	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	72	78.3%
	Frequently	15	16.3%
	Some of the Time	5	5.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent 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%

Evaluation of Judge Ashley K. Tunner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	67	71.3%
	Frequently	17	18.1%
	Some of the Time	7	7.5%
	Rarely	3	3.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	75	79.8%
	Frequently	14	14.9%
	Some of the Time	4	4.3%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	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 exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	69	74.2%
	Frequently	16	17.2%
	Some of the Time	8	8.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	66	71.7%
	Frequently	17	18.5%
	Some of the Time	7	7.6%
	Rarely	2	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Ashley K. Tunner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	68	81.9%
	Frequently	15	18.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	74	81.3%
	Frequently	15	16.5%
	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	76	82.6%
	Frequently	12	13.0%
	Some of the Time	4	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	61	66.3%
	Frequently	20	21.7%
	Some of the Time	8	8.7%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	71	78.9%
	Frequently	14	15.6%
	Some of the Time	5	5.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Ashley K. Tunner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	69	75.8%
	Frequently	13	14.3%
	Some of the Time	8	8.8%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	75	80.7%
	Frequently	15	16.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	70	78.7%
	Frequently	17	19.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	75	81.5%
	Frequently	15	16.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	69	75.0%
	Frequently	15	16.3%
	Some of the Time	6	6.5%
	Rarely	2	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Ashley K. Tunner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	44	47.8%
	Frequently	32	34.8%
	Some of the Time	10	10.9%
	Rarely	6	6.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	66	71.7%
	Frequently	18	19.6%
	Some of the Time	5	5.4%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	69	75.8%
	Good	13	14.3%
	Needs Improvement	7	7.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.2%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	11.1%
	Worse	4	4.9%
	Stayed the Same	68	84.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Margaret W. Deglau

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
14th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 81 completed surveys for Judge Margaret W. Deglau.

Evaluation of Judge Margaret W. Deglau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	35	43.2%
	Frequently	34	42.0%
	Some of the Time	11	13.6%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	42	52.5%
	Frequently	32	40.0%
	Some of the Time	5	6.3%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	58	72.5%
	Frequently	16	20.0%
	Some of the Time	6	7.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	59	73.8%
	Frequently	15	18.8%
	Some of the Time	6	7.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Margaret W. Deglau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	47	58.0%
	Frequently	24	29.6%
	Some of the Time	7	8.6%
	Rarely	3	3.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	57	71.3%
	Frequently	20	25.0%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	62	76.5%
	Frequently	14	17.3%
	Some of the Time	4	4.9%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	48	59.3%
	Frequently	23	28.4%
	Some of the Time	7	8.6%
	Rarely	3	3.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	44	54.3%
	Frequently	25	30.9%
	Some of the Time	8	9.9%
	Rarely	4	4.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Margaret W. Deglau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	49	69.0%
	Frequently	16	22.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	4	5.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	66	81.5%
	Frequently	13	16.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	67	82.7%
	Frequently	12	14.8%
	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	48	61.5%
	Frequently	18	23.1%
	Some of the Time	9	11.5%
	Rarely	3	3.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	59	74.7%
	Frequently	17	21.5%
	Some of the Time	2	2.5%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Margaret W. Deglau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	54	68.4%
	Frequently	19	24.1%
	Some of the Time	3	3.8%
	Rarely	3	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	60	75.0%
	Frequently	14	17.5%
	Some of the Time	3	3.8%
	Rarely	3	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	64	79.0%
	Frequently	16	19.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	61	75.3%
	Frequently	17	21.0%
	Some of the Time	3	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	48	60.0%
	Frequently	19	23.8%
	Some of the Time	10	12.5%
	Rarely	3	3.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Margaret W. Deglau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	39	48.8%
	Frequently	27	33.8%
	Some of the Time	8	10.0%
	Rarely	6	7.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	47	58.0%
	Frequently	25	30.9%
	Some of the Time	9	11.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	47	58.0%
	Good	27	33.3%
	Needs Improvement	5	6.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.5%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	8.5%
	Worse	1	1.4%
	Stayed the Same	64	90.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Rondelle D. Herman

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
14th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 90 completed surveys for Judge Rondelle D. Herman.

Evaluation of Judge Rondelle D. Herman: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	31	34.4%
	Frequently	35	38.9%
	Some of the Time	22	24.4%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	36	40.5%
	Frequently	29	32.6%
	Some of the Time	21	23.6%
	Rarely	3	3.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	55	61.1%
	Frequently	20	22.2%
	Some of the Time	13	14.4%
	Rarely	2	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	54	60.0%
	Frequently	25	27.8%
	Some of the Time	10	11.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Rondelle D. Herman: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	41	45.6%
	Frequently	22	24.4%
	Some of the Time	23	25.6%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	55	63.2%
	Frequently	26	29.9%
	Some of the Time	4	4.6%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	56	62.2%
	Frequently	26	28.9%
	Some of the Time	6	6.7%
	Rarely	2	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	44	48.9%
	Frequently	25	27.8%
	Some of the Time	18	20.0%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	2	2.2%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	41	46.6%
	Frequently	28	31.8%
	Some of the Time	15	17.1%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	3	3.4%

Evaluation of Judge Rondelle D. Herman: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	49	62.0%
	Frequently	17	21.5%
	Some of the Time	9	11.4%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	3	3.8%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	61	67.8%
	Frequently	23	25.6%
	Some of the Time	6	6.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	65	72.2%
	Frequently	20	22.2%
	Some of the Time	4	4.4%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	50	57.5%
	Frequently	27	31.0%
	Some of the Time	7	8.1%
	Rarely	3	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	51	58.6%
	Frequently	26	29.9%
	Some of the Time	8	9.2%
	Rarely	1	1.2%
	Never	1	1.2%

Evaluation of Judge Rondelle D. Herman: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	50	56.8%
	Frequently	22	25.0%
	Some of the Time	14	15.9%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	1	1.1%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	49	54.4%
	Frequently	25	27.8%
	Some of the Time	12	13.3%
	Rarely	4	4.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	65	73.0%
	Frequently	19	21.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.4%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	55	62.5%
	Frequently	24	27.3%
	Some of the Time	7	8.0%
	Rarely	2	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	48	53.3%
	Frequently	22	24.4%
	Some of the Time	14	15.6%
	Rarely	3	3.3%
	Never	3	3.3%

Evaluation of Judge Rondelle D. Herman: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	44	49.4%
	Frequently	24	27.0%
	Some of the Time	13	14.6%
	Rarely	8	9.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	45	50.6%
	Frequently	25	28.1%
	Some of the Time	12	13.5%
	Rarely	7	7.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	43	49.4%
	Good	25	28.7%
	Needs Improvement	15	17.2%
	Unsatisfactory	4	4.6%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	15.5%
	Worse	2	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	69	82.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Randall G. Johnson, Jr.

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
14th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 Randall G. Johnson, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	101	84.2%
	Frequently	14	11.7%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	107	89.2%
	Frequently	11	9.2%
	Some of the Time	2	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	97	81.5%
	Frequently	13	10.9%
	Some of the Time	9	7.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	94	78.3%
	Frequently	16	13.3%
	Some of the Time	9	7.5%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	103	86.6%
	Frequently	9	7.6%
	Some of the Time	7	5.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	98	83.1%
	Frequently	17	14.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	98	81.7%
	Frequently	17	14.2%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	97	80.8%
	Frequently	12	10.0%
	Some of the Time	11	9.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	97	81.5%
	Frequently	14	11.8%
	Some of the Time	7	5.9%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	87	80.6%
	Frequently	17	15.7%
	Some of the Time	4	3.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	98	83.1%
	Frequently	16	13.6%
	Some of the Time	4	3.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	102	85.0%
	Frequently	15	12.5%
	Some of the Time	3	2.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	90	76.3%
	Frequently	18	15.3%
	Some of the Time	9	7.6%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	81	68.1%
	Frequently	26	21.9%
	Some of the Time	5	4.2%
	Rarely	7	5.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	90	75.0%
	Frequently	16	13.3%
	Some of the Time	8	6.7%
	Rarely	6	5.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	85	70.8%
	Frequently	24	20.0%
	Some of the Time	8	6.7%
	Rarely	3	2.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	94	78.3%
	Frequently	21	17.5%
	Some of the Time	4	3.3%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	84	70.6%
	Frequently	24	20.2%
	Some of the Time	10	8.4%
	Rarely	1	0.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	99	82.5%
	Frequently	13	10.8%
	Some of the Time	6	5.0%
	Rarely	2	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	61	51.7%
	Frequently	39	33.1%
	Some of the Time	10	8.5%
	Rarely	7	5.9%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	66	55.5%
	Frequently	32	26.9%
	Some of the Time	15	12.6%
	Rarely	5	4.2%
	Never	1	0.8%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	82	70.1%
	Good	20	17.1%
	Needs Improvement	12	10.3%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.6%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	9.1%
	Worse	2	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	98	89.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Frank W. Somerville

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
16th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 78 completed surveys for Judge Frank W. Somerville.

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Somerville: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	56	71.8%
	Frequently	21	26.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	63	81.8%
	Frequently	11	14.3%
	Some of the Time	3	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	62	79.5%
	Frequently	9	11.5%
	Some of the Time	6	7.7%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	59	76.6%
	Frequently	11	14.3%
	Some of the Time	6	7.8%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Somerville: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	62	79.5%
	Frequently	8	10.3%
	Some of the Time	8	10.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	48	63.2%
	Frequently	14	18.4%
	Some of the Time	10	13.2%
	Rarely	4	5.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	63	80.8%
	Frequently	12	15.4%
	Some of the Time	3	3.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	58	74.4%
	Frequently	11	14.1%
	Some of the Time	7	9.0%
	Rarely	2	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	58	74.4%
	Frequently	10	12.8%
	Some of the Time	7	9.0%
	Rarely	3	3.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Somerville: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	55	83.3%
	Frequently	10	15.2%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	45	60.0%
	Frequently	22	29.3%
	Some of the Time	6	8.0%
	Rarely	2	2.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	53	68.0%
	Frequently	14	18.0%
	Some of the Time	8	10.3%
	Rarely	2	2.6%
	Never	1	1.3%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	49	71.0%
	Frequently	12	17.4%
	Some of the Time	7	10.1%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	56	80.0%
	Frequently	10	14.3%
	Some of the Time	4	5.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Somerville: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	52	75.4%
	Frequently	7	10.1%
	Some of the Time	7	10.1%
	Rarely	3	4.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	59	75.6%
	Frequently	14	18.0%
	Some of the Time	5	6.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	61	79.2%
	Frequently	11	14.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.3%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	3	3.9%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	58	75.3%
	Frequently	11	14.3%
	Some of the Time	7	9.1%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	60	79.0%
	Frequently	8	10.5%
	Some of the Time	6	7.9%
	Rarely	2	2.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Somerville: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	48	64.0%
	Frequently	21	28.0%
	Some of the Time	5	6.7%
	Rarely	1	1.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	42	53.9%
	Frequently	22	28.2%
	Some of the Time	5	6.4%
	Rarely	8	10.3%
	Never	1	1.3%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	60	79.0%
	Good	7	9.2%
	Needs Improvement	6	7.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3	4.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	4.3%
	Worse	4	5.7%
	Stayed the Same	63	90.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gayl Branum Carr

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
19th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 102 completed surveys for Judge Gayl Branum Carr.

Evaluation of Judge Gayl Branum Carr: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	38	37.3%
	Frequently	39	38.2%
	Some of the Time	20	19.6%
	Rarely	4	3.9%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	40	39.2%
	Frequently	38	37.3%
	Some of the Time	19	18.6%
	Rarely	5	4.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	69	67.7%
	Frequently	26	25.5%
	Some of the Time	6	5.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	72	70.6%
	Frequently	22	21.6%
	Some of the Time	7	6.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gayl Branum Carr: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	45	44.1%
	Frequently	33	32.4%
	Some of the Time	15	14.7%
	Rarely	8	7.8%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	65	64.4%
	Frequently	30	29.7%
	Some of the Time	4	4.0%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	73	71.6%
	Frequently	20	19.6%
	Some of the Time	7	6.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	60	58.8%
	Frequently	24	23.5%
	Some of the Time	14	13.7%
	Rarely	4	3.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	59	57.8%
	Frequently	22	21.6%
	Some of the Time	16	15.7%
	Rarely	5	4.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gayl Branum Carr: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	78	85.7%
	Frequently	12	13.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	85	83.3%
	Frequently	15	14.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	81	79.4%
	Frequently	18	17.7%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	50	49.5%
	Frequently	28	27.7%
	Some of the Time	20	19.8%
	Rarely	3	3.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	65	65.0%
	Frequently	26	26.0%
	Some of the Time	9	9.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gayl Branum Carr: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	61	61.0%
	Frequently	30	30.0%
	Some of the Time	9	9.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	54	52.9%
	Frequently	33	32.4%
	Some of the Time	11	10.8%
	Rarely	4	3.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	74	74.0%
	Frequently	26	26.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	68	67.3%
	Frequently	24	23.8%
	Some of the Time	8	7.9%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	64	64.0%
	Frequently	20	20.0%
	Some of the Time	12	12.0%
	Rarely	3	3.0%
	Never	1	1.0%

Evaluation of Judge Gayl Branum Carr: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	59	58.4%
	Frequently	29	28.7%
	Some of the Time	10	9.9%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	64	62.8%
	Frequently	27	26.5%
	Some of the Time	8	7.8%
	Rarely	2	2.0%
	Never	1	1.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	52.1%
	Good	28	29.2%
	Needs Improvement	15	15.6%
	Unsatisfactory	3	3.1%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	13.1%
	Worse	2	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	71	84.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Glenn L. Clayton, II

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
19th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 Glenn L. Clayton, II.

Evaluation of Judge Glenn L. Clayton, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	55	47.0%
	Frequently	44	37.6%
	Some of the Time	17	14.5%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	68	58.1%
	Frequently	34	29.1%
	Some of the Time	10	8.6%
	Rarely	5	4.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	65	56.0%
	Frequently	40	34.5%
	Some of the Time	10	8.6%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	67	58.8%
	Frequently	38	33.3%
	Some of the Time	9	7.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Glenn L. Clayton, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	68	58.1%
	Frequently	31	26.5%
	Some of the Time	14	12.0%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	69	61.1%
	Frequently	38	33.6%
	Some of the Time	5	4.4%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	73	62.4%
	Frequently	35	29.9%
	Some of the Time	9	7.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	60	51.7%
	Frequently	38	32.8%
	Some of the Time	17	14.7%
	Rarely	1	0.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	62	54.4%
	Frequently	27	23.7%
	Some of the Time	21	18.4%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Glenn L. Clayton, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	78	79.6%
	Frequently	17	17.4%
	Some of the Time	2	2.0%
	Rarely	1	1.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	81	71.1%
	Frequently	27	23.7%
	Some of the Time	6	5.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	78	67.8%
	Frequently	31	27.0%
	Some of the Time	6	5.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	55	49.6%
	Frequently	40	36.0%
	Some of the Time	12	10.8%
	Rarely	4	3.6%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	55	49.6%
	Frequently	35	31.5%
	Some of the Time	17	15.3%
	Rarely	4	3.6%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Glenn L. Clayton, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	49	44.1%
	Frequently	40	36.0%
	Some of the Time	19	17.1%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	63	54.8%
	Frequently	34	29.6%
	Some of the Time	14	12.2%
	Rarely	4	3.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	79	69.9%
	Frequently	31	27.4%
	Some of the Time	3	2.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	71	62.3%
	Frequently	31	27.2%
	Some of the Time	12	10.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	62	56.4%
	Frequently	30	27.3%
	Some of the Time	16	14.6%
	Rarely	2	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Glenn L. Clayton, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	56	48.3%
	Frequently	43	37.1%
	Some of the Time	13	11.2%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	1	0.9%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	57	50.0%
	Frequently	42	36.8%
	Some of the Time	11	9.7%
	Rarely	3	2.6%
	Never	1	0.9%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	56	48.3%
	Good	40	34.5%
	Needs Improvement	19	16.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	7.4%
	Worse	1	1.1%
	Stayed the Same	87	91.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Sarah A. Rice

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
22nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 47 completed surveys for Judge Sarah A. Rice.

Evaluation of Judge Sarah A. Rice: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	22	46.8%
	Frequently	24	51.1%
	Some of the Time	1	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	27	57.5%
	Frequently	20	42.6%
	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	34	73.9%
	Frequently	12	26.1%
	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	37	78.7%
	Frequently	10	21.3%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sarah A. Rice: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	33	70.2%
	Frequently	12	25.5%
	Some of the Time	2	4.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	33	71.7%
	Frequently	11	23.9%
	Some of the Time	2	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	42	91.3%
	Frequently	4	8.7%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	31	66.0%
	Frequently	13	27.7%
	Some of the Time	2	4.3%
	Rarely	1	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	33	71.7%
	Frequently	10	21.7%
	Some of the Time	2	4.4%
	Rarely	1	2.2%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sarah A. Rice: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	36	83.7%
	Frequently	6	14.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	2.3%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	39	83.0%
	Frequently	7	14.9%
	Some of the Time	1	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	40	87.0%
	Frequently	5	10.9%
	Some of the Time	1	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	32	69.6%
	Frequently	13	28.3%
	Some of the Time	1	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	36	78.3%
	Frequently	9	19.6%
	Some of the Time	1	2.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sarah A. Rice: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	33	71.7%
	Frequently	9	19.6%
	Some of the Time	4	8.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	36	76.6%
	Frequently	11	23.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	38	80.9%
	Frequently	9	19.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	40	85.1%
	Frequently	7	14.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	32	68.1%
	Frequently	9	19.2%
	Some of the Time	5	10.6%
	Rarely	1	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Sarah A. Rice: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	28	59.6%
	Frequently	18	38.3%
	Some of the Time	1	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	31	66.0%
	Frequently	14	29.8%
	Some of the Time	2	4.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	33	71.7%
	Good	12	26.1%
	Needs Improvement	1	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	4.8%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	40	95.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Brian H. Turpin

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
22nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 59 completed surveys for Judge Brian H. Turpin.

Evaluation of Judge Brian H. Turpin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	41	69.5%
	Frequently	17	28.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	51	86.4%
	Frequently	7	11.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	50	84.8%
	Frequently	9	15.3%
	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	51	86.4%
	Frequently	8	13.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Brian H. Turpin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	51	86.4%
	Frequently	6	10.2%
	Some of the Time	2	3.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	47	81.0%
	Frequently	8	13.8%
	Some of the Time	2	3.5%
	Rarely	1	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	50	84.8%
	Frequently	8	13.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	49	83.1%
	Frequently	9	15.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	52	88.1%
	Frequently	6	10.2%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Brian H. Turpin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	49	89.1%
	Frequently	5	9.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	52	88.1%
	Frequently	7	11.9%
	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	50	84.8%
	Frequently	8	13.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	44	77.2%
	Frequently	12	21.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	48	84.2%
	Frequently	7	12.3%
	Some of the Time	2	3.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Brian H. Turpin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	48	84.2%
	Frequently	6	10.5%
	Some of the Time	3	5.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	48	81.4%
	Frequently	10	17.0%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	52	88.1%
	Frequently	7	11.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	50	84.8%
	Frequently	8	13.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	51	86.4%
	Frequently	7	11.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.7%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Brian H. Turpin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	41	69.5%
	Frequently	15	25.4%
	Some of the Time	3	5.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	45	76.3%
	Frequently	12	20.3%
	Some of the Time	2	3.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	52	88.1%
	Good	6	10.2%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	13.7%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	44	86.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable H. Cary Payne

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
24th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 69 completed surveys for Judge H. Cary Payne.

Evaluation of Judge H. Cary Payne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	50	72.5%
	Frequently	15	21.7%
	Some of the Time	4	5.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	53	76.8%
	Frequently	15	21.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	59	86.8%
	Frequently	7	10.3%
	Some of the Time	2	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	56	81.2%
	Frequently	11	15.9%
	Some of the Time	2	2.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Cary Payne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	58	84.1%
	Frequently	7	10.1%
	Some of the Time	4	5.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	52	75.4%
	Frequently	13	18.8%
	Some of the Time	4	5.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	60	87.0%
	Frequently	8	11.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	51	75.0%
	Frequently	9	13.2%
	Some of the Time	8	11.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	53	76.8%
	Frequently	8	11.6%
	Some of the Time	8	11.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Cary Payne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	52	82.5%
	Frequently	9	14.3%
	Some of the Time	2	3.2%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	53	77.9%
	Frequently	14	20.6%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	54	79.4%
	Frequently	13	19.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	50	74.6%
	Frequently	13	19.4%
	Some of the Time	4	6.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	49	72.1%
	Frequently	13	19.1%
	Some of the Time	5	7.4%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Cary Payne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	48	70.6%
	Frequently	13	19.1%
	Some of the Time	6	8.8%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	56	83.6%
	Frequently	8	11.9%
	Some of the Time	3	4.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	61	89.7%
	Frequently	6	8.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	53	77.9%
	Frequently	12	17.7%
	Some of the Time	3	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	53	77.9%
	Frequently	6	8.8%
	Some of the Time	7	10.3%
	Rarely	2	2.9%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Cary Payne: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	43	64.2%
	Frequently	18	26.9%
	Some of the Time	5	7.5%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	44	66.7%
	Frequently	20	30.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.5%
	Rarely	1	1.5%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	53	77.9%
	Good	9	13.2%
	Needs Improvement	6	8.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	15.9%
	Worse	1	1.6%
	Stayed the Same	52	82.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable H. Lee Chitwood

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
27th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 72 completed surveys for Judge H. Lee Chitwood.

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Chitwood: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	51	70.8%
	Frequently	17	23.6%
	Some of the Time	4	5.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	63	87.5%
	Frequently	9	12.5%
	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	65	90.3%
	Frequently	6	8.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	64	90.1%
	Frequently	7	9.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Chitwood: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	59	81.9%
	Frequently	12	16.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	61	87.1%
	Frequently	9	12.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	64	88.9%
	Frequently	8	11.1%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	55	76.4%
	Frequently	13	18.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	2	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	60	83.3%
	Frequently	8	11.1%
	Some of the Time	2	2.8%
	Rarely	2	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Chitwood: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	63	92.7%
	Frequently	5	7.4%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	66	91.7%
	Frequently	5	6.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	66	91.7%
	Frequently	5	6.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	49	70.0%
	Frequently	18	25.7%
	Some of the Time	3	4.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	60	84.5%
	Frequently	9	12.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Chitwood: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	58	81.7%
	Frequently	11	15.5%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	58	80.6%
	Frequently	12	16.7%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	63	87.5%
	Frequently	9	12.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	59	81.9%
	Frequently	11	15.3%
	Some of the Time	1	1.4%
	Rarely	1	1.4%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	57	80.3%
	Frequently	8	11.3%
	Some of the Time	4	5.6%
	Rarely	2	2.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Chitwood: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	64	90.1%
	Frequently	7	9.9%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	65	91.6%
	Frequently	6	8.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	59	83.1%
	Good	9	12.7%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.4%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	1	1.6%
	Worse	1	1.6%
	Stayed the Same	62	96.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Monica D. Cox

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
27th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2017



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.

Beginning in 2017, bailiffs were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The bailiff and court staff surveys contain 19 of the 23 factors. The 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 56 completed surveys for Judge Monica D. Cox.

Evaluation of Judge Monica D. Cox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge displays patience in the courtroom	Every Time	29	51.8%
	Frequently	21	37.5%
	Some of the Time	6	10.7%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is courteous in the courtroom	Every Time	33	58.9%
	Frequently	19	33.9%
	Some of the Time	4	7.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	40	71.4%
	Frequently	14	25.0%
	Some of the Time	2	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	Every Time	40	71.4%
	Frequently	14	25.0%
	Some of the Time	2	3.6%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Monica D. Cox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge shows respect for all court participants	Every Time	37	66.1%
	Frequently	14	25.0%
	Some of the Time	5	8.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	Every Time	36	67.9%
	Frequently	16	30.2%
	Some of the Time	1	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is attentive to the proceedings	Every Time	41	74.6%
	Frequently	14	25.5%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	Every Time	40	72.7%
	Frequently	11	20.0%
	Some of the Time	4	7.3%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	Every Time	36	65.5%
	Frequently	13	23.6%
	Some of the Time	6	10.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Monica D. Cox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge avoids inappropriate ex parte communications	Every Time	35	77.8%
	Frequently	8	17.8%
	Some of the Time	2	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge maintains order in the courtroom	Every Time	42	76.4%
	Frequently	12	21.8%
	Some of the Time	1	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	Every Time	43	78.2%
	Frequently	11	20.0%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	Every Time	34	73.9%
	Frequently	10	21.7%
	Some of the Time	2	4.4%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge displays knowledge of the law	Every Time	33	68.8%
	Frequently	13	27.1%
	Some of the Time	1	2.1%
	Rarely	1	2.1%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Monica D. Cox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge is faithful to the law	Every Time	29	60.4%
	Frequently	18	37.5%
	Some of the Time	1	2.1%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge communicates effectively	Every Time	38	69.1%
	Frequently	16	29.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.8%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	Every Time	40	75.5%
	Frequently	12	22.6%
	Some of the Time	0	0.0%
	Rarely	1	1.9%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge's decisions are clear	Every Time	40	74.1%
	Frequently	13	24.1%
	Some of the Time	1	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	Every Time	37	67.3%
	Frequently	12	21.8%
	Some of the Time	5	9.1%
	Rarely	1	1.8%
	Never	0	0.0%

Evaluation of Judge Monica D. Cox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
The judge starts court on time	Every Time	36	69.2%
	Frequently	15	28.9%
	Some of the Time	1	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	0	0.0%
The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	Every Time	41	75.9%
	Frequently	11	20.4%
	Some of the Time	1	1.9%
	Rarely	0	0.0%
	Never	1	1.9%
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	37	67.3%
	Good	15	27.3%
	Needs Improvement	3	5.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	17.3%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	43	82.7%