

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

November 30, 2018

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 Robert B. Bell, 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 Bell:

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, which, as you know, are used for self-improvement purposes and “shall not be disclosed” pursuant to paragraph C of the aforesaid statute.

The report for each circuit court judge includes, as an addendum, the information provided by the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission as required in Va. Code § 17.1-100(A) as amended in 2018.

Circuit Court Judges

1. Honorable Glenn R. Croshaw, 2nd Circuit
2. Honorable W. Revell Lewis, III, 2nd Circuit
3. Honorable Everett A. Martin, Jr., 4th Circuit
4. Honorable Carl Edward Eason, Jr., 5th Circuit
5. Honorable C. Peter Tench, 7th Circuit
6. Honorable Christopher W. Hutton, 8th Circuit
7. Honorable Paul W. Cella, 11th Circuit
8. Honorable Bradley B. Cavedo, 13th Circuit
9. Honorable James Stephen Yoffy, 14th Circuit
10. Honorable Sarah L. Deneke, 15th Circuit
11. Honorable Timothy K. Sanner, 16th Circuit
12. Honorable James C. Clark, 18th Circuit
13. Honorable Randy I. Bellows, 19th Circuit
14. Honorable F. Patrick Yeatts, 24th Circuit
15. Honorable Brett L. Geisler, 27th Circuit
16. Honorable Chadwick S. Dotson, 30th Circuit
17. Honorable John C. Kilgore, 30th Circuit

General District Court Judges

18. Honorable C. Ridley Bain, 6th District
19. Honorable Stephen Ashton Hudgins, 9th District
20. Honorable Keith Nelson Hurley, 12th District
21. Honorable Tracy W. J. Thorne-Begland, 13th District
22. Honorable Lawrence B. Cann, III, 13th District
23. Honorable George Barton Chucker, 14th District
24. Honorable Hugh S. Campbell, 15th District
25. Honorable J. Bruce Strickland, 15th District
26. Honorable R. Frances O'Brien, 17th District
27. Honorable William Harrison Cleaveland, 25th District
28. Honorable Eric R. Thiessen, 28th District
29. Honorable Henry A. Barringer, 29th District

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges

30. Honorable Alotha C. Willis, 3rd District
31. Honorable Lauri D. Hogge, 4th District
32. Honorable Carson E. Saunders, Jr., 6th District
33. Honorable Jay Edward Dugger, 8th District
34. Honorable Robert B. Wilson, V, 8th District
35. Honorable Robert H. Morrison, 10th District
36. Honorable Phillip T. DiStanislao, 11th District
37. Honorable Richard B. Campbell, 13th District
38. Honorable Phillip U. Fines, 15th District
39. Honorable Joseph A. Vance, IV, 15th District

The Honorable Mark D. Obenshain, Chairman
The Honorable Robert B. Bell, Chairman
November 30, 2018
Page 3

- 40. Honorable Claude V. Worrell, 16th District
- 41. Honorable Kimberly J. Daniel, 19th District
- 42. Honorable Avelina S. Jacob, 20th District
- 43. Honorable Susan N. Deatherage, 21st District
- 44. Honorable Leisa K. Ciaffone, 23rd District
- 45. Honorable William W. Sharp, 26th District
- 46. Honorable Elizabeth S. Wills, 30th District
- 47. Honorable Lisa Michelle Baird, 31st 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 'K 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 – 2018

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and "shall not be disclosed" by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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 and court reporters who served in their courtrooms. Some judges had few of these respondents; others had several. A few judges did not have any bailiffs surveyed because the local sheriff did not provide contact information for bailiffs. Some judges had no court reporters surveyed because the JPE Program was not able to identify any court reporters who worked in the judge's courtroom.
 - 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 **12 months**.
- 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 Glenn R. Croshaw

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 150 completed surveys for Judge Glenn R. Croshaw.

Evaluation of Judge Glenn R. Croshaw: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	79.3% 119	18.7% 28	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.0% 132	11.3% 17	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.5% 121	13.1% 19	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.2% 114	17.4% 25	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	85.3% 128	12.7% 19	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.5% 128	12.8% 19	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.7% 133	10.7% 16	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.0% 120	15.3% 23	3.3% 5	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.0% 117	17.3% 26	3.3% 5	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.3% 101	11.1% 13	0.9% 1	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.8% 127	9.8% 14	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.5% 131	10.1% 15	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.0% 104	21.5% 29	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	73.5% 100	21.3% 29	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	75.7% 103	19.1% 26	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.5% 121	13.8% 20	1.4% 2	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.9% 112	17.6% 25	2.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.6% 126	12.1% 18	2.0% 3	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.8% 124	12.2% 18	2.7% 4	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	73.3% 107	24.0% 35	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.4% 119	16.9% 25	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.7% 1

Evaluation of Judge Glenn R. Croshaw: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	123	82.6%
	Good	23	15.4%
	Needs Improvement	2	1.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	11.2%
	Worse	2	1.6%
	Stayed the Same	109	87.2%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Glenn R. Croshaw
2nd Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	33	7	0
2012	102	27	0
2013	171	45	0
2014	166	32	0
2015	191	43	0
2016	122	25	0
2017	164	35	0
2018	75	16	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable W. Revell Lewis, III

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 131 completed surveys for Judge W. Revell Lewis, III.

Evaluation of Judge W. Revell Lewis, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	70.2% 92	22.9% 30	4.6% 6	1.5% 2	0.8% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.5% 106	13.1% 17	3.1% 4	1.5% 2	0.8% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.4% 103	12.0% 15	2.4% 3	2.4% 3	0.8% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.8% 99	15.3% 19	2.4% 3	1.6% 2	0.8% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.2% 109	12.2% 16	2.3% 3	0.0% 0	2.3% 3
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.6% 102	16.0% 20	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.8% 105	16.2% 21	1.5% 2	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.7% 101	13.9% 18	5.4% 7	1.5% 2	1.5% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.5% 100	15.5% 20	3.9% 5	0.8% 1	2.3% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.5% 83	11.5% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.0% 105	16.0% 20	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.2% 112	13.9% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	71.8% 79	24.6% 27	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.2% 79	21.6% 24	6.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	78.2% 86	13.6% 15	7.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	75.6% 96	20.5% 26	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	77.8% 98	19.1% 24	1.6% 2	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.4% 98	20.0% 26	3.9% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.9% 101	15.6% 20	2.3% 3	0.8% 1	2.3% 3
20. The judge starts court on time	66.4% 83	29.6% 37	2.4% 3	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.9% 100	20.0% 26	2.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.8% 1

Evaluation of Judge W. Revell Lewis, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	95	75.4%
	Good	24	19.1%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	4	3.2%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15	16.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	78	83.9%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable W. Revell Lewis, III
2nd Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	23	10	0
2012	86	44	0
2013	101	42	0
2014	119	36	0
2015	96	36	0
2016	103	40	0
2017	112	47	0
2018	46	20	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Everett A. Martin, Jr.

Judge of the Circuit Court
4th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 167 completed surveys for Judge Everett A. Martin, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Everett A. Martin, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	44.6% 74	36.1% 60	15.1% 25	3.0% 5	1.2% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	54.5% 91	29.9% 50	12.6% 21	2.4% 4	0.6% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.3% 119	17.3% 26	2.0% 3	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.0% 120	16.7% 25	2.0% 3	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	64.7% 108	22.2% 37	9.0% 15	3.6% 6	0.6% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.3% 130	13.9% 22	3.2% 5	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.8% 140	13.2% 22	3.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	73.3% 121	17.6% 29	6.7% 11	1.8% 3	0.6% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.7% 119	21.7% 36	4.8% 8	1.2% 2	0.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.6% 97	12.1% 14	2.6% 3	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.2% 134	8.8% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.0% 149	6.2% 10	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	56.8% 75	30.3% 40	9.9% 13	2.3% 3	0.8% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.1% 106	17.2% 23	2.2% 3	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	74.4% 99	19.6% 26	4.5% 6	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.2% 115	19.2% 29	4.6% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.8% 115	17.8% 26	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.5% 132	14.8% 24	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	74.1% 120	18.5% 30	4.3% 7	3.1% 5	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	75.2% 121	24.2% 39	0.0% 0	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.9% 136	15.2% 25	0.6% 1	1.2% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Everett A. Martin, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	119	71.3%
	Good	35	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	10	6.0%
	Unsatisfactory	3	1.8%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	7.8%
	Worse	6	4.7%
	Stayed the Same	112	87.5%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Everett A. Martin, Jr.
4th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	138	49	0
2012	155	53	0
2013	209	66	0
2014	190	61	0
2015	93	25	0
2016	98	31	0
2017	96	20	0
2018	41	5	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Carl Edward Eason, Jr.

Judge of the Circuit Court
5th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 145 completed surveys for Judge Carl Edward Eason, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Carl Edward Eason, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	47.9% 69	30.6% 44	15.3% 22	4.2% 6	2.1% 3
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	59.7% 86	22.2% 32	13.9% 20	2.8% 4	1.4% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.4% 109	16.6% 23	4.3% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.3% 113	13.0% 18	5.0% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	62.5% 90	20.1% 29	11.1% 16	4.2% 6	2.1% 3
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.1% 110	15.8% 22	5.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.0% 129	7.6% 11	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	70.3% 102	17.9% 26	9.0% 13	2.1% 3	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.5% 103	15.3% 22	9.7% 14	2.8% 4	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.5% 107	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.2% 125	8.0% 11	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.7% 132	8.3% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	55.0% 71	20.9% 27	17.1% 22	4.7% 6	2.3% 3
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	64.6% 84	26.9% 35	7.7% 10	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	70.8% 92	19.2% 25	7.7% 10	2.3% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.5% 98	21.6% 30	5.0% 7	2.2% 3	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.0% 109	17.4% 24	2.9% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.0% 108	20.8% 30	2.8% 4	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.7% 108	11.5% 16	6.5% 9	3.6% 5	0.7% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	87.4% 125	9.8% 14	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.8% 107	14.7% 21	9.8% 14	0.0% 0	0.7% 1

Evaluation of Judge Carl Edward Eason, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	84	60.4%
	Good	33	23.7%
	Needs Improvement	17	12.2%
	Unsatisfactory	5	3.6%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	5.2%
	Worse	9	7.8%
	Stayed the Same	101	87.1%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Carl Edward Eason, Jr.
5th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	155	55	0
2012	151	48	0
2013	179	56	0
2014	149	50	0
2015	102	41	0
2016	100	31	0
2017	101	36	0
2018	35	14	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable C. Peter Tench

Judge of the Circuit Court
7th 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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 166 completed surveys for Judge C. Peter Tench.

Evaluation of Judge C. Peter Tench: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	79.5% 132	19.3% 32	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.2% 148	10.2% 17	0.0% 0	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.9% 121	14.4% 21	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.6% 114	17.9% 26	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.0% 146	10.2% 17	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.8% 139	12.8% 21	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.8% 144	9.2% 15	3.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.5% 137	9.6% 16	7.2% 12	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.2% 134	13.3% 22	4.9% 8	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.3% 108	9.1% 11	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.3% 126	12.3% 18	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.6% 147	8.5% 14	1.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.4% 103	18.1% 24	3.8% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.0% 104	15.6% 21	5.9% 8	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	78.5% 106	14.1% 19	5.9% 8	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.0% 116	16.6% 24	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.9% 115	16.7% 24	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.6% 133	16.4% 27	3.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.0% 136	10.0% 16	4.4% 7	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	80.5% 132	16.5% 27	3.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.3% 139	11.7% 19	2.5% 4	0.6% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge C. Peter Tench: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	136	82.4%
	Good	21	12.7%
	Needs Improvement	8	4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	3.4%
	Worse	5	4.3%
	Stayed the Same	108	92.3%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable C. Peter Tench
7th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	222	29	2
2012	178	40	1
2013	168	24	0
2014	133	21	0
2015	146	22	0
2016	129	24	0
2017	99	13	0
2018	58	6	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Christopher W. Hutton

Judge of the Circuit Court
8th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 195 completed surveys for Judge Christopher W. Hutton.

Evaluation of Judge Christopher W. Hutton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	80.5% 157	18.5% 36	1.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	83.6% 163	14.9% 29	1.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.6% 109	9.8% 12	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.6% 109	9.8% 12	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.2% 173	9.3% 18	1.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.8% 166	11.6% 22	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.7% 173	10.3% 20	1.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.7% 173	9.2% 18	1.5% 3	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.2% 172	9.7% 19	1.5% 3	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.6% 93	9.5% 10	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	93.4% 114	6.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.2% 178	7.3% 14	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.8% 97	18.3% 22	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	88.2% 105	9.2% 11	1.7% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	84.0% 100	11.8% 14	3.4% 4	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.3% 100	16.3% 20	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.3% 98	18.0% 22	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.6% 167	11.3% 22	2.1% 4	1.0% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	88.5% 170	9.9% 19	1.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.5% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	79.9% 151	18.0% 34	1.1% 2	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.1% 165	10.8% 21	2.6% 5	1.0% 2	0.5% 1

Evaluation of Judge Christopher W. Hutton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	166	85.6%
	Good	25	12.9%
	Needs Improvement	3	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	6.9%
	Worse	2	2.0%
	Stayed the Same	93	91.2%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Christopher W. Hutton
8th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	117	28	0
2012	80	22	0
2013	80	25	0
2014	131	31	0
2015	140	35	0
2016	119	28	0
2017	113	28	0
2018	46	13	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Paul W. Cella

Judge of the Circuit Court
11th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 166 completed surveys for Judge Paul W. Cella.

Evaluation of Judge Paul W. Cella: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	81.1% 133	17.7% 29	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.5% 146	10.3% 17	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.2% 127	13.4% 20	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.8% 127	12.8% 19	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.0% 146	10.2% 17	1.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.3% 126	14.8% 23	3.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.3% 144	11.5% 19	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.5% 137	12.8% 21	3.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.0% 137	12.7% 21	4.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.1% 97	14.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.5% 128	13.5% 20	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.4% 145	11.0% 18	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.6% 102	15.2% 19	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	81.1% 103	14.2% 18	3.2% 4	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	80.8% 101	14.4% 18	4.0% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.2% 124	13.4% 20	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.7% 112	19.9% 29	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.1% 137	12.9% 21	2.5% 4	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.7% 137	9.5% 15	2.5% 4	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	77.5% 124	20.6% 33	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.6% 133	16.2% 26	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Paul W. Cella: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	134	83.2%
	Good	22	13.7%
	Needs Improvement	5	3.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	15.4%
	Worse	1	0.9%
	Stayed the Same	98	83.8%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Paul W. Cella
11th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	93	29	0
2012	214	52	0
2013	230	72	0
2014	200	42	0
2015	200	45	0
2016	149	31	0
2017	134	28	0
2018	55	10	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Bradley B. Cavedo

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 147 completed surveys for Judge Bradley B. Cavedo.

Evaluation of Judge Bradley B. Cavedo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	72.6% 106	23.3% 34	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	78.9% 116	17.0% 25	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.6% 100	20.2% 27	3.0% 4	0.8% 1	1.5% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.5% 101	18.9% 25	2.3% 3	0.8% 1	1.5% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	77.6% 114	16.3% 24	4.1% 6	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.1% 103	22.0% 31	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	77.4% 113	18.5% 27	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 2
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	68.3% 99	21.4% 31	5.5% 8	3.5% 5	1.4% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	69.0% 100	20.0% 29	6.9% 10	2.8% 4	1.4% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	79.1% 87	14.6% 16	3.6% 4	0.9% 1	1.8% 2
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	75.2% 100	23.3% 31	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	76.4% 110	21.5% 31	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	65.1% 84	29.5% 38	3.9% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	60.5% 78	27.9% 36	9.3% 12	0.8% 1	1.6% 2
15. The judge is faithful to the law	62.8% 81	21.7% 28	12.4% 16	1.6% 2	1.6% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.7% 98	21.8% 29	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	1.5% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	70.3% 90	25.0% 32	3.1% 4	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.2% 104	21.8% 31	2.8% 4	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	71.6% 101	18.4% 26	5.7% 8	2.8% 4	1.4% 2
20. The judge starts court on time	72.5% 103	22.5% 32	4.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.6% 101	25.2% 36	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.7% 1

Evaluation of Judge Bradley B. Cavedo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	99	69.2%
	Good	32	22.4%
	Needs Improvement	10	7.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.4%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	11.4%
	Worse	5	4.8%
	Stayed the Same	88	83.8%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Bradley B. Cavedo
13th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	364	105	0
2012	272	94	0
2013	300	89	0
2014	268	118	0
2015	238	91	0
2016	106	44	0
2017	93	20	0
2018	41	11	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable James Stephen Yoffy

Judge of the Circuit Court
14th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 James Stephen Yoffy.

Evaluation of Judge James Stephen Yoffy: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	40.2% 53	43.9% 58	13.6% 18	2.3% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	61.4% 81	30.3% 40	6.1% 8	2.3% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.8% 98	20.6% 27	4.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	74.6% 97	22.3% 29	3.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	64.4% 85	23.5% 31	9.9% 13	1.5% 2	0.8% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	77.3% 99	20.3% 26	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.9% 112	12.1% 16	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	65.2% 86	22.7% 30	10.6% 14	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	64.4% 85	20.5% 27	12.9% 17	2.3% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	76.6% 82	17.8% 19	4.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.0% 114	12.2% 16	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.1% 115	12.1% 16	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	59.1% 75	31.5% 40	7.1% 9	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.6% 89	26.2% 33	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	66.1% 84	28.4% 36	5.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.3% 96	18.3% 24	7.6% 10	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.4% 105	17.1% 22	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.8% 97	21.9% 28	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	67.7% 88	23.1% 30	6.9% 9	2.3% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	79.1% 102	19.4% 25	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.8% 105	18.5% 24	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge James Stephen Yoffy: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	86	66.2%
	Good	30	23.1%
	Needs Improvement	14	10.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	8.5%
	Worse	5	5.3%
	Stayed the Same	81	86.2%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable James Stephen Yoffy
14th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	80	28	0
2012	182	58	0
2013	164	64	0
2014	180	51	0
2015	260	87	0
2016	233	67	0
2017	225	85	0
2018	77	20	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Sarah L. Deneke

Judge of the Circuit Court
15th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 160 completed surveys for Judge Sarah L. Deneke.

Evaluation of Judge Sarah L. Deneke: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	74.8% 119	21.4% 34	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.9% 135	13.2% 21	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.1% 120	13.5% 19	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.5% 116	13.0% 18	1.4% 2	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.3% 134	11.3% 18	2.5% 4	1.9% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.0% 131	14.1% 22	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.6% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.5% 140	10.0% 16	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.6% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.0% 132	12.6% 20	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.0% 132	12.6% 20	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.5% 102	10.5% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.4% 121	13.6% 19	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.8% 141	9.6% 15	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.5% 103	12.5% 16	3.9% 5	2.3% 3	0.8% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.3% 107	13.9% 18	3.1% 4	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	79.7% 102	16.4% 21	2.3% 3	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.1% 118	12.7% 18	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.9% 124	11.4% 16	0.0% 0	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.9% 134	10.9% 17	2.6% 4	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.4% 135	10.8% 17	2.5% 4	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	80.3% 126	17.2% 27	2.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.0% 132	14.5% 23	1.3% 2	1.3% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Sarah L. Deneke: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	135	85.4%
	Good	17	10.8%
	Needs Improvement	4	2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.3%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	17.5%
	Worse	4	3.5%
	Stayed the Same	90	79.0%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)

The Honorable Sarah L. Deneke
15th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	99	38	0
2012	234	87	0
2013	195	72	0
2014	150	65	0
2015	202	89	0
2016	156	63	0
2017	141	41	0
2018	50	21	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Timothy K. Sanner

Judge of the Circuit Court
16th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 196 completed surveys for Judge Timothy K. Sanner.

Evaluation of Judge Timothy K. Sanner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	69.9% 137	26.0% 51	3.6% 7	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.7% 162	14.3% 28	2.6% 5	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.5% 142	7.6% 12	1.3% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.1% 144	8.2% 13	0.0% 0	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.5% 162	10.8% 21	4.6% 9	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.2% 162	8.5% 16	4.3% 8	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.8% 177	7.7% 15	0.5% 1	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.1% 169	8.8% 17	2.6% 5	1.0% 2	0.5% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	86.5% 166	8.9% 17	2.6% 5	1.6% 3	0.5% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.5% 95	8.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.6% 144	8.2% 13	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.6% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.1% 175	5.8% 11	2.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.0% 105	12.8% 17	6.0% 8	1.5% 2	0.8% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.9% 116	13.3% 18	0.0% 0	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	79.6% 105	16.7% 22	3.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.7% 137	7.6% 12	3.8% 6	1.3% 2	0.6% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.5% 130	12.5% 19	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.1% 165	10.8% 21	3.1% 6	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.7% 164	9.6% 18	0.5% 1	1.6% 3	0.5% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	84.3% 161	13.6% 26	1.1% 2	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.8% 162	13.1% 25	1.1% 2	0.5% 1	0.5% 1

Evaluation of Judge Timothy K. Sanner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	169	86.7%
	Good	20	10.3%
	Needs Improvement	5	2.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.5%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	11.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	104	88.9%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Timothy K. Sanner
16th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	99	33	6
2012	124	53	2
2013	93	41	3
2014	124	43	3
2015	114	46	2
2016	138	45	1
2017	119	49	3
2018	45	14	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable James C. Clark

Judge of the Circuit Court
18th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 164 completed surveys for Judge James C. Clark.

Evaluation of Judge James C. Clark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	82.9% 136	14.6% 24	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.3% 153	5.5% 9	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	92.0% 126	5.8% 8	1.5% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.2% 120	9.6% 13	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.2% 148	8.5% 14	0.0% 0	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.9% 130	14.2% 22	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	91.5% 150	7.3% 12	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.8% 139	12.2% 20	1.8% 3	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.7% 142	10.5% 17	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.0% 111	7.4% 9	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.7% 120	13.6% 19	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.3% 139	11.7% 19	3.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.2% 115	11.1% 15	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.8% 108	19.7% 27	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	76.8% 106	18.1% 25	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	87.8% 122	10.8% 15	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.9% 120	9.6% 13	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.0% 141	11.6% 19	2.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.3% 139	11.2% 18	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	78.1% 125	20.0% 32	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.0% 136	14.2% 23	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge James C. Clark: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	144	88.9%
	Good	15	9.3%
	Needs Improvement	1	0.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.2%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	22	19.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	93	80.9%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable James C. Clark
18th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	1	0	0
2012	126	40	0
2013	68	24	0
2014	77	23	0
2015	66	28	3
2016	112	40	2
2017	71	26	1
2018	12	6	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Randy I. Bellows

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 174 completed surveys for Judge Randy I. Bellows.

Evaluation of Judge Randy I. Bellows: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	80.2% 138	17.4% 30	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.6% 149	12.1% 21	2.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.7% 117	7.8% 10	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.2% 115	9.3% 12	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.8% 151	11.5% 20	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.9% 140	12.3% 20	1.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	91.3% 158	8.7% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.0% 141	11.6% 20	5.2% 9	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.8% 145	10.4% 18	4.1% 7	1.7% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	96.9% 93	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	93.0% 120	7.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.2% 161	5.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.0% 84	20.9% 24	6.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.9% 99	11.9% 14	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	78.0% 92	14.4% 17	6.8% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	82.3% 107	16.2% 21	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.7% 100	18.9% 24	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.2% 144	13.5% 23	1.8% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.4% 146	10.5% 18	3.5% 6	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	77.4% 130	21.4% 36	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.4% 135	18.2% 31	2.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Randy I. Bellows: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	146	83.9%
	Good	24	13.8%
	Needs Improvement	4	2.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	9.4%
	Worse	1	0.9%
	Stayed the Same	96	89.7%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Randy I. Bellows
19th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	97	29	0
2012	104	39	0
2013	103	29	0
2014	101	37	0
2015	63	26	0
2016	74	28	0
2017	94	26	0
2018	42	9	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable F. Patrick Yeatts

Judge of the Circuit Court
24th 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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 185 completed surveys for Judge F. Patrick Yeatts.

Evaluation of Judge F. Patrick Yeatts: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	78.8% 145	20.1% 37	1.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.9% 158	12.5% 23	1.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.5% 120	19.5% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.7% 115	20.7% 31	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.2% 154	13.1% 24	2.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.8% 144	17.1% 30	1.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.2% 153	14.7% 27	1.1% 2	1.1% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.6% 152	12.5% 23	3.3% 6	1.6% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.7% 154	11.4% 21	3.8% 7	1.1% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.8% 105	11.6% 14	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.0% 125	15.0% 22	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.4% 159	12.1% 22	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.2% 105	17.7% 24	5.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	73.0% 100	19.7% 27	6.6% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	73.5% 100	20.6% 28	5.2% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.4% 116	17.6% 26	3.4% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.6% 103	27.0% 40	2.7% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.7% 144	18.6% 34	2.2% 4	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.1% 152	12.6% 23	3.3% 6	1.1% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	61.8% 113	26.2% 48	8.7% 16	1.6% 3	1.6% 3
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.5% 141	18.1% 33	3.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.6% 1

Evaluation of Judge F. Patrick Yeatts: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	151	83.0%
	Good	26	14.3%
	Needs Improvement	5	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	28	22.6%
	Worse	3	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	93	75.0%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable F. Patrick Yeatts
24th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	72	14	0
2012	236	75	2
2013	210	69	3
2014	244	81	0
2015	242	78	0
2016	217	56	0
2017	168	42	0
2018	54	14	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Brett L. Geisler

Judge of the Circuit Court
27th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 98 completed surveys for Judge Brett L. Geisler.

Evaluation of Judge Brett L. Geisler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	82.7% 81	14.3% 14	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.8% 89	9.2% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 78	12.1% 11	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.2% 74	13.3% 12	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.7% 89	7.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.0% 80	11.8% 11	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.6% 84	10.3% 10	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	86.7% 85	10.2% 10	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	86.6% 84	9.3% 9	3.1% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.3% 65	8.3% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.8% 79	12.1% 11	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.4% 82	13.5% 13	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	86.8% 72	10.8% 9	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.1% 57	27.1% 23	5.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	75.0% 63	19.1% 16	6.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.1% 70	17.4% 16	5.4% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.6% 64	20.7% 19	6.5% 6	3.3% 3	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.4% 78	13.4% 13	5.2% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.3% 81	11.6% 11	2.1% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	72.9% 70	24.0% 23	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.2% 76	17.7% 17	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Brett L. Geisler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	78	79.6%
	Good	19	19.4%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	14.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	57	85.1%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Brett L. Geisler
27th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	186	25	0
2012	239	45	0
2013	210	39	0
2014	253	37	0
2015	177	28	0
2016	238	35	0
2017	277	42	0
2018	131	19	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Chadwick S. Dotson

Judge of the Circuit Court
30th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 91 completed surveys for Judge Chadwick S. Dotson.

Evaluation of Judge Chadwick S. Dotson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	51.1% 46	38.9% 35	7.8% 7	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	58.9% 53	34.4% 31	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.4% 65	21.4% 18	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.2% 64	22.6% 19	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	70.0% 63	21.1% 19	6.7% 6	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.6% 64	23.0% 20	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 78	13.2% 12	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.6% 68	22.2% 20	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.4% 68	16.9% 15	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.4% 61	10.1% 7	0.0% 0	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.2% 74	8.5% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.1% 82	7.8% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.7% 53	24.0% 18	5.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.9% 63	14.5% 11	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	77.3% 58	20.0% 15	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.3% 70	14.5% 12	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.7% 67	12.1% 10	4.8% 4	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.3% 74	16.5% 15	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.9% 71	18.9% 17	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	81.3% 74	15.4% 14	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	89.0% 81	9.9% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.1% 1

Evaluation of Judge Chadwick S. Dotson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64 71.1%
	Good	25 27.8%
	Needs Improvement	1 1.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23 31.9%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	49 68.1%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable Chadwick S. Dotson
30th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	99	24	1
2012	190	84	5
2013	209	89	4
2014	239	101	9
2015	93	51	1
2016	129	46	1
2017	102	42	1
2018	45	21	2

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable John C. Kilgore

Judge of the Circuit Court
30th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 John C. Kilgore.

Evaluation of Judge John C. Kilgore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	92.4% 110	7.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.1% 112	5.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.4% 99	8.0% 9	3.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.1% 92	12.5% 14	4.5% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.4% 109	6.8% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.3% 99	12.9% 15	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.7% 104	10.8% 13	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.3% 106	7.5% 9	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.9% 104	9.4% 11	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.3% 83	8.6% 8	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	89.1% 98	10.9% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.6% 101	12.7% 15	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	89.1% 90	9.9% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	87.0% 87	9.0% 9	3.0% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	82.0% 82	11.0% 11	5.0% 5	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	90.2% 101	7.1% 8	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.3% 88	17.1% 19	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.0% 105	10.2% 12	0.0% 0	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.8% 106	6.8% 8	3.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	55.9% 66	29.7% 35	11.9% 14	1.7% 2	0.9% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.3% 92	20.2% 24	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge John C. Kilgore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	96	82.1%
	Good	17	14.5%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 3 years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	20.2%
	Worse	1	1.1%
	Stayed the Same	70	78.7%



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •
Websites: www.vcsc.virginia.gov • mobile.vcsc.virginia.gov

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **CY 2011 – CY 2018 (Through May)**

The Honorable John C. Kilgore
30th Circuit

In accordance with Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(A), the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission has provided the Supreme Court of Virginia with “the number of cases during the judge's term in which a judge imposed a sentence that is either greater or less than that indicated by the sentencing guidelines and did not file a written explanation of such departure required pursuant to subsection B of § 19.2-298.01.”

Calendar Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2011	183	74	3
2012	155	60	3
2013	134	59	2
2014	167	66	2
2015	146	46	1
2016	187	69	2
2017	144	53	0
2018	82	37	0

Note: Figures for CY 2018 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable C. Ridley Bain

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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 58 completed surveys for Judge C. Ridley Bain.

Evaluation of Judge C. Ridley Bain: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	81.0% 47	17.2% 10	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.7% 52	8.6% 5	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 48	14.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.3% 50	10.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.4% 53	6.9% 4	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	71.4% 40	26.8% 15	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.8% 48	17.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.4% 42	22.4% 13	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.0% 45	17.5% 10	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.8% 44	10.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.0% 47	17.2% 10	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	79.3% 46	17.2% 10	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.6% 45	19.0% 11	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.1% 43	20.7% 12	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	72.4% 42	22.4% 13	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.0% 47	17.2% 10	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.2% 48	12.3% 7	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.8% 48	15.5% 9	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.2% 44	14.0% 8	8.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	70.9% 39	20.0% 11	5.5% 3	3.6% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.8% 43	14.3% 8	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	1.8% 1

Evaluation of Judge C. Ridley Bain: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	47	82.5%
	Good	7	12.3%
	Needs Improvement	3	5.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	5.9%
	Worse	1	2.0%
	Stayed the Same	47	92.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stephen Ashton Hudgins

Judge of the General District Court
9th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 113 completed surveys for Judge Stephen Ashton Hudgins.

Evaluation of Judge Stephen Ashton Hudgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	90.3% 102	9.7% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	97.4% 110	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	97.3% 108	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	96.4% 106	3.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	96.5% 109	3.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	92.7% 102	7.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	96.5% 109	3.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	96.5% 109	3.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	93.7% 104	6.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.4% 85	5.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	94.6% 104	5.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.1% 102	8.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	95.2% 98	4.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	92.3% 96	7.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	92.2% 95	7.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	94.7% 107	5.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	96.4% 108	2.7% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	95.6% 108	3.5% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	94.6% 104	5.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	90.1% 100	9.9% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	92.9% 105	7.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Stephen Ashton Hudgins: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	108	95.6%
	Good	5	4.4%
	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	5	5.0%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	96	95.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Keith Nelson Hurley

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 62 completed surveys for Judge Keith Nelson Hurley.

Evaluation of Judge Keith Nelson Hurley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.4% 48	21.0% 13	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.5% 53	12.9% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.3% 56	8.1% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.5% 54	9.8% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.5% 54	9.8% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.0% 51	15.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	91.9% 57	6.5% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	86.9% 53	11.5% 7	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	86.9% 53	11.5% 7	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.4% 42	10.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.9% 53	11.5% 7	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.0% 50	18.0% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.6% 38	20.4% 10	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.0% 44	17.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	80.8% 42	19.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	90.3% 56	6.5% 4	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.3% 56	8.1% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.3% 56	8.1% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	93.0% 53	5.3% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	74.2% 46	25.8% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.7% 50	17.7% 11	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Keith Nelson Hurley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	55	90.2%
	Good	4	6.6%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	8.5%
	Worse	1	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	42	89.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Tracy W. J. Thorne-Begland

Judge of the General District Court
13th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 145 completed surveys for Judge Tracy W. J. Thorne-Begland.

Evaluation of Judge Tracy W. J. Thorne-Begland: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	80.7% 117	17.2% 25	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.5% 124	13.8% 20	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	93.8% 135	5.6% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.4% 128	7.9% 11	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.8% 125	11.1% 16	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.9% 125	10.1% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	91.7% 132	8.3% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.0% 121	12.5% 18	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	85.2% 121	12.0% 17	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.9% 100	9.1% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	93.0% 132	6.3% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	95.1% 136	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	87.4% 118	11.1% 15	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	86.7% 117	12.6% 17	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	85.3% 116	12.5% 17	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.6% 129	9.7% 14	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	95.0% 133	4.3% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.8% 128	8.5% 12	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.1% 120	12.1% 17	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	81.5% 110	18.5% 25	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.2% 121	13.4% 19	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Tracy W. J. Thorne-Begland: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	122	86.5%
	Good	18	12.8%
	Needs Improvement	1	0.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	17.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	94	82.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Lawrence B. Cann, III

Judge of the General District Court
13th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 Lawrence B. Cann.

Evaluation of Judge Lawrence B. Cann, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.5% 131	10.1% 15	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.6% 137	6.8% 10	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.8% 130	10.8% 16	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.0% 127	9.6% 14	2.7% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.9% 136	6.8% 10	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.9% 116	14.3% 20	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.8% 130	10.1% 15	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.8% 121	14.2% 21	2.7% 4	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.9% 121	13.0% 19	2.7% 4	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.8% 106	9.3% 11	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.3% 118	17.0% 25	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.9% 122	13.4% 19	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	82.2% 111	15.6% 21	1.5% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	68.4% 95	20.1% 28	9.4% 13	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	71.2% 99	18.0% 25	9.4% 13	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.2% 112	19.7% 29	4.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.0% 108	19.9% 29	4.8% 7	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.2% 112	18.4% 27	4.8% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.6% 122	13.7% 20	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	74.8% 107	20.3% 29	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.6% 101	22.4% 32	7.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Lawrence B. Cann, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	112	76.7%
	Good	27	18.5%
	Needs Improvement	7	4.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	17	14.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	104	86.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable George Barton Chucker

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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 George Barton Chucker.

Evaluation of Judge George Barton Chucker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	70.7% 58	24.4% 20	3.7% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	79.3% 65	15.9% 13	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.8% 63	18.5% 15	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.0% 64	16.3% 13	3.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	82.9% 68	11.0% 9	6.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.4% 65	13.0% 10	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.2% 69	11.0% 9	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.0% 64	12.5% 10	5.0% 4	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.0% 64	12.4% 10	7.4% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.6% 58	11.9% 8	0.0% 0	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.4% 70	11.1% 9	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.4% 70	12.4% 10	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.7% 56	21.1% 16	4.0% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.0% 57	19.5% 15	3.9% 3	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	77.9% 60	14.3% 11	3.9% 3	3.9% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	82.7% 67	13.6% 11	0.0% 0	3.7% 3	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.5% 66	14.8% 12	2.5% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.0% 64	13.9% 11	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.5% 66	10.0% 8	7.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	65.4% 53	21.0% 17	9.9% 8	1.2% 1	2.5% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	71.3% 57	18.8% 15	3.8% 3	5.0% 4	1.3% 1

Evaluation of Judge George Barton Chucker: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	65	81.3%
	Good	9	11.3%
	Needs Improvement	4	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.5%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	8.1%
	Worse	4	6.5%
	Stayed the Same	53	85.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Hugh S. Campbell

Judge of the General District Court
15th 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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 71 completed surveys for Judge Hugh S. Campbell.

Evaluation of Judge Hugh S. Campbell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	62.0% 44	26.8% 19	11.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	77.5% 55	21.1% 15	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.6% 55	17.1% 12	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	77.1% 54	18.6% 13	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.1% 54	18.3% 13	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	69.1% 47	29.4% 20	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.1% 59	15.5% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	68.1% 47	23.2% 16	8.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	67.1% 47	15.7% 11	14.3% 10	2.9% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	73.1% 38	17.3% 9	9.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.9% 56	18.3% 13	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.6% 55	20.0% 14	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	67.7% 42	25.8% 16	3.2% 2	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	66.1% 41	16.1% 10	16.1% 10	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	63.9% 39	18.0% 11	14.8% 9	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.1% 54	15.7% 11	7.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.7% 60	14.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.0% 56	17.1% 12	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.6% 48	20.6% 14	7.4% 5	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	65.7% 46	17.1% 12	10.0% 7	5.7% 4	1.4% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	71.8% 51	16.9% 12	8.5% 6	2.8% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Hugh S. Campbell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	46	67.7%
	Good	15	22.1%
	Needs Improvement	7	10.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	17.5%
	Worse	3	5.3%
	Stayed the Same	44	77.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable J. Bruce Strickland

Judge of the General District Court
15th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 101 completed surveys for Judge J. Bruce Strickland.

Evaluation of Judge J. Bruce Strickland: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	86.1% 87	13.9% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.1% 94	6.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.1% 90	10.9% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.1% 89	10.9% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.1% 94	6.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.9% 85	13.1% 13	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	95.0% 95	5.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	86.1% 87	13.9% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	86.9% 86	11.1% 11	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.4% 73	7.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.0% 90	10.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.9% 87	12.1% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.7% 77	16.3% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.5% 70	22.3% 21	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	75.5% 71	23.4% 22	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.9% 86	13.1% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	91.0% 91	9.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	88.9% 88	11.1% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.1% 87	11.9% 12	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	74.3% 75	23.8% 24	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.2% 84	14.9% 15	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge J. Bruce Strickland: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	87	86.1%
	Good	14	13.9%
	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	11	12.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	77	87.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable R. Frances O'Brien

Judge of the General District Court
17th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 131 completed surveys for Judge R. Frances O'Brien.

Evaluation of Judge R. Frances O'Brien: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	73.3% 96	22.1% 29	3.8% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	79.2% 103	18.5% 24	0.8% 1	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.1% 108	13.1% 17	2.3% 3	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.3% 104	14.1% 18	3.9% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.9% 109	12.3% 16	2.3% 3	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.3% 101	19.4% 25	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.6% 116	9.9% 13	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	74.1% 97	13.7% 18	9.2% 12	2.3% 3	0.8% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.8% 94	15.3% 20	8.4% 11	3.8% 5	0.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.3% 83	8.6% 8	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.7% 111	13.0% 17	1.5% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.6% 110	12.3% 16	1.5% 2	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.7% 87	18.3% 21	4.4% 5	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.3% 74	29.1% 34	5.1% 6	2.6% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	62.9% 73	27.6% 32	6.9% 8	2.6% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	74.1% 97	23.7% 31	1.5% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.6% 102	16.8% 21	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.4% 100	16.7% 21	4.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.8% 92	17.7% 23	7.7% 10	3.9% 5	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	74.2% 95	25.0% 32	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.2% 88	27.1% 35	3.9% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge R. Frances O'Brien: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	89	68.5%
	Good	32	24.6%
	Needs Improvement	7	5.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.5%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	16.8%
	Worse	2	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	92	81.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable William Harrison Cleaveland

Judge of the General District Court
25th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 112 completed surveys for Judge William Harrison Cleaveland.

Evaluation of Judge William Harrison Cleveland: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	62.5% 70	27.7% 31	7.1% 8	1.8% 2	0.9% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	74.1% 83	14.3% 16	8.9% 10	1.8% 2	0.9% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	73.4% 80	11.0% 12	10.1% 11	4.6% 5	0.9% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	75.9% 82	10.2% 11	7.4% 8	6.5% 7	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.9% 82	12.6% 14	7.2% 8	5.4% 6	0.9% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	71.0% 76	23.4% 25	1.9% 2	2.8% 3	0.9% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	78.4% 87	15.3% 17	5.4% 6	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	73.9% 82	5.4% 6	10.8% 12	7.2% 8	2.7% 3
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	72.1% 80	8.1% 9	9.0% 10	7.2% 8	3.6% 4
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.0% 68	13.8% 11	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.6% 93	14.6% 16	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.6% 87	18.5% 20	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	64.3% 63	22.5% 22	8.2% 8	5.1% 5	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	64.0% 64	19.0% 19	7.0% 7	6.0% 6	4.0% 4
15. The judge is faithful to the law	65.0% 65	15.0% 15	9.0% 9	7.0% 7	4.0% 4
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.9% 78	20.0% 22	6.4% 7	2.7% 3	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.4% 84	20.9% 23	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.1% 80	15.3% 17	10.8% 12	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	69.7% 76	9.2% 10	11.9% 13	5.5% 6	3.7% 4
20. The judge starts court on time	72.9% 78	22.4% 24	4.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	69.1% 76	23.6% 26	5.5% 6	0.9% 1	0.9% 1

Evaluation of Judge William Harrison Cleaveland: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	74	66.7%
	Good	16	14.4%
	Needs Improvement	9	8.1%
	Unsatisfactory	12	10.8%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	5.4%
	Worse	7	7.5%
	Stayed the Same	81	87.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Eric R. Thiessen

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 Eric R. Thiessen.

Evaluation of Judge Eric R. Thiessen: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	81.9% 68	16.9% 14	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.6% 71	13.4% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.9% 68	14.6% 12	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.7% 67	16.9% 14	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.2% 74	10.8% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 64	17.5% 14	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.3% 69	13.8% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.9% 68	14.5% 12	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.9% 68	13.3% 11	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.3% 66	5.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.3% 65	13.6% 11	4.9% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.4% 70	11.1% 9	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	78.2% 61	20.5% 16	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.4% 58	18.0% 14	6.4% 5	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	75.3% 58	18.2% 14	5.2% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.7% 58	20.7% 17	7.3% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.3% 61	18.8% 15	2.5% 2	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.5% 66	14.5% 12	4.8% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.2% 69	12.2% 10	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	48.2% 39	30.9% 25	13.6% 11	4.9% 4	2.5% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	56.1% 46	30.5% 25	9.8% 8	1.2% 1	2.4% 2

Evaluation of Judge Eric R. Thiessen: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	62	74.7%
	Good	15	18.1%
	Needs Improvement	6	7.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	26.7%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	55	73.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Henry A. Barringer

Judge of the General District Court
29th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 Henry A. Barringer.

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Barringer: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	56.5% 39	31.9% 22	10.1% 7	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.0% 49	24.6% 17	2.9% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.1% 53	17.9% 12	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	77.3% 51	16.7% 11	4.6% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.8% 53	18.8% 13	2.9% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	76.6% 49	18.8% 12	3.1% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	73.9% 51	17.4% 12	7.3% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.7% 48	19.7% 13	6.1% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	70.2% 47	22.4% 15	4.5% 3	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	79.3% 46	15.5% 9	1.7% 1	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	73.9% 51	21.7% 15	2.9% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.8% 52	16.7% 11	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	72.1% 44	23.0% 14	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	3.3% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	59.4% 38	25.0% 16	9.4% 6	3.1% 2	3.1% 2
15. The judge is faithful to the law	67.2% 43	21.9% 14	6.3% 4	3.1% 2	1.6% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	59.4% 41	27.5% 19	10.1% 7	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	70.2% 47	23.9% 16	3.0% 2	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	63.2% 43	29.4% 20	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	2.9% 2
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.3% 47	21.5% 14	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	3.1% 2
20. The judge starts court on time	69.2% 45	27.7% 18	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	58.8% 40	29.4% 20	7.4% 5	1.5% 1	2.9% 2

Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Barringer: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	45	68.2%
	Good	15	22.7%
	Needs Improvement	5	7.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.5%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	17.0%
	Worse	2	3.4%
	Stayed the Same	47	79.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Alotha C. Willis

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 89 completed surveys for Judge Alotha C. Willis.

Evaluation of Judge Alotha C. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	59.1% 52	28.4% 25	11.4% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	64.0% 57	28.1% 25	5.6% 5	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	69.0% 60	23.0% 20	5.8% 5	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	69.7% 62	22.5% 20	5.6% 5	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	69.3% 61	23.9% 21	4.6% 4	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	70.5% 62	25.0% 22	3.4% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	70.5% 62	23.9% 21	4.6% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	69.3% 61	19.3% 17	9.1% 8	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	73.9% 65	14.8% 13	8.0% 7	3.4% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	80.0% 64	15.0% 12	5.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	75.0% 66	20.5% 18	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	70.8% 63	25.8% 23	3.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	65.9% 58	22.7% 20	9.1% 8	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.1% 61	18.4% 16	9.2% 8	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	63.6% 56	20.5% 18	12.5% 11	3.4% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.1% 61	19.5% 17	10.3% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	75.0% 66	19.3% 17	4.6% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.9% 65	19.3% 17	5.7% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	74.7% 65	16.1% 14	6.9% 6	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	41.9% 36	34.9% 30	10.5% 9	9.3% 8	3.5% 3
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	53.9% 48	30.3% 27	10.1% 9	4.5% 4	1.1% 1

Evaluation of Judge Alotha C. Willis: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	61	69.3%
	Good	18	20.5%
	Needs Improvement	7	8.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.3%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	9.3%
	Worse	2	2.7%
	Stayed the Same	66	88.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Lauri D. Hogge

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 134 completed surveys for Judge Lauri D. Hogge.

Evaluation of Judge Lauri D. Hogge: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	73.1% 98	24.6% 33	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.8% 115	13.4% 18	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.3% 113	15.7% 21	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.6% 108	19.4% 26	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.6% 112	14.2% 19	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.9% 116	12.1% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.8% 115	14.2% 19	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	79.0% 105	16.5% 22	4.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.9% 102	16.8% 22	5.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.1% 95	14.2% 16	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.0% 117	12.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.1% 118	9.2% 12	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.2% 96	19.8% 25	3.2% 4	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.8% 98	20.6% 26	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	76.2% 96	19.8% 25	4.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.0% 113	14.3% 19	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.7% 114	14.3% 19	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.5% 111	16.5% 22	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.8% 105	14.6% 19	4.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	54.9% 73	33.8% 45	9.8% 13	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.2% 99	21.5% 28	2.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Lauri D. Hogge: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	104	79.4%
	Good	27	20.6%
	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	10	8.6%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	106	91.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Carson E. Saunders, Jr.

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 87 completed surveys for Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	92.0% 80	6.9% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	97.7% 85	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	94.3% 82	4.6% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	93.1% 81	5.8% 5	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	95.4% 83	3.5% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	94.2% 81	4.7% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.7% 78	9.2% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	85.1% 74	12.6% 11	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.5% 77	8.1% 7	2.3% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.8% 67	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.8% 79	9.2% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.8% 79	8.1% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.9% 67	9.0% 7	3.9% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	87.2% 68	10.3% 8	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	88.5% 69	7.7% 6	3.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.7% 78	9.2% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.1% 74	11.5% 10	2.3% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.4% 76	10.3% 9	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.1% 74	9.4% 8	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	78.8% 67	16.5% 14	4.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.9% 67	17.4% 15	3.5% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	78	90.7%
	Good	6	7.0%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	5.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	75	94.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jay Edward Dugger

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
8th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 Jay Edward Dugger.

Evaluation of Judge Jay Edward Dugger: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	34.6% 28	44.4% 36	17.3% 14	3.7% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	46.9% 38	28.4% 23	23.5% 19	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	71.6% 58	23.5% 19	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	75.0% 60	18.8% 15	6.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	53.1% 43	23.5% 19	19.8% 16	3.7% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	66.3% 53	30.0% 24	3.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	75.3% 61	21.0% 17	2.5% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	63.0% 51	23.5% 19	11.1% 9	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	60.5% 49	27.2% 22	11.1% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.4% 58	18.9% 14	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.5% 62	20.0% 16	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.8% 63	22.2% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	57.5% 46	25.0% 20	16.3% 13	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.0% 56	22.5% 18	6.3% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	62.5% 50	30.0% 24	7.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	66.7% 54	18.5% 15	13.6% 11	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	73.8% 59	25.0% 20	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.8% 59	23.5% 19	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	68.4% 54	20.3% 16	10.1% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	59.3% 48	30.9% 25	8.6% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.8% 51	22.5% 18	13.8% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Jay Edward Dugger: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48	60.8%
	Good	21	26.6%
	Needs Improvement	10	12.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	2.8%
	Worse	2	2.8%
	Stayed the Same	67	94.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert B. Wilson, V

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
8th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 84 completed surveys for Judge Robert B. Wilson, V.

Evaluation of Judge Robert B. Wilson, V: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	83.3% 70	15.5% 13	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.9% 73	11.9% 10	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.2% 74	10.8% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	90.2% 74	8.5% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.7% 77	7.1% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.8% 72	12.1% 10	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.5% 76	7.1% 6	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.1% 69	14.3% 12	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.1% 69	14.3% 12	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.7% 65	12.0% 9	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.8% 77	7.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.9% 78	7.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.0% 64	19.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.8% 67	10.1% 8	5.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	83.5% 66	10.1% 8	6.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	88.0% 73	10.8% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	91.6% 76	7.2% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.8% 72	10.8% 9	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.3% 70	12.1% 10	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	74.7% 62	22.9% 19	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.7% 67	17.1% 14	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Robert B. Wilson, V: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71	87.7%
	Good	10	12.4%
	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	4	5.3%
	Worse	1	1.3%
	Stayed the Same	71	93.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert H. Morrison

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
10th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 64 completed surveys for Judge Robert H. Morrison.

Evaluation of Judge Robert H. Morrison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.8% 49	20.6% 13	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.5% 57	9.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.9% 56	11.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 54	14.3% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.6% 58	9.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.4% 50	17.5% 11	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	93.7% 59	6.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.4% 54	10.9% 7	4.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.8% 53	12.5% 8	4.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.5% 51	10.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.3% 55	12.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.4% 54	15.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.7% 50	17.7% 11	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.7% 54	11.1% 7	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	81.0% 51	15.9% 10	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.4% 54	15.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.5% 57	9.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.1% 57	10.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.1% 54	8.1% 5	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	74.2% 46	22.6% 14	0.0% 0	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.1% 47	19.7% 12	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Robert H. Morrison: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	52	82.5%
	Good	10	15.9%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	13.6%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	51	86.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Phillip T. DiStanislaio

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 66 completed surveys for Judge Phillip T. DiStanislaio.

Evaluation of Judge Phillip T. DiStanislaio: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	74.2% 49	25.8% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.2% 56	13.9% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.4% 57	12.1% 8	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.4% 59	6.1% 4	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.4% 57	13.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.3% 53	19.7% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.9% 56	12.1% 8	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.1% 54	13.9% 9	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.3% 55	13.6% 9	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.9% 47	12.5% 7	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.9% 56	15.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.7% 57	12.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.1% 54	7.7% 5	6.2% 4	3.1% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.5% 51	18.5% 12	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	73.9% 48	20.0% 13	4.6% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.8% 52	18.2% 12	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.6% 55	15.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.8% 53	15.6% 10	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.5% 53	13.9% 9	3.1% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	84.6% 55	15.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	86.2% 56	10.8% 7	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Phillip T. DiStanislao: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	56 86.2%
	Good	8 12.3%
	Needs Improvement	1 1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12 20.0%
	Worse	1 1.7%
	Stayed the Same	47 78.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Richard B. Campbell

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 89 completed surveys for Judge Richard B. Campbell.

Evaluation of Judge Richard B. Campbell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	51.7% 46	38.2% 34	7.9% 7	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	65.2% 58	28.1% 25	6.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.6% 70	18.2% 16	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.6% 70	19.3% 17	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	69.0% 60	20.7% 18	9.2% 8	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.9% 72	15.7% 14	3.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.6% 78	10.1% 9	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	69.7% 62	22.5% 20	4.5% 4	3.4% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	69.7% 62	18.0% 16	9.0% 8	2.3% 2	1.1% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	72.4% 55	22.4% 17	5.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.6% 78	12.4% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.8% 79	10.1% 9	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	72.4% 63	17.2% 15	6.9% 6	2.3% 2	1.2% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	80.5% 70	13.8% 12	5.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	77.9% 67	16.3% 14	5.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.4% 68	21.4% 19	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.8% 72	17.1% 15	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.7% 70	19.1% 17	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	71.8% 61	17.7% 15	5.9% 5	4.7% 4	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	52.3% 46	34.1% 30	10.2% 9	2.3% 2	1.1% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	69.3% 61	26.1% 23	3.4% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Richard B. Campbell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	65	75.6%
	Good	18	20.9%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	9.2%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	69	90.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Phillip U. Fines

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
15th 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 89 completed surveys for Judge Phillip U. Fines.

Evaluation of Judge Phillip U. Fines: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	23.6% 21	37.1% 33	30.3% 27	5.6% 5	3.4% 3
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	38.2% 34	33.7% 30	21.4% 19	4.5% 4	2.3% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	68.5% 61	19.1% 17	11.2% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	71.6% 63	18.2% 16	8.0% 7	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	38.2% 34	36.0% 32	14.6% 13	9.0% 8	2.3% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	63.6% 56	25.0% 22	6.8% 6	3.4% 3	1.1% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	70.8% 63	19.1% 17	10.1% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	50.6% 45	22.5% 20	18.0% 16	7.9% 7	1.1% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	49.4% 44	24.7% 22	19.1% 17	4.5% 4	2.3% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	79.8% 63	15.2% 12	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.3% 75	13.5% 12	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	79.8% 71	15.7% 14	3.4% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	39.5% 34	34.9% 30	18.6% 16	4.7% 4	2.3% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.8% 59	20.7% 18	9.2% 8	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	66.7% 58	18.4% 16	10.3% 9	3.5% 3	1.2% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	68.5% 61	20.2% 18	9.0% 8	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.3% 75	11.2% 10	2.3% 2	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.4% 68	18.0% 16	4.5% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	62.9% 56	15.7% 14	13.5% 12	6.7% 6	1.1% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	47.1% 41	37.9% 33	9.2% 8	4.6% 4	1.2% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	61.4% 54	26.1% 23	8.0% 7	2.3% 2	2.3% 2

Evaluation of Judge Phillip U. Fines: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	43	48.3%
	Good	26	29.2%
	Needs Improvement	14	15.7%
	Unsatisfactory	6	6.7%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	9.4%
	Worse	7	8.2%
	Stayed the Same	70	82.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Joseph A. Vance, IV

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
15th 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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 116 completed surveys for Judge Joseph A. Vance, IV.

Evaluation of Judge Joseph A. Vance, IV: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	81.9% 95	16.4% 19	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	87.8% 101	10.4% 12	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.6% 101	9.7% 11	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.8% 101	10.4% 12	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.9% 102	9.5% 11	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.6% 95	15.7% 18	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.8% 101	10.4% 12	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.6% 95	14.8% 17	1.7% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.7% 94	13.9% 16	2.6% 3	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.8% 90	7.1% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.0% 94	16.4% 19	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.8% 96	15.5% 18	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.0% 88	17.3% 19	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.6% 85	20.7% 23	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	73.6% 81	23.6% 26	0.9% 1	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.6% 97	13.8% 16	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.3% 95	12.3% 14	4.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.6% 90	19.0% 22	3.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.3% 95	12.3% 14	3.5% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	65.5% 72	28.2% 31	1.8% 2	4.6% 5	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.8% 77	24.1% 27	5.4% 6	1.8% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Joseph A. Vance, IV: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	95	84.8%
	Good	13	11.6%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	13.0%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	87	87.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Claude V. Worrell

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 113 completed surveys for Judge Claude V. Worrell.

Evaluation of Judge Claude V. Worrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	54.9% 62	35.4% 40	8.9% 10	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	63.7% 72	31.0% 35	4.4% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	54.1% 60	29.7% 33	11.7% 13	4.5% 5	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	53.2% 59	27.0% 30	16.2% 18	2.7% 3	0.9% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	61.1% 69	31.0% 35	6.2% 7	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	63.3% 69	30.3% 33	5.5% 6	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	50.0% 56	29.5% 33	15.2% 17	4.5% 5	0.9% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	53.1% 60	24.8% 28	17.7% 20	4.4% 5	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	57.5% 65	22.1% 25	16.8% 19	3.5% 4	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.8% 72	15.9% 14	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	71.4% 80	24.1% 27	4.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	74.3% 81	21.1% 23	4.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	54.8% 57	29.8% 31	11.5% 12	3.9% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	48.1% 51	34.0% 36	12.3% 13	5.7% 6	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	46.2% 49	29.3% 31	18.9% 20	4.7% 5	0.9% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	55.8% 63	28.3% 32	12.4% 14	2.7% 3	0.9% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	63.4% 71	33.0% 37	2.7% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	51.8% 58	26.8% 30	14.3% 16	5.4% 6	1.8% 2
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	59.5% 66	28.8% 32	8.1% 9	3.6% 4	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	43.8% 49	40.2% 45	10.7% 12	5.4% 6	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	42.3% 47	40.5% 45	9.0% 10	8.1% 9	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Claude V. Worrell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	52	47.3%
	Good	32	29.1%
	Needs Improvement	23	20.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.7%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	17	18.3%
	Worse	1	1.1%
	Stayed the Same	75	80.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kimberly J. Daniel

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 122 completed surveys for Judge Kimberly J. Daniel.

Evaluation of Judge Kimberly J. Daniel: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	39.3% 48	43.4% 53	15.6% 19	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	54.1% 66	32.0% 39	12.3% 15	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	65.6% 80	25.4% 31	7.4% 9	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	64.5% 78	25.6% 31	8.3% 10	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	59.8% 73	25.4% 31	10.7% 13	4.1% 5	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	60.7% 71	30.8% 36	7.7% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	70.5% 86	23.0% 28	5.7% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	60.3% 73	23.1% 28	12.4% 15	3.3% 4	0.8% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	67.5% 81	17.5% 21	8.3% 10	5.8% 7	0.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.3% 80	11.5% 11	2.1% 2	3.1% 3	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.2% 99	16.4% 20	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.3% 94	17.5% 21	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	55.5% 61	29.1% 32	10.0% 11	5.5% 6	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.4% 71	23.2% 26	11.6% 13	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	62.5% 70	21.4% 24	10.7% 12	5.4% 6	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.5% 86	20.5% 25	9.0% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.2% 89	22.5% 27	3.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.0% 90	20.8% 25	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	68.9% 82	17.7% 21	8.4% 10	4.2% 5	0.8% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	55.0% 66	35.8% 43	7.5% 9	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	64.5% 78	29.8% 36	5.8% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Kimberly J. Daniel: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	74	61.2%
	Good	31	25.6%
	Needs Improvement	15	12.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.8%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	7.8%
	Worse	3	2.9%
	Stayed the Same	91	89.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Avelina S. Jacob

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 125 completed surveys for Judge Avelina S. Jacob.

Evaluation of Judge Avelina S. Jacob: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	36.0% 45	42.4% 53	18.4% 23	2.4% 3	0.8% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	50.0% 62	29.8% 37	16.1% 20	4.0% 5	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	58.9% 73	28.2% 35	8.9% 11	4.0% 5	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	57.7% 71	31.7% 39	8.1% 10	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	56.5% 70	23.4% 29	16.1% 20	2.4% 3	1.6% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	54.2% 65	35.0% 42	8.3% 10	2.5% 3	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	60.0% 75	27.2% 34	10.4% 13	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	55.7% 69	25.8% 32	13.7% 17	4.0% 5	0.8% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	55.7% 68	25.4% 31	13.1% 16	4.9% 6	0.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.7% 74	16.0% 15	4.3% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	71.2% 89	23.2% 29	5.6% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	75.6% 93	17.9% 22	5.7% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	50.4% 59	33.3% 39	10.3% 12	3.4% 4	2.6% 3
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	64.2% 77	24.2% 29	8.3% 10	2.5% 3	0.8% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	50.8% 61	32.5% 39	13.3% 16	2.5% 3	0.8% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	64.5% 80	23.4% 29	10.5% 13	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.9% 86	22.0% 27	6.5% 8	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	68.6% 85	23.4% 29	5.7% 7	1.6% 2	0.8% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	66.1% 80	18.2% 22	12.4% 15	2.5% 3	0.8% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	30.1% 37	30.1% 37	22.0% 27	15.5% 19	2.4% 3
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	49.2% 61	34.7% 43	9.7% 12	4.8% 6	1.6% 2

Evaluation of Judge Avelina S. Jacob: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71	57.3%
	Good	34	27.4%
	Needs Improvement	14	11.3%
	Unsatisfactory	5	4.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	7.5%
	Worse	5	4.7%
	Stayed the Same	94	87.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Susan N. Deatherage

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
21st 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 48 completed surveys for Judge Susan N. Deatherage.

Evaluation of Judge Susan N. Deatherage: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	48.9% 23	38.3% 18	10.6% 5	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	63.8% 30	29.8% 14	4.3% 2	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.0% 39	14.9% 7	0.0% 0	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.9% 38	17.0% 8	0.0% 0	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	59.6% 28	29.8% 14	8.5% 4	0.0% 0	2.1% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.7% 37	21.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.1% 40	12.8% 6	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	59.6% 28	25.5% 12	10.6% 5	4.3% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	61.7% 29	21.3% 10	12.8% 6	4.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.1% 30	16.2% 6	2.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.6% 38	17.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.1% 40	14.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.2% 30	12.2% 5	12.2% 5	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.5% 29	20.0% 8	5.0% 2	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	66.7% 26	25.6% 10	5.1% 2	0.0% 0	2.6% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.3% 39	14.6% 7	2.1% 1	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.2% 41	10.6% 5	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.9% 38	17.0% 8	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	66.0% 31	25.5% 12	6.4% 3	0.0% 0	2.1% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	62.2% 28	26.7% 12	11.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.1% 35	17.4% 8	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Susan N. Deatherage: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	33	68.8%
	Good	13	27.1%
	Needs Improvement	1	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1	2.1%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	7.1%
	Worse	2	4.8%
	Stayed the Same	37	88.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Leisa K. Ciaffone

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
23rd Judicial District

Submitted to:

Chairman of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

Chairman of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

Prepared by:

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

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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 Leisa K. Ciaffone.

Evaluation of Judge Leisa K. Ciaffone: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	86.7% 78	13.3% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.3% 83	4.5% 4	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	94.4% 85	4.4% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	93.3% 84	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.3% 84	4.4% 4	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.8% 79	10.1% 9	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.4% 85	5.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	92.2% 83	4.4% 4	2.2% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	93.3% 84	4.4% 4	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	96.0% 72	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.1% 82	8.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.1% 81	5.7% 5	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	90.0% 72	8.8% 7	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	92.5% 74	6.3% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	91.3% 73	6.3% 5	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	93.3% 84	6.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.7% 78	13.3% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.0% 81	10.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	91.1% 82	5.6% 5	2.2% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	76.7% 69	21.1% 19	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.4% 76	13.5% 12	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Leisa K. Ciaffone: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	84 94.4%
	Good	4 4.5%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.1%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12 14.8%
	Worse	2 2.5%
	Stayed the Same	67 82.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable William W. Sharp

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 68 completed surveys for Judge William W. Sharp.

Evaluation of Judge William W. Sharp: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	66.2% 45	26.5% 18	7.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.4% 56	13.2% 9	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	91.0% 61	7.5% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.2% 62	7.4% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.9% 55	14.7% 10	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.4% 57	12.1% 8	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.4% 56	16.2% 11	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	86.8% 59	7.4% 5	4.4% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.2% 60	5.9% 4	5.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	96.9% 62	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	98.5% 66	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.0% 61	9.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.3% 52	18.8% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	97.0% 64	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	95.5% 63	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	92.7% 63	5.9% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.7% 63	7.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	91.2% 62	7.4% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.9% 58	9.1% 6	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	82.1% 55	17.9% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	92.5% 62	7.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge William W. Sharp: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	63	92.7%
	Good	3	4.4%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	4.8%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	59	95.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Elizabeth S. Wills

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 Elizabeth S. Wills.

Evaluation of Judge Elizabeth S. Wills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	27.1% 16	35.6% 21	25.4% 15	11.9% 7	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	45.8% 27	27.1% 16	22.0% 13	5.1% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	49.2% 29	28.8% 17	11.9% 7	10.2% 6	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	55.9% 33	25.4% 15	8.5% 5	10.2% 6	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	39.0% 23	32.2% 19	18.6% 11	8.5% 5	1.7% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	54.4% 31	31.6% 18	8.8% 5	5.3% 3	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	61.0% 36	22.0% 13	13.6% 8	3.4% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	39.0% 23	33.9% 20	20.3% 12	6.8% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	39.0% 23	30.5% 18	22.0% 13	6.8% 4	1.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	50.0% 26	15.4% 8	15.4% 8	15.4% 8	3.9% 2
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	63.2% 36	22.8% 13	7.0% 4	7.0% 4	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	61.4% 35	22.8% 13	10.5% 6	5.3% 3	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	35.1% 20	26.3% 15	26.3% 15	7.0% 4	5.3% 3
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	45.6% 26	24.6% 14	21.1% 12	5.3% 3	3.5% 2
15. The judge is faithful to the law	40.4% 23	29.8% 17	15.8% 9	10.5% 6	3.5% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	50.9% 30	30.5% 18	13.6% 8	1.7% 1	3.4% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.6% 44	10.2% 6	13.6% 8	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	66.1% 39	13.6% 8	17.0% 10	1.7% 1	1.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	45.8% 27	25.4% 15	15.3% 9	10.2% 6	3.4% 2
20. The judge starts court on time	48.3% 28	27.6% 16	20.7% 12	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	56.9% 33	20.7% 12	20.7% 12	0.0% 0	1.7% 1

Evaluation of Judge Elizabeth S. Wills: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	24	40.7%
	Good	20	33.9%
	Needs Improvement	8	13.6%
	Unsatisfactory	7	11.9%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	6.0%
	Worse	1	2.0%
	Stayed the Same	46	92.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Lisa Michelle Baird

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2018



VCU

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. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

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.

Bailiffs and court reporters 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 surveys for these groups 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 112 completed surveys for Judge Lisa Michelle Baird.

Evaluation of Judge Lisa Michelle Baird: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	49.1% 55	37.5% 42	12.5% 14	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	60.7% 68	30.4% 34	8.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	71.4% 80	19.6% 22	8.0% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	69.1% 76	22.7% 25	7.3% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	68.5% 76	20.7% 23	8.1% 9	2.7% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	70.4% 76	23.2% 25	4.6% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	74.1% 83	17.0% 19	6.3% 7	2.7% 3	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	65.2% 73	18.8% 21	11.6% 13	4.5% 5	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	65.1% 71	21.1% 23	10.1% 11	2.8% 3	0.9% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.8% 78	12.0% 11	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.7% 94	14.4% 16	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.8% 93	14.4% 16	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	58.3% 63	32.4% 35	5.6% 6	3.7% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	59.1% 65	28.2% 31	10.9% 12	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	60.9% 67	27.3% 30	10.0% 11	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	65.2% 73	25.0% 28	8.9% 10	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.8% 87	20.2% 22	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.1% 80	26.1% 29	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	64.8% 70	25.9% 28	6.5% 7	2.8% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	60.9% 67	31.8% 35	5.5% 6	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.9% 78	23.6% 26	4.6% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Lisa Michelle Baird: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	66	60.6%
	Good	33	30.3%
	Needs Improvement	8	7.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.8%
In general, over the last 12 months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	14.9%
	Worse	5	5.8%
	Stayed the Same	69	79.3%