

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
MICHAEL J. RIGGS, SR., 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
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

November 26, 2019

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 2020 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 W. Allan Sharrett, 6th Circuit
2. Honorable Michael E. McGinty, 9th Circuit
3. Honorable Steven C. McCallum, 12th Circuit
4. Honorable Gregory L. Rupe, 13th Circuit
5. Honorable Richard S. Wallerstein, Jr., 14th Circuit
6. Honorable Susan L. Whitlock, 16th Circuit
7. Honorable Louise M. DiMatteo, 17th Circuit
8. Honorable Daniel S. Fiore, II, 17th Circuit
9. Honorable Stacey W. Moreau, 22nd Circuit
10. Honorable Marcus H. Long, Jr., 27th Circuit
11. Honorable Sage B. Johnson, 28th Circuit

General District Court Judges

12. Honorable Robert G. MacDonald, 1st District
13. Honorable Elizabeth S. Hodges, 2nd District
14. Honorable Salvatore R. Iaquinto, 2nd District
15. Honorable Paul David Merullo, 2nd District
16. Honorable Joan E. Mahoney, 4th District
17. Honorable Michael Charles Rosenblum, 4th District
18. Honorable W. Parker Councill, 5th District
19. Honorable H. Lee Townsend, III, 6th District
20. Honorable Stephanie E. Merritt, 9th District
21. Honorable Robert Beman Beasley, Jr., 11th District
22. Honorable Ray P. Lupold, III, 11th District
23. Honorable Matthew Donald Nelson, 12th District
24. Honorable Robert Eric Reibach, 15th District
25. Honorable Donald M. Haddock, Jr., 18th District
26. Honorable Robert L. Adams, Jr., 22nd District
27. Honorable Francis W. Burkart, III, 23rd District
28. Honorable John Stanley Hart, Jr., 26th District
29. Honorable George Robert Brittain, II, 29th District
30. Honorable Shawn L. Hines, 30th District
31. Honorable Wallace Semeon Covington, III, 31st District

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges

32. Honorable Philip C. Hollowell, 2nd District
33. Honorable Scott David Landry, 12th District
34. Honorable Jayne Ann Pemberton, 12th District
35. Honorable Vanessa L. Jones, 12th District
36. Honorable Marilyn C. Goss-Thornton, 13th District
37. Honorable Georgia K. Sutton, 15th District
38. Honorable David M. Barredo, 16th District
39. Honorable Deborah S. Tinsley, 16th District

The Honorable Mark D. Obenshain, Chairman
The Honorable Robert B. Bell, Chairman
November 26, 2019
Page 3

40. Honorable Janine M. Saxe, 19th District
41. Honorable Onzlee Ware, 23rd District
42. Honorable Frank W. Rogers, III, 23rd District
43. Honorable Laura L. Dascher, 25th District
44. Honorable Linda Schorsch Jones, 25th District
45. Honorable Kimberly Marion Athey, 26th District
46. Honorable Anthony Wayne Bailey, 26th District
47. Honorable Bradley G. Dalton, 27th District
48. Honorable Stephanie Murray Shortt, 27th District
49. Honorable Florence A. Powell, 28th District
50. Honorable H. Jan Roltsch-Anoll, 31st District

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

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,



Karl R. Hade

KRH:pd

Enclosure

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

Judicial Performance Evaluation Program Information for General Assembly Members – 2019

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 W. Allan Sharrett

Judge of the Circuit Court
6th 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

2019



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 154 completed surveys for Judge W. Allan Sharrett.

Evaluation of Judge W. Allan Sharrett: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	81.7% 125	15.0% 23	2.6% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.3% 139	9.1% 14	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.1% 111	8.7% 11	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.1% 111	7.9% 10	1.6% 2	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.6% 141	6.5% 10	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	91.2% 134	8.8% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.7% 144	4.6% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	90.3% 139	5.8% 9	3.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.3% 139	5.2% 8	4.6% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	97.9% 91	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	95.1% 117	4.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.8% 145	5.2% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	88.1% 96	9.2% 10	2.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.5% 94	12.7% 14	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	84.4% 92	11.0% 12	3.7% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	91.5% 140	7.2% 11	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.8% 99	14.5% 18	1.6% 2	3.2% 4	0.8% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.4% 111	9.5% 12	1.6% 2	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	90.7% 137	6.6% 10	2.0% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	85.2% 127	12.1% 18	1.3% 2	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.8% 138	8.6% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge W. Allan Sharrett: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	138	89.6%
	Good	12	7.8%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	10.0%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	89	89.0%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable W. Alan Sharrett
6th 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
2012	222	73	0
2013	186	57	0
2014	125	36	0
2015	143	49	0
2016	120	38	0
2017	163	54	0
2018	152	40	0
2019	92	28	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael E. McGinty

Judge of the Circuit Court
9th 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

2019



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 144 completed surveys for Judge Michael E. McGinty.

Evaluation of Judge Michael E. McGinty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.8% 112	20.8% 30	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.7% 122	14.6% 21	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.0% 102	13.3% 16	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.7% 98	15.0% 18	2.5% 3	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.5% 128	7.7% 11	1.4% 2	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.4% 112	15.4% 21	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.9% 128	9.0% 13	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.3% 117	13.2% 19	3.5% 5	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.4% 117	12.0% 17	3.5% 5	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.2% 83	7.6% 7	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.1% 104	11.0% 13	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.0% 126	9.3% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.7% 80	17.5% 18	4.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.5% 84	15.9% 17	3.7% 4	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	77.4% 82	16.0% 17	4.7% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.0% 121	10.4% 15	4.2% 6	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.5% 100	12.8% 15	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.0% 100	10.9% 13	3.4% 4	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.8% 119	12.7% 18	2.1% 3	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	77.7% 108	21.6% 30	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.6% 116	16.0% 23	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Michael E. McGinty: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	119	82.6%
	Good	18	12.5%
	Needs Improvement	6	4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	11.4%
	Worse	3	3.4%
	Stayed the Same	75	85.2%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Michael E. McGinty
9th 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
2012	86	31	0
2013	156	52	0
2014	159	47	0
2015	131	41	0
2016	90	29	0
2017	152	49	0
2018	177	43	0
2019	93	21	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Steven C. McCallum

Judge of the Circuit Court
12th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 153 completed surveys for Judge Steven C. McCallum.

Evaluation of Judge Steven C. McCallum: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	85.0% 130	12.4% 19	2.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.2% 141	6.5% 10	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	93.3% 126	5.2% 7	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.6% 125	6.7% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.8% 138	6.6% 10	2.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.0% 129	8.3% 12	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	1.4% 2
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.7% 144	4.6% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.5% 136	7.2% 11	3.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.1% 136	7.3% 11	2.0% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.7% 89	5.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	94.1% 127	5.2% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.3% 140	6.0% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	82.5% 99	10.8% 13	5.8% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.5% 99	14.2% 17	2.5% 3	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	84.9% 101	12.6% 15	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	90.8% 138	7.2% 11	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.9% 116	11.9% 16	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.7% 117	12.6% 17	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.3% 133	8.7% 13	1.3% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	84.0% 126	14.7% 22	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.4% 132	11.9% 18	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Steven C. McCallum: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	129	84.9%
	Good	20	13.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	3.9%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	99	95.2%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Steven C. McCallum
12th 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
2012	83	14	0
2013	216	41	0
2014	221	55	0
2015	155	32	0
2016	219	35	0
2017	199	35	0
2018	147	23	0
2019	47	9	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gregory L. Rupe

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

2019



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 138 completed surveys for Judge Gregory L. Rupe.

Evaluation of Judge Gregory L. Rupe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	46.3% 63	30.2% 41	15.4% 21	8.1% 11	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	60.3% 82	21.3% 29	14.0% 19	4.4% 6	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	59.0% 72	30.3% 37	8.2% 10	2.5% 3	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	64.2% 77	23.3% 28	11.7% 14	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	60.9% 84	20.3% 28	10.9% 15	7.3% 10	0.7% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	66.4% 89	22.4% 30	9.0% 12	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	66.2% 92	18.0% 25	13.0% 18	2.9% 4	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	63.0% 87	20.3% 28	12.3% 17	3.6% 5	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	62.8% 86	17.5% 24	14.6% 20	4.4% 6	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	74.0% 74	21.0% 21	5.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.5% 99	16.3% 20	3.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.6% 111	14.0% 19	3.7% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	57.6% 68	24.6% 29	13.6% 16	4.2% 5	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	52.1% 63	33.1% 40	13.2% 16	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	50.8% 61	31.7% 38	15.8% 19	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	64.5% 89	23.9% 33	9.4% 13	1.5% 2	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.0% 88	24.4% 29	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	65.9% 81	26.8% 33	5.7% 7	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	67.7% 92	16.9% 23	11.0% 15	3.7% 5	0.7% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	69.4% 93	26.9% 36	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	66.4% 91	27.0% 37	6.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Gregory L. Rupe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	85	62.5%
	Good	33	24.3%
	Needs Improvement	14	10.3%
	Unsatisfactory	4	2.9%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	6.1%
	Worse	4	4.9%
	Stayed the Same	73	89.0%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Gregory L. Rupe
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
2012	54	17	1
2013	132	50	1
2014	140	51	0
2015	101	36	0
2016	113	56	1
2017	137	58	1
2018	119	48	0
2019	54	19	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Richard S. Wallerstein, Jr.

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

2019



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 Richard S. Wallerstein, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Richard S. Wallerstein, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	66.7% 130	26.7% 52	5.1% 10	1.5% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	78.6% 154	16.3% 32	5.1% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.0% 128	16.1% 26	4.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.0% 128	15.6% 25	3.8% 6	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	79.5% 155	11.8% 23	7.2% 14	1.5% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.9% 155	13.4% 25	2.1% 4	0.5% 1	1.1% 2
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.2% 168	12.3% 24	1.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.0% 149	15.3% 30	7.7% 15	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.0% 154	14.9% 29	4.6% 9	1.0% 2	0.5% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	80.5% 103	15.6% 20	3.1% 4	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.7% 142	12.4% 20	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.6% 168	12.4% 24	1.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	65.1% 97	23.5% 35	8.7% 13	2.7% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.0% 108	20.7% 31	6.7% 10	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	71.1% 106	22.2% 33	6.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.4% 158	13.9% 27	4.1% 8	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.9% 131	15.6% 25	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.5% 128	15.7% 25	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.6% 154	11.5% 22	6.3% 12	1.1% 2	0.5% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	79.0% 154	18.5% 36	1.5% 3	0.0% 0	1.0% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.4% 156	18.0% 35	1.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Richard S. Wallerstein, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	147	76.2%
	Good	30	15.5%
	Needs Improvement	15	7.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.5%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	8.3%
	Worse	7	5.3%
	Stayed the Same	114	86.4%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Richard S. Wallerstein, Jr.
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
2012	85	22	0
2013	173	43	0
2014	170	29	0
2015	253	52	0
2016	224	52	0
2017	219	35	0
2018	195	37	0
2019	112	16	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Susan L. Whitlock

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

2019



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 140 completed surveys for Judge Susan L. Whitlock.

Evaluation of Judge Susan L. Whitlock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	76.4% 107	21.4% 30	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.3% 118	12.1% 17	2.9% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.2% 120	11.0% 15	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.6% 121	6.7% 9	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.8% 122	9.4% 13	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.4% 114	12.1% 16	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.9% 130	7.1% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.3% 115	12.3% 17	4.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.7% 116	11.7% 16	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.2% 97	5.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.0% 122	8.2% 11	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.2% 130	5.1% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.2% 93	21.3% 26	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.4% 98	19.2% 24	2.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	83.2% 104	15.2% 19	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.4% 107	19.3% 27	4.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.8% 101	20.0% 27	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.0% 112	13.3% 18	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.2% 119	10.9% 15	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	80.5% 107	18.1% 24	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.6% 112	16.6% 23	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Susan L. Whitlock: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	112	81.8%
	Good	20	14.6%
	Needs Improvement	4	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	14.4%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	82	84.5%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Susan L. Whitlock
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
2012	69	15	0
2013	179	59	0
2014	181	37	0
2015	196	44	0
2016	227	61	0
2017	216	67	0
2018	220	57	0
2019	92	23	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Louise M. DiMatteo

Judge of the Circuit Court
17th 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

2019



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 218 completed surveys for Judge Louise M. DiMatteo.

Evaluation of Judge Louise M. DiMatteo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.9% 135	25.7% 56	9.6% 21	2.3% 5	0.5% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	72.0% 157	19.3% 42	6.4% 14	2.3% 5	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.1% 132	12.4% 21	8.3% 14	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.4% 131	13.3% 22	6.7% 11	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.9% 161	16.1% 35	6.9% 15	3.2% 7	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.2% 154	15.7% 31	4.6% 9	1.5% 3	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.7% 189	10.6% 23	2.3% 5	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.4% 165	14.4% 31	6.9% 15	2.3% 5	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.7% 165	13.0% 28	6.5% 14	2.8% 6	0.9% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.7% 102	6.4% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.8% 145	13.6% 23	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.9% 186	10.8% 23	2.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	67.3% 101	18.7% 28	10.0% 15	3.3% 5	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.0% 110	19.4% 30	7.7% 12	1.9% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	71.5% 108	20.5% 31	6.0% 9	2.0% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.8% 174	16.1% 35	4.1% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.5% 127	21.7% 36	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	70.8% 119	24.4% 41	4.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.9% 164	12.5% 26	5.8% 12	2.4% 5	0.5% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	73.7% 154	21.5% 45	2.9% 6	1.4% 3	0.5% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.3% 163	19.4% 41	1.4% 3	1.4% 3	0.5% 1

Evaluation of Judge Louise M. DiMatteo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	162	76.1%
	Good	32	15.0%
	Needs Improvement	14	6.6%
	Unsatisfactory	5	2.4%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	17.4%
	Worse	5	4.4%
	Stayed the Same	90	78.3%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Louise M. DiMatteo
17th 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
2012	29	7	0
2013	106	40	0
2014	69	20	0
2015	113	40	0
2016	139	54	0
2017	139	54	0
2018	93	37	0
2019*	4	0	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

* Staff of the Clerk's office have been notified about the missing guidelines

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Daniel S. Fiore, II

Judge of the Circuit Court
17th 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

2019



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 190 completed surveys for Judge Daniel S. Fiore, II.

Evaluation of Judge Daniel S. Fiore, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	34.2% 65	33.7% 64	26.3% 50	5.8% 11	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	42.6% 81	32.1% 61	19.5% 37	5.8% 11	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	51.8% 85	28.7% 47	15.2% 25	3.7% 6	0.6% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	51.9% 83	30.6% 49	12.5% 20	4.4% 7	0.6% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	47.9% 90	25.5% 48	18.6% 35	6.9% 13	1.1% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	62.5% 110	29.6% 52	6.3% 11	1.7% 3	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	65.6% 124	23.3% 44	10.1% 19	0.5% 1	0.5% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	51.6% 98	25.3% 48	12.6% 24	9.0% 17	1.6% 3
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	53.7% 101	23.9% 45	11.7% 22	9.6% 18	1.1% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.3% 93	10.6% 12	7.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.4% 130	19.1% 32	3.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	75.5% 139	21.2% 39	2.7% 5	0.5% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	38.6% 59	27.5% 42	24.2% 37	9.2% 14	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	44.9% 70	35.9% 56	13.5% 21	5.1% 8	0.6% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	47.4% 73	27.9% 43	18.2% 28	4.6% 7	2.0% 3
16. The judge communicates effectively	51.9% 98	28.0% 53	14.3% 27	4.8% 9	1.1% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	43.0% 71	29.1% 48	18.8% 31	5.5% 9	3.6% 6
18. The judge's decisions are clear	48.2% 81	26.2% 44	16.1% 27	7.1% 12	2.4% 4
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	59.3% 108	20.3% 37	12.6% 23	5.0% 9	2.8% 5
20. The judge starts court on time	55.9% 104	32.8% 61	9.1% 17	2.2% 4	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	56.5% 105	26.3% 49	12.4% 23	4.3% 8	0.5% 1

Evaluation of Judge Daniel S. Fiore, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	91	49.5%
	Good	50	27.2%
	Needs Improvement	24	13.0%
	Unsatisfactory	19	10.3%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	30	24.2%
	Worse	14	11.3%
	Stayed the Same	80	64.5%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Daniel S. Fiore, II
17th 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
2012	52	22	0
2013	111	42	0
2014	141	60	0
2015	109	47	0
2016	123	46	0
2017	191	68	0
2018	119	46	0
2019*	0	0	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

* Staff of the Clerk's office have been notified about the missing guidelines

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stacey W. Moreau

Judge of the Circuit Court
22nd 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

2019



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 177 completed surveys for Judge Stacey W. Moreau.

Evaluation of Judge Stacey W. Moreau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	75.7% 134	20.9% 37	2.3% 4	1.1% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.2% 150	12.5% 22	1.7% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.6% 116	9.7% 13	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.3% 113	9.9% 13	3.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	85.2% 150	12.5% 22	1.7% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.8% 150	9.6% 16	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.8% 159	7.9% 14	1.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.6% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.8% 143	13.6% 24	2.8% 5	2.3% 4	0.6% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.2% 142	14.7% 26	2.8% 5	1.7% 3	0.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.0% 94	5.0% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.1% 118	11.9% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.4% 160	8.6% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	64.4% 74	29.6% 34	6.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.0% 79	23.7% 28	6.8% 8	1.7% 2	0.9% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	70.9% 83	20.5% 24	6.8% 8	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.3% 137	16.6% 29	4.0% 7	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.0% 110	14.5% 19	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.7% 103	18.4% 25	5.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.8% 145	11.6% 20	2.3% 4	1.7% 3	0.6% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	81.2% 138	17.1% 29	1.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.3% 145	14.5% 25	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Stacey W. Moreau: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	140	80.5%
	Good	24	13.8%
	Needs Improvement	8	4.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	10.9%
	Worse	2	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	96	87.3%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Stacey W. Moreau
22nd 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
2012	99	14	0
2013	208	44	0
2014	143	23	0
2015	168	38	0
2016	163	43	0
2017	163	42	0
2018	129	28	0
2019	76	15	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Marcus H. Long, Jr.

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

2019



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 168 completed surveys for Judge Marcus H. Long, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Marcus H. Long, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	34.7% 58	31.1% 52	22.8% 38	9.0% 15	2.4% 4
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	49.4% 83	25.0% 42	17.9% 30	4.8% 8	3.0% 5
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	59.2% 84	22.5% 32	14.8% 21	2.1% 3	1.4% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	61.2% 85	20.1% 28	17.3% 24	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	48.8% 81	18.7% 31	18.7% 31	7.8% 13	6.0% 10
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	64.2% 102	25.2% 40	6.3% 10	3.1% 5	1.3% 2
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	72.0% 121	19.1% 32	7.7% 13	0.6% 1	0.6% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	56.1% 92	15.9% 26	15.9% 26	7.9% 13	4.3% 7
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	54.9% 90	16.5% 27	17.1% 28	7.9% 13	3.7% 6
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.2% 79	14.9% 15	5.0% 5	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.1% 111	19.4% 28	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.4% 127	15.4% 25	4.9% 8	0.0% 0	1.2% 2
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	40.9% 52	26.0% 33	18.9% 24	7.9% 10	6.3% 8
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	60.9% 78	22.7% 29	10.9% 14	3.9% 5	1.6% 2
15. The judge is faithful to the law	57.0% 73	19.5% 25	18.0% 23	3.9% 5	1.6% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	63.0% 104	22.4% 37	10.3% 17	3.0% 5	1.2% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	64.8% 92	26.8% 38	7.8% 11	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	64.8% 92	23.2% 33	9.9% 14	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	62.8% 103	14.0% 23	12.2% 20	7.3% 12	3.7% 6
20. The judge starts court on time	60.1% 98	29.5% 48	8.6% 14	1.2% 2	0.6% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	62.4% 101	30.3% 49	7.4% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Marcus H. Long, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	91	56.2%
	Good	29	17.9%
	Needs Improvement	24	14.8%
	Unsatisfactory	18	11.1%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	16	14.6%
	Worse	8	7.3%
	Stayed the Same	86	78.2%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Marcus H. Long
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
2012	148	34	9
2013	379	110	10
2014	401	120	8
2015	151	61	1
2016	129	40	3
2017	143	56	2
2018	130	47	0
2019	73	17	1

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Sage B. Johnson

Judge of the Circuit Court
28th 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

2019



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 128 completed surveys for Judge Sage B. Johnson.

Evaluation of Judge Sage B. Johnson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	71.4% 90	25.4% 32	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	80.7% 100	17.7% 22	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.5% 95	17.0% 20	1.7% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.9% 90	18.0% 21	5.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.3% 104	13.3% 17	3.9% 5	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.3% 94	16.2% 19	2.6% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.2% 109	14.1% 18	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.2% 91	18.3% 23	7.1% 9	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	73.6% 92	15.2% 19	8.8% 11	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.4% 76	9.3% 8	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.0% 100	11.3% 13	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.8% 108	10.6% 13	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.2% 77	19.8% 20	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	60.6% 63	24.0% 25	14.4% 15	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	58.3% 60	28.2% 29	10.7% 11	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.3% 99	16.4% 21	5.5% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	71.6% 83	20.7% 24	6.0% 7	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.4% 84	19.0% 22	8.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.5% 99	11.4% 14	5.7% 7	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	72.2% 91	25.4% 32	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.4% 100	15.9% 20	4.0% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Sage B. Johnson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	89 69.5%
	Good	29 22.7%
	Needs Improvement	9 7.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	31 30.4%
	Worse	4 3.9%
	Stayed the Same	67 65.7%



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 2012 – CY 2019 (Through May)**

The Honorable Sage B. Johnson
28th 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
2012	78	24	1
2013	210	64	2
2014	190	51	1
2015	204	34	0
2016	188	50	3
2017	180	35	4
2018	222	50	1
2019	85	17	0

Note: Figures for CY 2019 are through May only.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert G. MacDonald

Judge of the General District Court
1st Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 107 completed surveys for Judge Robert G. MacDonald.

Evaluation of Judge Robert G. MacDonald: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	86.9% 93	12.2% 13	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.8% 95	11.2% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	91.6% 98	8.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.5% 98	5.7% 6	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.6% 98	7.5% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.4% 91	9.7% 10	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.5% 98	7.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.7% 94	10.4% 11	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	89.6% 95	8.5% 9	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.6% 70	11.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.4% 94	8.7% 9	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.7% 97	8.4% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.4% 74	16.3% 15	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	81.3% 74	16.5% 15	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	76.9% 70	22.0% 20	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	91.5% 97	8.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.2% 90	9.8% 10	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.4% 90	12.6% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.7% 91	11.4% 12	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	83.8% 88	14.3% 15	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.5% 79	18.6% 19	2.9% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Robert G. MacDonald: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	93	86.9%
	Good	13	12.2%
	Needs Improvement	1	0.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	12.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	84	87.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Elizabeth S. Hodges

Judge of the General District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 108 completed surveys for Judge Elizabeth S. Hodges.

Evaluation of Judge Elizabeth S. Hodges: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.9% 96	10.2% 11	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.6% 100	5.6% 6	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.7% 93	8.5% 9	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.8% 92	9.4% 10	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.6% 100	4.6% 5	1.9% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.6% 89	12.5% 13	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.7% 97	5.6% 6	0.9% 1	2.8% 3	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.3% 91	11.1% 12	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	85.1% 91	9.4% 10	2.8% 3	1.9% 2	0.9% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.5% 74	6.3% 5	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.6% 87	16.7% 18	2.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.9% 90	14.2% 15	0.0% 0	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	87.4% 90	8.7% 9	1.9% 2	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.2% 79	15.2% 16	6.7% 7	1.9% 2	1.0% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	76.0% 79	17.3% 18	2.9% 3	2.9% 3	1.0% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.1% 93	10.2% 11	1.9% 2	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	91.6% 98	6.5% 7	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	88.0% 95	7.4% 8	3.7% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.5% 87	8.7% 9	3.9% 4	1.9% 2	1.0% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	86.9% 93	11.2% 12	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.8% 95	9.4% 10	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.9% 1

Evaluation of Judge Elizabeth S. Hodges: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	88	82.2%
	Good	15	14.0%
	Needs Improvement	1	0.9%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	14.7%
	Worse	2	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	79	83.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Salvatore R. Iaquinto

Judge of the General District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 93 completed surveys for Judge Salvatore R. Iaquinto.

Evaluation of Judge Salvatore R. Iaquinto: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	69.6% 64	28.3% 26	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.7% 76	16.1% 15	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.2% 82	10.8% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.8% 79	11.1% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.2% 82	9.7% 9	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.6% 77	13.3% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.0% 80	11.8% 11	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	79.1% 72	17.6% 16	2.2% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.2% 74	14.4% 13	2.2% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.9% 64	11.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.0% 81	12.0% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.2% 82	11.8% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.0% 73	13.6% 12	2.3% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.3% 69	17.2% 15	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	79.3% 69	18.4% 16	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	88.2% 82	8.6% 8	2.2% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	89.1% 82	10.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.0% 81	11.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.2% 74	14.6% 13	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	83.5% 76	16.5% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.6% 77	14.3% 13	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Salvatore R. Iaquinto: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	76	81.7%
	Good	14	15.1%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15	17.7%
	Worse	1	1.2%
	Stayed the Same	69	81.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Paul David Merullo

Judge of the General District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 106 completed surveys for Judge Paul David Merullo.

Evaluation of Judge Paul David Merullo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	86.8% 92	11.3% 12	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.6% 96	9.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.9% 90	9.4% 10	3.8% 4	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.0% 88	11.3% 12	3.8% 4	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.6% 95	10.4% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.7% 90	14.3% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.7% 94	9.4% 10	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.2% 80	18.1% 19	5.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.1% 82	17.1% 18	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.2% 75	11.5% 10	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.7% 87	15.4% 16	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.5% 94	8.6% 9	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.8% 76	16.2% 16	7.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	62.6% 62	19.2% 19	11.1% 11	7.1% 7	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	64.0% 64	18.0% 18	14.0% 14	4.0% 4	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.1% 81	16.2% 17	4.8% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.8% 84	16.4% 17	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.1% 81	15.2% 16	5.7% 6	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.2% 85	13.2% 14	5.7% 6	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	89.5% 94	10.5% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.1% 81	20.0% 21	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Paul David Merullo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	72	70.6%
	Good	18	17.7%
	Needs Improvement	9	8.8%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	12.5%
	Worse	5	5.7%
	Stayed the Same	72	81.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Joan E. Mahoney

Judge of the General District Court
4th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 163 completed surveys for Judge Joan E. Mahoney.

Evaluation of Judge Joan E. Mahoney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	62.6% 102	29.5% 48	8.0% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	70.6% 113	23.1% 37	5.6% 9	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.5% 128	18.0% 29	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.5% 128	17.0% 27	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	77.6% 125	14.9% 24	6.8% 11	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.2% 125	15.1% 23	2.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.4% 135	13.8% 22	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.2% 121	16.2% 26	8.1% 13	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	75.8% 122	17.4% 28	6.2% 10	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.3% 104	13.9% 17	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.9% 139	12.5% 20	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.4% 144	8.7% 14	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	68.2% 101	23.0% 34	7.4% 11	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.3% 107	22.0% 33	5.3% 8	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	68.7% 103	24.7% 37	5.3% 8	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.3% 126	17.4% 28	3.7% 6	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.5% 136	13.2% 21	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.7% 129	12.7% 20	5.1% 8	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.7% 122	17.2% 27	3.8% 6	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	78.8% 126	21.3% 34	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.0% 132	16.2% 26	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Joan E. Mahoney: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	110	68.3%
	Good	44	27.3%
	Needs Improvement	7	4.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	9.4%
	Worse	2	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	123	89.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael Charles Rosenblum

Judge of the General District Court
4th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 161 completed surveys for Judge Michael Charles Rosenblum.

Evaluation of Judge Michael Charles Rosenblum: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	94.4% 152	5.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	98.8% 159	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	96.3% 155	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	94.4% 152	5.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	98.8% 158	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	93.6% 146	6.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	95.6% 153	3.8% 6	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	93.8% 151	5.0% 8	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	95.6% 153	1.9% 3	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.4% 125	3.1% 4	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.6% 149	7.5% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.1% 148	6.9% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	96.7% 145	2.7% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	92.0% 138	8.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	88.6% 132	10.1% 15	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	93.1% 149	6.3% 10	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	93.1% 149	5.6% 9	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	95.6% 153	4.4% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	95.6% 153	2.5% 4	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	91.2% 145	8.8% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.8% 142	8.1% 13	3.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Michael Charles Rosenblum: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	145	92.4%
	Good	11	7.0%
	Needs Improvement	1	0.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	27	18.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	116	81.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable W. Parker Council

Judge of the General District Court
5th 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

2019



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 102 completed surveys for Judge W. Parker Council.

Evaluation of Judge W. Parker Council: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	89.2% 91	8.8% 9	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.2% 93	7.8% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.0% 84	11.0% 11	4.0% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.3% 86	12.8% 13	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.2% 93	7.8% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.0% 88	9.0% 9	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.2% 83	12.9% 13	5.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	86.3% 88	9.8% 10	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.3% 86	12.8% 13	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.5% 77	8.1% 7	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.2% 85	11.9% 12	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.1% 88	10.9% 11	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	89.3% 83	8.6% 8	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.9% 78	14.0% 13	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	81.3% 74	14.3% 13	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.3% 85	12.8% 13	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	89.2% 91	7.8% 8	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.1% 90	8.9% 9	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.2% 83	14.9% 15	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	79.8% 79	18.2% 18	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.0% 78	19.0% 19	1.0% 1	2.0% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge W. Parker Council: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	81 81.8%
	Good	15 15.2%
	Needs Improvement	3 3.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 6.5%
	Worse	1 1.1%
	Stayed the Same	85 92.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable H. Lee Townsend, III

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

2019



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 74 completed surveys for Judge H. Lee Townsend, III.

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Townsend, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	56.8% 42	29.7% 22	8.1% 6	4.1% 3	1.4% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	75.7% 56	17.6% 13	5.4% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.3% 55	16.2% 12	4.1% 3	5.4% 4	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.7% 56	12.3% 9	5.5% 4	5.5% 4	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.1% 60	9.5% 7	8.1% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.1% 59	11.3% 8	4.2% 3	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	75.7% 56	14.9% 11	5.4% 4	2.7% 2	1.4% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.3% 55	15.1% 11	4.1% 3	5.5% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.1% 54	15.5% 11	2.8% 2	5.6% 4	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.9% 52	6.5% 4	4.8% 3	4.8% 3	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.8% 65	5.4% 4	4.1% 3	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.1% 63	9.5% 7	2.7% 2	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.0% 49	17.1% 12	5.7% 4	5.7% 4	1.4% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.4% 50	21.1% 15	4.2% 3	4.2% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	66.7% 48	20.8% 15	6.9% 5	5.6% 4	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.1% 60	10.8% 8	1.4% 1	6.8% 5	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.3% 63	8.2% 6	2.7% 2	2.7% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.4% 61	8.1% 6	5.4% 4	4.1% 3	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.2% 57	16.7% 12	2.8% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	84.9% 62	13.7% 10	0.0% 0	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.5% 60	7.0% 5	7.0% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge H. Lee Townsend, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	54	76.1%
	Good	11	15.5%
	Needs Improvement	3	4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	3	4.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	7.8%
	Worse	3	4.7%
	Stayed the Same	56	87.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stephanie E. Merritt

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

2019



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 135 completed surveys for Judge Stephanie E. Merritt.

Evaluation of Judge Stephanie E. Merritt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.9% 91	24.2% 32	5.3% 7	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	77.0% 104	16.3% 22	5.9% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.0% 104	19.3% 26	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.9% 103	19.4% 26	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.9% 103	14.9% 20	7.5% 10	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	75.9% 101	19.6% 26	4.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.0% 108	16.3% 22	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.0% 104	18.5% 25	4.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.7% 102	16.5% 22	5.3% 7	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.7% 87	13.5% 14	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.6% 112	14.2% 19	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.2% 112	14.3% 19	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.0% 89	22.1% 27	4.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.2% 92	21.0% 26	4.0% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	74.8% 92	20.3% 25	3.3% 4	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.3% 103	20.7% 28	2.2% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.1% 110	15.7% 21	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.0% 105	17.3% 23	3.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.2% 108	15.8% 21	1.5% 2	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	73.5% 97	23.5% 31	2.3% 3	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.0% 108	14.8% 20	3.7% 5	1.5% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Stephanie E. Merritt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	96	71.6%
	Good	31	23.1%
	Needs Improvement	6	4.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	30	27.5%
	Worse	1	0.9%
	Stayed the Same	78	71.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert Beman Beasley, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
11th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 63 completed surveys for Judge Robert Beman Beasley, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Robert Beman Beasley, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.3% 38	29.0% 18	6.5% 4	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.4% 45	20.6% 13	3.2% 2	3.2% 2	1.6% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	65.1% 41	25.4% 16	4.8% 3	3.2% 2	1.6% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	61.3% 38	30.7% 19	3.2% 2	3.2% 2	1.6% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	64.5% 40	24.2% 15	6.5% 4	3.2% 2	1.6% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	66.1% 39	25.4% 15	5.1% 3	1.7% 1	1.7% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	66.7% 42	25.4% 16	6.4% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	60.7% 37	29.5% 18	4.9% 3	1.6% 1	3.3% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	61.3% 38	27.4% 17	6.5% 4	0.0% 0	4.8% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	73.7% 28	18.4% 7	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	5.3% 2
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	70.5% 43	26.2% 16	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	61.3% 38	35.5% 22	0.0% 0	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	63.0% 34	27.8% 15	3.7% 2	3.7% 2	1.9% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	57.4% 31	29.6% 16	7.4% 4	1.9% 1	3.7% 2
15. The judge is faithful to the law	55.6% 30	27.8% 15	11.1% 6	1.9% 1	3.7% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	67.7% 42	24.2% 15	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	3.2% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	65.0% 39	28.3% 17	3.3% 2	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	62.9% 39	29.0% 18	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	3.2% 2
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	60.7% 37	27.9% 17	6.6% 4	1.6% 1	3.3% 2
20. The judge starts court on time	62.9% 39	19.4% 12	12.9% 8	4.8% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	54.8% 34	25.8% 16	11.3% 7	4.8% 3	3.2% 2

Evaluation of Judge Robert Beman Beasley, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29 46.8%
	Good	24 38.7%
	Needs Improvement	5 8.1%
	Unsatisfactory	4 6.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3 6.0%
	Worse	3 6.0%
	Stayed the Same	44 88.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Ray P. Lupold, III

Judge of the General District Court
11th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 Ray P. Lupold, III.

Evaluation of Judge Ray P. Lupold, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	58.5% 86	22.5% 33	14.3% 21	4.1% 6	0.7% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	63.7% 93	25.3% 37	8.9% 13	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.2% 112	19.1% 28	2.7% 4	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.7% 112	17.1% 25	4.1% 6	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	68.0% 100	17.7% 26	8.8% 13	4.1% 6	1.4% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.8% 117	14.0% 20	3.5% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 126	10.9% 16	2.0% 3	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.6% 106	15.8% 23	6.9% 10	3.4% 5	1.4% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.2% 104	17.8% 26	4.8% 7	4.1% 6	2.1% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.2% 99	10.1% 12	3.4% 4	2.5% 3	0.8% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.8% 123	13.1% 19	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.7% 122	12.5% 18	1.4% 2	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.6% 103	16.4% 23	6.4% 9	2.9% 4	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.4% 112	15.6% 22	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
15. The judge is faithful to the law	75.9% 107	15.6% 22	5.7% 8	1.4% 2	1.4% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.2% 112	18.4% 27	3.4% 5	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.5% 126	10.4% 15	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.6% 125	11.6% 17	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	1.4% 2
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.4% 105	17.2% 25	4.1% 6	4.8% 7	1.4% 2
20. The judge starts court on time	83.3% 120	13.2% 19	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.3% 118	12.9% 19	4.1% 6	2.0% 3	0.7% 1

Evaluation of Judge Ray P. Lupold, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	105	72.4%
	Good	25	17.2%
	Needs Improvement	10	6.9%
	Unsatisfactory	5	3.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	14.3%
	Worse	1	0.8%
	Stayed the Same	113	85.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Matthew Donald Nelson

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

2019



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 Matthew Donald Nelson.

Evaluation of Judge Matthew Donald Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.1% 64	16.9% 14	6.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	80.7% 67	15.7% 13	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.9% 63	18.1% 15	4.8% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	73.2% 60	22.0% 18	3.7% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	78.1% 64	17.1% 14	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	76.0% 60	22.8% 18	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.1% 69	14.5% 12	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	63.9% 53	22.9% 19	8.4% 7	3.6% 3	1.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	68.7% 57	20.5% 17	7.2% 6	2.4% 2	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.2% 56	12.3% 8	0.0% 0	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	74.4% 61	24.4% 20	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.7% 67	19.3% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	63.2% 48	26.3% 20	9.2% 7	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	51.3% 39	31.6% 24	14.5% 11	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	59.2% 45	30.3% 23	7.9% 6	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	68.7% 57	26.5% 22	3.6% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	72.3% 60	24.1% 20	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.2% 60	22.0% 18	2.4% 2	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	71.6% 58	22.2% 18	1.2% 1	3.7% 3	1.2% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	67.5% 56	28.9% 24	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	61.9% 52	33.3% 28	3.6% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Matthew Donald Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	47	57.3%
	Good	27	32.9%
	Needs Improvement	7	8.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	11.0%
	Worse	3	4.1%
	Stayed the Same	62	84.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert Eric Reibach

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

2019



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 110 completed surveys for Judge Robert Eric Reibach.

Evaluation of Judge Robert Eric Reibach: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.2% 75	29.1% 32	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	80.0% 88	19.1% 21	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.5% 91	15.6% 17	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.3% 91	13.9% 15	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.4% 95	10.9% 12	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.7% 89	14.7% 16	3.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.5% 91	13.8% 15	2.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.9% 86	17.4% 19	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.2% 86	17.3% 19	2.7% 3	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.2% 74	16.9% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.2% 94	11.9% 13	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.6% 92	12.7% 14	3.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	78.6% 81	17.5% 18	2.9% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.5% 76	22.6% 23	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	73.8% 76	22.3% 23	1.0% 1	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	82.7% 91	15.5% 17	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.1% 96	11.0% 12	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.6% 93	12.7% 14	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.8% 90	12.7% 14	3.6% 4	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	75.0% 81	23.2% 25	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.9% 86	21.1% 23	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Robert Eric Reibach: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	92	83.6%
	Good	15	13.6%
	Needs Improvement	2	1.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	13.6%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	88	85.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Donald M. Haddock, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
18th 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

2019



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 143 completed surveys for Judge Donald M. Haddock, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Donald M. Haddock, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	72.7% 104	23.8% 34	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	77.6% 111	20.3% 29	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.9% 114	14.9% 21	2.8% 4	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.6% 112	15.8% 22	2.9% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.9% 107	18.4% 26	4.3% 6	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.3% 110	15.3% 21	4.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.3% 114	15.5% 22	3.5% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.5% 110	13.4% 19	5.6% 8	3.5% 5	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.2% 111	13.4% 19	4.9% 7	3.5% 5	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.1% 98	9.1% 10	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.9% 120	11.9% 17	4.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.7% 118	14.2% 20	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.6% 105	18.3% 25	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	80.3% 110	13.1% 18	5.1% 7	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	71.3% 97	19.9% 27	7.4% 10	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.2% 111	16.9% 24	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.1% 122	11.4% 16	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.4% 112	15.6% 22	2.8% 4	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.0% 112	12.9% 18	4.3% 6	2.9% 4	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	58.5% 83	35.2% 50	4.2% 6	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.4% 95	30.2% 42	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Donald M. Haddock, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	112	78.9%
	Good	22	15.5%
	Needs Improvement	7	4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	3.9%
	Worse	4	3.1%
	Stayed the Same	119	93.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert L. Adams, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
22nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 76 completed surveys for Judge Robert L. Adams, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge Robert L. Adams, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	41.3% 31	26.7% 20	18.7% 14	12.0% 9	1.3% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	54.0% 41	25.0% 19	14.5% 11	6.6% 5	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	62.7% 47	21.3% 16	10.7% 8	5.3% 4	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	63.2% 48	25.0% 19	7.9% 6	4.0% 3	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	58.7% 44	26.7% 20	5.3% 4	9.3% 7	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	72.0% 54	18.7% 14	8.0% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	65.8% 50	22.4% 17	7.9% 6	4.0% 3	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	56.6% 43	25.0% 19	9.2% 7	9.2% 7	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	55.3% 42	23.7% 18	13.2% 10	7.9% 6	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.3% 51	12.9% 8	3.2% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.6% 59	18.4% 14	1.3% 1	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	76.3% 58	15.8% 12	4.0% 3	4.0% 3	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	47.8% 32	19.4% 13	20.9% 14	9.0% 6	3.0% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	58.8% 40	25.0% 17	10.3% 7	4.4% 3	1.5% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	51.5% 35	25.0% 17	16.2% 11	5.9% 4	1.5% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	57.9% 44	23.7% 18	10.5% 8	6.6% 5	1.3% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.4% 61	10.8% 8	4.1% 3	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	65.8% 50	19.7% 15	9.2% 7	4.0% 3	1.3% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	63.5% 47	18.9% 14	10.8% 8	5.4% 4	1.4% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	82.4% 61	13.5% 10	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.3% 58	18.7% 14	0.0% 0	2.7% 2	1.3% 1

Evaluation of Judge Robert L. Adams, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	39	52.7%
	Good	20	27.0%
	Needs Improvement	9	12.2%
	Unsatisfactory	6	8.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	10.1%
	Worse	8	11.6%
	Stayed the Same	54	78.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Francis W. Burkart, III

Judge of the General District Court
23rd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 103 completed surveys for Judge Francis W. Burkart, III.

Evaluation of Judge Francis W. Burkart, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	54.9% 56	28.4% 29	14.7% 15	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	67.7% 69	21.6% 22	9.8% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.5% 78	14.7% 15	6.9% 7	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	77.5% 79	13.7% 14	6.9% 7	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.5% 75	14.7% 15	9.8% 10	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.7% 81	14.3% 14	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.6% 82	15.5% 16	3.9% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	69.9% 72	18.5% 19	7.8% 8	3.9% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.8% 74	18.5% 19	6.8% 7	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	93.1% 81	5.8% 5	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	89.2% 91	8.8% 9	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.3% 89	11.8% 12	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.7% 73	16.2% 16	8.1% 8	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.3% 73	18.8% 19	7.9% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	64.4% 65	22.8% 23	10.9% 11	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.8% 75	21.4% 22	4.9% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.0% 87	11.0% 11	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.6% 81	16.5% 17	2.9% 3	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	73.0% 73	17.0% 17	7.0% 7	3.0% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	76.5% 75	20.4% 20	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.2% 81	16.8% 17	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Francis W. Burkart, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	66.0%
	Good	24	23.3%
	Needs Improvement	7	6.8%
	Unsatisfactory	4	3.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	0	0.0%
	Worse	4	4.1%
	Stayed the Same	94	95.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable John Stanley Hart, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
26th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 John Stanley Hart, Jr.

Evaluation of Judge John Stanley Hart, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.8% 63	17.3% 14	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.0% 68	12.4% 10	2.5% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.8% 67	8.8% 7	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	2.5% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.3% 65	11.1% 9	4.9% 4	1.2% 1	2.5% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.7% 71	4.9% 4	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	2.5% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.8% 63	13.9% 11	5.1% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.7% 71	3.7% 3	6.2% 5	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.8% 63	8.6% 7	11.1% 9	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.3% 61	10.0% 8	10.0% 8	2.5% 2	1.3% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.0% 61	4.5% 3	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.5% 62	16.3% 13	3.8% 3	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.0% 68	11.1% 9	3.7% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.3% 61	10.7% 8	6.7% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.3% 49	22.7% 17	4.0% 3	6.7% 5	1.3% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	68.0% 51	20.0% 15	4.0% 3	6.7% 5	1.3% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	75.3% 61	13.6% 11	6.2% 5	3.7% 3	1.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.5% 66	10.1% 8	5.1% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.3% 61	12.5% 10	7.5% 6	3.8% 3	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	74.7% 59	12.7% 10	10.1% 8	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	85.0% 68	13.8% 11	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.0% 64	16.1% 13	2.5% 2	2.5% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge John Stanley Hart, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	55	69.6%
	Good	13	16.5%
	Needs Improvement	9	11.4%
	Unsatisfactory	2	2.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	13.2%
	Worse	2	2.6%
	Stayed the Same	64	84.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable George Robert Brittain, II

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

2019



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 67 completed surveys for Judge George Robert Brittain, II.

Evaluation of Judge George Robert Brittain, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	65.7% 44	25.4% 17	9.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	74.2% 49	16.7% 11	9.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.6% 50	17.9% 12	7.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	77.6% 52	13.4% 9	9.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	77.6% 52	16.4% 11	6.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	72.7% 48	21.2% 14	6.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	71.6% 48	17.9% 12	9.0% 6	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	70.2% 47	19.4% 13	7.5% 5	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	73.1% 49	16.4% 11	7.5% 5	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.6% 44	16.1% 9	1.8% 1	3.6% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.3% 51	18.2% 12	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.6% 54	11.9% 8	7.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.5% 43	16.4% 10	11.5% 7	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.2% 41	21.3% 13	8.2% 5	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	67.2% 41	19.7% 12	9.8% 6	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	71.6% 48	19.4% 13	7.5% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.1% 53	17.9% 12	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.6% 52	17.9% 12	4.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	73.4% 47	20.3% 13	4.7% 3	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	70.8% 46	20.0% 13	9.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.8% 46	21.5% 14	3.1% 2	4.6% 3	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge George Robert Brittain, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48	73.9%
	Good	14	21.5%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	10.9%
	Worse	2	3.6%
	Stayed the Same	47	85.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Shawn L. Hines

Judge of the General District Court
30th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 57 completed surveys for Judge Shawn L. Hines.

Evaluation of Judge Shawn L. Hines: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	59.7% 34	28.1% 16	12.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	68.4% 39	22.8% 13	8.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	64.3% 36	23.2% 13	10.7% 6	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	62.5% 35	28.6% 16	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	64.9% 37	26.3% 15	8.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	67.3% 37	21.8% 12	10.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	70.2% 40	21.1% 12	8.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	55.4% 31	23.2% 13	14.3% 8	7.1% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	58.9% 33	23.2% 13	10.7% 6	7.1% 4	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	76.6% 36	19.2% 9	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	74.1% 40	20.4% 11	5.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	66.1% 37	32.1% 18	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	71.4% 35	20.4% 10	8.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	57.1% 28	28.6% 14	8.2% 4	4.1% 2	2.0% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	53.1% 26	32.7% 16	8.2% 4	4.1% 2	2.0% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	56.1% 32	22.8% 13	17.5% 10	1.8% 1	1.8% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.6% 39	28.6% 16	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	66.1% 37	28.6% 16	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	66.0% 35	18.9% 10	13.2% 7	0.0% 0	1.9% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	68.4% 39	28.1% 16	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	71.9% 41	24.6% 14	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Shawn L. Hines: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	27	50.0%
	Good	19	35.2%
	Needs Improvement	7	13.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	17.7%
	Worse	2	3.9%
	Stayed the Same	40	78.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Wallace Semeon Covington, III

Judge of the General District Court
31st Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 121 completed surveys for Judge Wallace Semeon Covington, III.

Evaluation of Judge Wallace Semeon Covington, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.5% 93	19.2% 23	3.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.2% 101	14.2% 17	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	81.5% 97	16.0% 19	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.7% 98	16.7% 20	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.2% 101	14.2% 17	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.0% 93	15.2% 17	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.8% 100	11.0% 13	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.5% 93	17.5% 21	4.2% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.1% 91	20.3% 24	1.7% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.5% 77	10.3% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.0% 104	12.4% 15	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.4% 102	11.0% 13	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.5% 91	15.6% 17	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.3% 84	22.1% 25	3.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	73.9% 85	22.6% 26	2.6% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.0% 92	21.5% 26	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.5% 98	13.8% 16	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.7% 94	15.3% 18	4.2% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.3% 92	15.5% 18	4.3% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	80.7% 96	16.0% 19	3.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.3% 100	14.2% 17	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Wallace Semeon Covington, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	90 75.6%
	Good	26 21.9%
	Needs Improvement	3 2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	17 16.7%
	Worse	2 2.0%
	Stayed the Same	83 81.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Philip C. Hollowell

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

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 139 completed surveys for Judge Philip C. Hollowell.

Evaluation of Judge Philip C. Hollowell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	54.0% 75	34.5% 48	11.5% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	66.7% 92	26.8% 37	5.8% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.5% 105	18.7% 26	4.3% 6	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	72.7% 101	21.6% 30	4.3% 6	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	68.1% 94	22.5% 31	8.0% 11	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	74.6% 103	20.3% 28	5.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	75.5% 105	22.3% 31	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	63.8% 88	21.0% 29	12.3% 17	2.9% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	63.5% 87	24.1% 33	8.0% 11	3.7% 5	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.5% 96	14.8% 17	0.0% 0	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.0% 114	17.3% 24	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.3% 110	18.3% 25	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	57.4% 78	28.7% 39	9.6% 13	4.4% 6	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.8% 84	29.4% 40	6.6% 9	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	59.7% 80	28.4% 38	6.7% 9	5.2% 7	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	68.8% 95	23.2% 32	5.1% 7	2.9% 4	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.5% 113	15.3% 21	0.7% 1	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	69.1% 96	24.5% 34	4.3% 6	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	64.7% 88	25.0% 34	3.7% 5	5.9% 8	0.7% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	64.5% 89	29.7% 41	5.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.8% 97	26.3% 36	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Philip C. Hollowell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	87	64.4%
	Good	33	24.4%
	Needs Improvement	14	10.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	22	17.9%
	Worse	3	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	98	79.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Scott David Landry

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2019



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 114 completed surveys for Judge Scott David Landry.

Evaluation of Judge Scott David Landry: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	79.0% 90	18.4% 21	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	83.3% 95	14.0% 16	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.2% 94	12.4% 14	4.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.5% 94	11.4% 13	4.4% 5	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.2% 96	12.3% 14	0.9% 1	2.6% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.9% 92	14.4% 16	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.1% 97	12.3% 14	1.8% 2	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.6% 93	14.0% 16	1.8% 2	2.6% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.5% 94	13.2% 15	1.8% 2	1.8% 2	0.9% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.5% 84	8.3% 8	2.1% 2	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.5% 94	13.2% 15	4.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.6% 95	12.6% 14	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.0% 81	21.6% 24	3.6% 4	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.4% 87	18.0% 20	1.8% 2	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	77.5% 86	18.9% 21	1.8% 2	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.1% 86	15.9% 18	6.2% 7	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	73.7% 84	17.5% 20	8.8% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.3% 87	16.7% 19	7.0% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.1% 92	14.3% 16	1.8% 2	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	58.8% 67	27.2% 31	10.5% 12	3.5% 4	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	58.7% 64	20.2% 22	16.5% 18	4.6% 5	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Scott David Landry: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	83	72.8%
	Good	25	21.9%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	9.5%
	Worse	3	2.9%
	Stayed the Same	92	87.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jayne Ann Pemberton

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2019



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 146 completed surveys for Judge Jayne Ann Pemberton.

Evaluation of Judge Jayne Ann Pemberton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	84.3% 123	15.1% 22	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.3% 128	11.7% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.7% 130	10.3% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.7% 128	12.3% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.9% 128	11.1% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.4% 123	13.9% 20	0.0% 0	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.0% 130	11.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.9% 124	13.7% 20	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	85.6% 125	13.0% 19	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.2% 115	10.1% 13	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	79.5% 116	19.9% 29	0.0% 0	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.2% 125	13.8% 20	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.9% 114	17.0% 24	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.1% 101	25.0% 35	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	76.6% 108	20.6% 29	2.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.7% 117	17.9% 26	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.8% 120	15.2% 22	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.0% 121	14.6% 21	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.3% 124	11.3% 16	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	67.1% 96	28.0% 40	4.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.3% 107	22.6% 33	3.4% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Jayne Ann Pemberton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	119	82.6%
	Good	23	16.0%
	Needs Improvement	2	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23	17.3%
	Worse	2	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	108	81.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Vanessa L. Jones

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2019



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 140 completed surveys for Judge Vanessa L. Jones.

Evaluation of Judge Vanessa L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	76.4% 107	18.6% 26	5.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.0% 119	13.6% 19	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.2% 117	11.5% 16	4.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.2% 112	15.2% 21	3.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	82.0% 114	13.0% 18	5.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 108	17.0% 23	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.5% 116	13.0% 18	3.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.0% 107	19.4% 27	2.9% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.4% 109	18.7% 26	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.6% 101	12.7% 15	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	74.8% 104	22.3% 31	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.8% 112	16.8% 23	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.7% 103	18.4% 25	5.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	62.2% 84	23.7% 32	9.6% 13	3.7% 5	0.7% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	70.4% 95	18.5% 25	8.9% 12	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.9% 102	15.9% 22	9.4% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	72.7% 101	20.9% 29	5.8% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	69.8% 97	21.6% 30	7.2% 10	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.0% 111	14.6% 20	3.7% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	60.6% 83	28.5% 39	10.2% 14	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.5% 87	23.4% 32	11.7% 16	1.5% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Vanessa L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	92	67.2%
	Good	31	22.6%
	Needs Improvement	14	10.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	27	20.5%
	Worse	1	0.8%
	Stayed the Same	104	78.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Marilyn C. Goss-Thornton

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

2019



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 74 completed surveys for Judge Marilyn C. Goss-Thornton.

Evaluation of Judge Marilynn C. Goss-Thornton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.5% 50	27.4% 20	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.1% 60	16.2% 12	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.4% 61	14.9% 11	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.1% 63	13.5% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.8% 59	12.3% 9	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.2% 60	13.7% 10	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.2% 66	9.5% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	86.5% 64	9.5% 7	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.8% 62	12.2% 9	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.4% 57	12.1% 8	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.6% 61	13.7% 10	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.2% 66	10.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	82.2% 60	12.3% 9	5.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.5% 58	16.4% 12	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	79.5% 58	15.1% 11	4.1% 3	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.5% 64	10.8% 8	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	93.2% 68	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.0% 65	9.6% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.8% 62	12.2% 9	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	70.3% 52	25.7% 19	2.7% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.6% 61	15.1% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Marilyn C. Goss-Thornton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	59	80.8%
	Good	12	16.4%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	8.7%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	63	91.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Georgia K. Sutton

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

2019



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 Georgia K. Sutton.

Evaluation of Judge Georgia K. Sutton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	56.4% 57	27.7% 28	14.9% 15	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	74.3% 75	18.8% 19	6.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.2% 86	14.9% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.2% 84	15.8% 16	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.3% 74	18.8% 19	4.0% 4	4.0% 4	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.6% 80	15.3% 15	1.0% 1	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.1% 90	9.9% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.2% 82	12.9% 13	5.0% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.2% 80	11.9% 12	6.9% 7	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.3% 84	6.6% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.1% 89	11.9% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.0% 90	9.0% 9	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	66.0% 64	22.7% 22	8.3% 8	3.1% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.5% 80	14.4% 14	2.1% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	79.4% 77	16.5% 16	3.1% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.2% 80	17.8% 18	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.0% 83	17.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.0% 81	17.0% 17	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.7% 81	11.2% 11	5.1% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	62.4% 63	27.7% 28	5.9% 6	4.0% 4	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.3% 69	20.8% 21	7.9% 8	1.0% 1	2.0% 2

Evaluation of Judge Georgia K. Sutton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	78	78.8%
	Good	17	17.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	15.1%
	Worse	2	2.3%
	Stayed the Same	71	82.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable David M. Barredo

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

2019



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 96 completed surveys for Judge David M. Barredo.

Evaluation of Judge David M. Barredo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	63.5% 61	29.2% 28	6.3% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.9% 69	22.9% 22	5.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.3% 79	13.5% 13	4.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.0% 75	15.8% 15	4.2% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	79.2% 76	15.6% 15	4.2% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	77.7% 73	17.0% 16	4.3% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.1% 78	14.7% 14	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.8% 72	20.0% 19	2.1% 2	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.0% 75	15.8% 15	3.2% 3	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.7% 64	12.3% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.0% 76	17.9% 17	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	79.2% 76	18.8% 18	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	62.7% 52	28.9% 24	8.4% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.5% 65	18.8% 16	4.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	71.8% 61	21.2% 18	5.9% 5	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	68.8% 66	21.9% 21	6.3% 6	3.1% 3	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.0% 79	13.8% 13	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.8% 72	21.1% 20	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.4% 73	15.2% 14	3.3% 3	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	75.8% 69	20.9% 19	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.8% 72	21.1% 20	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge David M. Barredo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	79	82.3%
	Good	12	12.5%
	Needs Improvement	5	5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15	18.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	68	81.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Deborah S. Tinsley

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

2019



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 Deborah S. Tinsley.

Evaluation of Judge Deborah S. Tinsley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.9% 52	34.5% 29	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	70.2% 59	27.4% 23	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.5% 71	15.5% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.1% 74	11.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.8% 62	23.8% 20	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.1% 69	16.9% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.2% 74	10.8% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.2% 64	21.4% 18	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.1% 64	20.5% 17	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.6% 56	14.9% 10	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.1% 74	11.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.5% 76	9.5% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.9% 51	27.4% 20	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.9% 62	15.1% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	80.8% 59	16.4% 12	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.5% 71	15.5% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.7% 71	12.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.8% 72	12.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.3% 65	18.1% 15	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	73.2% 60	23.2% 19	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.3% 65	18.1% 15	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Deborah S. Tinsley: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	81.9%
	Good	14	16.9%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	12.3%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	64	87.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Janine M. Saxe

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

2019



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 142 completed surveys for Judge Janine M. Saxe.

Evaluation of Judge Janine M. Saxe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.3% 87	28.2% 40	8.5% 12	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.1% 101	19.0% 27	7.8% 11	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	72.3% 102	19.9% 28	6.4% 9	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	69.0% 98	23.2% 33	7.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	69.0% 98	17.6% 25	9.9% 14	2.8% 4	0.7% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	71.7% 99	21.0% 29	6.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.0% 112	15.0% 21	3.6% 5	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	61.7% 87	22.7% 32	9.2% 13	5.7% 8	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	66.2% 92	15.8% 22	12.2% 17	5.0% 7	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.9% 91	11.3% 12	2.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	75.9% 107	20.6% 29	3.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.0% 112	17.1% 24	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	59.9% 82	24.8% 34	8.0% 11	6.6% 9	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.9% 86	24.5% 34	8.6% 12	4.3% 6	0.7% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	59.0% 82	26.6% 37	8.6% 12	5.8% 8	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	64.1% 91	24.7% 35	6.3% 9	4.9% 7	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	71.6% 101	21.3% 30	5.0% 7	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	68.1% 96	24.8% 35	6.4% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	69.6% 96	14.5% 20	10.1% 14	5.1% 7	0.7% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	46.4% 64	31.9% 44	14.5% 20	5.1% 7	2.2% 3
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	51.4% 73	28.2% 40	14.1% 20	4.2% 6	2.1% 3

Evaluation of Judge Janine M. Saxe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	81	58.3%
	Good	35	25.2%
	Needs Improvement	16	11.5%
	Unsatisfactory	7	5.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	5.1%
	Worse	5	4.3%
	Stayed the Same	106	90.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Onzlee Ware

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

2019



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 Onzlee Ware.

Evaluation of Judge Onzlee Ware: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	53.2% 33	37.1% 23	9.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	67.7% 42	22.6% 14	8.1% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	66.1% 41	22.6% 14	11.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	64.4% 38	23.7% 14	10.2% 6	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	64.5% 40	21.0% 13	11.3% 7	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	68.9% 42	23.0% 14	8.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	67.7% 42	25.8% 16	6.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	59.7% 37	25.8% 16	11.3% 7	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	64.5% 40	17.7% 11	14.5% 9	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	75.9% 41	14.8% 8	9.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.4% 48	16.1% 10	6.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.4% 48	14.5% 9	8.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	66.7% 40	25.0% 15	5.0% 3	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	52.5% 31	27.1% 16	15.3% 9	5.1% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	53.3% 32	26.7% 16	18.3% 11	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	54.8% 34	24.2% 15	19.4% 12	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	72.1% 44	21.3% 13	6.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	62.9% 39	22.6% 14	14.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	59.7% 37	30.7% 19	8.1% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	50.0% 30	40.0% 24	5.0% 3	5.0% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	55.7% 34	36.1% 22	6.6% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Onzlee Ware: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	35	58.3%
	Good	16	26.7%
	Needs Improvement	6	10.0%
	Unsatisfactory	3	5.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	18.2%
	Worse	1	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	44	80.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Frank W. Rogers, III

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

2019



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 65 completed surveys for Judge Frank W. Rogers, III.

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Rogers, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	78.1% 50	20.3% 13	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.2% 56	10.8% 7	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.2% 58	7.7% 5	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.2% 58	7.7% 5	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.2% 56	9.2% 6	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.7% 57	10.8% 7	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.3% 60	6.2% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.5% 52	11.1% 7	6.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.6% 55	7.7% 5	7.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.5% 54	8.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	93.9% 61	6.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.3% 60	7.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.3% 49	18.0% 11	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.9% 52	16.1% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	82.3% 51	12.9% 8	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	87.7% 57	12.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.3% 60	7.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.8% 59	7.7% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.1% 54	10.8% 7	6.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	84.4% 54	12.5% 8	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.7% 57	9.2% 6	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Rogers, III: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	55	84.6%
	Good	8	12.3%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	14.0%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	49	86.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Laura L. Dascher

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2019



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 61 completed surveys for Judge Laura L. Dascher.

Evaluation of Judge Laura L. Dascher: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	47.5% 29	39.3% 24	13.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	67.2% 41	26.2% 16	6.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.4% 46	19.7% 12	3.3% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.3% 47	16.7% 10	5.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	60.7% 37	29.5% 18	8.2% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.7% 47	17.0% 10	3.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.9% 53	9.8% 6	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.3% 49	11.5% 7	6.6% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.1% 47	14.8% 9	8.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.3% 43	9.8% 5	5.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.3% 47	15.0% 9	6.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.1% 47	16.4% 10	6.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.1% 38	21.8% 12	7.3% 4	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.9% 39	23.6% 13	3.6% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	70.9% 39	20.0% 11	7.3% 4	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.1% 47	19.7% 12	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.5% 54	11.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.8% 45	21.3% 13	3.3% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.1% 49	11.9% 7	3.4% 2	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	73.3% 44	25.0% 15	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.3% 49	16.4% 10	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Laura L. Dascher: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	46	76.7%
	Good	11	18.3%
	Needs Improvement	3	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	10.9%
	Worse	1	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	48	87.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Linda Schorsch Jones

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2019



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 56 completed surveys for Judge Linda Schorsch Jones.

Evaluation of Judge Linda Schorsch Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	70.9% 39	21.8% 12	7.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.1% 46	16.1% 9	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.6% 46	14.6% 8	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.6% 43	18.5% 10	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	78.2% 43	18.2% 10	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 44	18.2% 10	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.5% 49	10.7% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	74.6% 41	23.6% 13	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.8% 43	21.4% 12	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.5% 33	15.0% 6	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.5% 47	14.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.5% 47	14.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	72.3% 34	23.4% 11	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.5% 35	23.4% 11	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	72.3% 34	25.5% 12	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.8% 45	16.4% 9	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.5% 49	12.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.3% 50	10.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.4% 45	16.1% 9	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	70.9% 39	20.0% 11	9.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.6% 41	18.2% 10	7.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Linda Schorsch Jones: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	45	83.3%
	Good	8	14.8%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	10.4%
	Worse	1	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	42	87.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kimberly Marion Athey

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

2019



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 67 completed surveys for Judge Kimberly Marion Athey.

Evaluation of Judge Kimberly Marion Athey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	50.8% 34	35.8% 24	13.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	56.7% 38	34.3% 23	7.5% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	59.1% 39	25.8% 17	10.6% 7	4.6% 3	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	56.7% 38	26.9% 18	10.5% 7	6.0% 4	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	62.7% 42	23.9% 16	11.9% 8	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	54.6% 36	31.8% 21	7.6% 5	4.6% 3	1.5% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	59.7% 40	28.4% 19	9.0% 6	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	56.7% 38	22.4% 15	11.9% 8	9.0% 6	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	62.7% 42	20.9% 14	10.5% 7	6.0% 4	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	72.6% 37	19.6% 10	3.9% 2	3.9% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	53.0% 35	36.4% 24	4.6% 3	4.6% 3	1.5% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	62.1% 41	30.3% 20	3.0% 2	3.0% 2	1.5% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	53.3% 32	30.0% 18	15.0% 9	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	43.3% 26	25.0% 15	18.3% 11	11.7% 7	1.7% 1
15. The judge is faithful to the law	44.1% 26	27.1% 16	17.0% 10	11.9% 7	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	50.8% 34	28.4% 19	14.9% 10	4.5% 3	1.5% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	59.1% 39	28.8% 19	10.6% 7	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	54.6% 36	28.8% 19	10.6% 7	6.1% 4	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	60.6% 40	27.3% 18	4.6% 3	7.6% 5	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	45.3% 29	32.8% 21	15.6% 10	6.3% 4	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	37.9% 25	30.3% 20	18.2% 12	12.1% 8	1.5% 1

Evaluation of Judge Kimberly Marion Athey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29	43.9%
	Good	20	30.3%
	Needs Improvement	14	21.2%
	Unsatisfactory	3	4.6%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	16	25.4%
	Worse	3	4.8%
	Stayed the Same	44	69.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Anthony Wayne Bailey

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

2019



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 57 completed surveys for Judge Anthony Wayne Bailey.

Evaluation of Judge Anthony Wayne Bailey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	82.5% 47	14.0% 8	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.0% 53	3.5% 2	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	59.7% 34	17.5% 10	17.5% 10	3.5% 2	1.8% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	45.6% 26	24.6% 14	22.8% 13	5.3% 3	1.8% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.2% 52	5.3% 3	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	76.8% 43	16.1% 9	5.4% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.0% 45	17.5% 10	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.7% 46	10.5% 6	5.3% 3	1.8% 1	1.8% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.2% 48	10.5% 6	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.3% 39	10.4% 5	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	2.1% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	71.9% 41	14.0% 8	12.3% 7	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	71.4% 40	14.3% 8	12.5% 7	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	71.2% 37	17.3% 9	11.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	66.7% 34	19.6% 10	11.8% 6	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	62.0% 31	16.0% 8	20.0% 10	0.0% 0	2.0% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	65.5% 36	20.0% 11	3.6% 2	7.3% 4	3.6% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	26.8% 15	25.0% 14	25.0% 14	14.3% 8	8.9% 5
18. The judge's decisions are clear	49.1% 28	29.8% 17	19.3% 11	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.2% 40	24.6% 14	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
20. The judge starts court on time	28.6% 16	23.2% 13	26.8% 15	14.3% 8	7.1% 4
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	21.1% 12	14.0% 8	26.3% 15	28.1% 16	10.5% 6

Evaluation of Judge Anthony Wayne Bailey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	26	47.3%
	Good	14	25.5%
	Needs Improvement	11	20.0%
	Unsatisfactory	4	7.3%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	37.5%
	Worse	1	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	29	60.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Bradley G. Dalton

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

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 72 completed surveys for Judge Bradley G. Dalton.

Evaluation of Judge Bradley G. Dalton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	84.7% 61	15.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.1% 67	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	91.7% 66	6.9% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	90.1% 64	8.5% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.7% 66	8.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.3% 59	12.9% 9	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.4% 68	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.3% 62	11.3% 8	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.5% 60	14.1% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.7% 52	13.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.1% 59	15.5% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.5% 60	14.1% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.8% 50	24.2% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.7% 48	22.7% 15	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	73.1% 49	25.4% 17	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.7% 60	12.9% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	77.5% 55	21.1% 15	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.9% 56	18.3% 13	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.9% 58	15.7% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	75.0% 51	23.5% 16	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.1% 54	22.5% 16	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Bradley G. Dalton: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	60	84.5%
	Good	10	14.1%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	14.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	53	85.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stephanie Murray Shortt

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

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

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

2019



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 Stephanie Murray Shortt.

Evaluation of Judge Stephanie Murray Shortt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	62.1% 36	32.8% 19	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	72.4% 42	27.6% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.6% 45	17.2% 10	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	75.4% 43	22.8% 13	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.7% 46	15.8% 9	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	68.5% 37	25.9% 14	5.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	77.6% 45	20.7% 12	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	73.7% 42	21.1% 12	3.5% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.9% 41	21.1% 12	3.5% 2	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.0% 34	9.5% 4	7.1% 3	0.0% 0	2.4% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	70.7% 41	22.4% 13	6.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	74.1% 43	22.4% 13	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	62.5% 30	27.1% 13	10.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	66.0% 33	30.0% 15	2.0% 1	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	72.0% 36	24.0% 12	2.0% 1	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.2% 40	22.8% 13	7.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.0% 45	19.3% 11	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	68.4% 39	28.1% 16	3.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	75.9% 44	19.0% 11	1.7% 1	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	60.0% 33	30.9% 17	9.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	61.4% 35	28.1% 16	10.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Stephanie Murray Shortt: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	38	70.4%
	Good	12	22.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	5.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	14.3%
	Worse	1	2.0%
	Stayed the Same	41	83.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Florence A. Powell

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2019



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 Florence A. Powell.

Evaluation of Judge Florence A. Powell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	56.9% 33	36.2% 21	5.2% 3	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	61.0% 36	35.6% 21	1.7% 1	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	93.1% 54	5.2% 3	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	93.1% 54	5.2% 3	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	67.2% 39	25.9% 15	5.2% 3	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	64.4% 38	33.9% 20	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.7% 52	8.6% 5	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.4% 42	20.7% 12	6.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	74.1% 43	17.2% 10	8.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.0% 45	8.0% 4	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.8% 48	17.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.5% 49	13.8% 8	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.5% 40	17.0% 9	5.7% 3	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	87.0% 47	13.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	77.8% 42	20.4% 11	1.9% 1	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	84.5% 49	15.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.3% 46	19.0% 11	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.3% 46	13.8% 8	6.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	55.4% 31	33.9% 19	10.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.8% 37	27.6% 16	8.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Florence A. Powell: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	45	79.0%
	Good	11	19.3%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	16.1%
	Worse	2	3.6%
	Stayed the Same	45	80.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable H. Jan Roltsch-Anoll

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

2019



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 95 completed surveys for Judge H. Jan Roltsch-Anoll.

Evaluation of Judge H. Jan Roltsch-Anoll: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	76.3% 71	18.3% 17	4.3% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	79.0% 75	16.8% 16	4.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.9% 72	14.6% 13	4.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.9% 71	16.7% 15	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.9% 76	14.9% 14	3.2% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.6% 67	23.1% 21	1.1% 1	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	81.9% 77	17.0% 16	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	74.5% 70	19.2% 18	4.3% 4	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	74.5% 70	19.2% 18	4.3% 4	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.7% 58	16.9% 12	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	76.9% 70	20.9% 19	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.3% 72	18.5% 17	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.5% 62	23.9% 21	5.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	73.9% 65	18.2% 16	8.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge is faithful to the law	72.4% 63	18.4% 16	8.1% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.4% 72	16.1% 15	5.4% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.9% 72	16.9% 15	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.7% 70	16.9% 15	3.4% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.8% 70	15.6% 14	4.4% 4	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge starts court on time	68.9% 62	28.9% 26	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.5% 63	27.2% 25	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge H. Jan Roltsch-Anoll: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Survey Responses		
	Number	Percent	
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	70	76.9%
	Good	18	19.8%
	Needs Improvement	3	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	19.4%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	58	80.6%