

**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**  
BARRY M. WENZIG, DIRECTOR

**HUMAN RESOURCES**  
RENÉE FLEMING MILLS, DIRECTOR

# SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA



**JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**  
MICHAEL J. RIGGS, SR., DIRECTOR

**JUDICIAL SERVICES**  
PAUL F. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

**LEGAL RESEARCH**  
EILEEN A. LONGENECKER, DIRECTOR

**LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS**  
ALISA W. PADDEN, DIRECTOR

**MAGISTRATE SERVICES**  
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

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

November 18, 2024

DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL

The Honorable Scott A. Surovell, Chairman  
Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
General Assembly Building  
Capitol Square  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

The Honorable Patrick A. Hope, Chairman  
House Committee for Courts of Justice  
General Assembly Building  
Capitol Square  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

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

Dear Chairmen Surovell and Hope:

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 the judges, listed below, who are eligible for re-election during the 2025 Session of the General Assembly. Each has 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.

Please note that beginning in 2024, Performance Factor 15 was amended from “[t]he judge is faithful to the law” to “[t]he judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.” This change was made to better capture the intent of the performance factor, which is to evaluate whether the judge considers the applicable law, rather than whether the attorney agrees with the judge’s ruling.

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

#### **Circuit Court Judges**

1. The Honorable William Edward Tomko, III, Sixth Judicial Circuit
2. The Honorable Christopher R. Papile, Seventh Judicial Circuit
3. The Honorable David A. Oblon, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit
4. The Honorable James R. Swanson, Twenty-Third Judicial Circuit

#### **General District Court Judges**

5. The Honorable Erin L. Evans-Bedois, First Judicial District
6. The Honorable Sandra S. Menago, Second Judicial District
7. The Honorable Nicole A. Belote, Fifth Judicial District
8. The Honorable Elbert D. Mumphery, IV, Sixth Judicial District
9. The Honorable Robert G. Saunders, Seventh Judicial District
10. The Honorable Jody H. Fariss, Tenth Judicial District
11. The Honorable Darrel W. Puckett, Tenth Judicial District
12. The Honorable Calvin S. Spencer, Jr., Tenth Judicial District
13. The Honorable Thomas Stark, IV, Eleventh Judicial District
14. The Honorable Keith Nelson Hurley, Twelfth Judicial District
15. The Honorable L. B. Cann, III, Thirteenth Judicial District
16. The Honorable Lauren Ann Caudill, Fourteenth Judicial District
17. The Honorable George Barton Chucker, Fourteenth Judicial District
18. The Honorable Hugh S. Campbell, Fifteenth Judicial District
19. The Honorable Angela M. O'Connor, Fifteenth Judicial District
20. The Honorable Matthew J. Quatrara, Sixteenth Judicial District
21. The Honorable Jason S. Rucker, Seventeenth Judicial District
22. The Honorable Susan Friedlander Earman, Nineteenth Judicial District
23. The Honorable Joan Ziglar, Twenty-First Judicial District
24. The Honorable Christopher M. Billias, Twenty-Fifth Judicial District
25. The Honorable Travis B. Lee, Twenty-Eighth Judicial District
26. The Honorable Henry A. Barringer, Twenty-Ninth Judicial District
27. The Honorable Turkessa B. Rollins, Thirty-First Judicial District

#### **Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges**

28. The Honorable Lori Beth Galbraith, First Judicial District
29. The Honorable Cheshire I'Anson Eveleigh, Second Judicial District

The Honorable Scott A. Surovell, Chairman  
The Honorable Patrick A. Hope, Chairman  
November 18, 2024  
Page 3

30. The Honorable Timothy J. Quick, Second Judicial District
31. The Honorable Lauri DiEnno Hogge, Fourth Judicial District
32. The Honorable Devon R. Paige, Fourth Judicial District
33. The Honorable Christopher B. Ackerman, Sixth Judicial District
34. The Honorable Rebecca M. Robinson, Seventh Judicial District
35. The Honorable Jeffrey C. Rountree, Seventh Judicial District
36. The Honorable Gregory C. Bane, Eighth Judicial District
37. The Honorable Jay Edward Dugger, Eighth Judicial District
38. The Honorable Robert B. Wilson, V, Eighth Judicial District
39. The Honorable Phillip T. DiStanislao, Eleventh Judicial District
40. The Honorable Theresa J. Royall, Eleventh Judicial District
41. The Honorable Brice Edward Lambert, Thirteenth Judicial District
42. The Honorable Joseph A. Vance, IV, Fifteenth Judicial District
43. The Honorable Gilbert H. Berger, Sixteenth Judicial District
44. The Honorable Barbara G. Lowe, Sixteenth Judicial District
45. The Honorable Maha-Rebekah Ramos Abejuela, Nineteenth Judicial District
46. The Honorable Kimberly R. Belongia, Twenty-First Judicial District
47. The Honorable Stephanie Mutter-Ayers, Twenty-Fourth Judicial District
48. The Honorable Jennifer E. Stille, Twenty-Fourth Judicial District
49. The Honorable Susan B. Read, Twenty-Fifth Judicial District
50. The Honorable Rachel E. Figura, Twenty-Sixth Judicial District
51. The Honorable Chad A. Logan, Twenty-Sixth Judicial District
52. The Honorable Kimberly M. Jenkins, Thirtieth Judicial District
53. The Honorable Elizabeth S. Wills, Thirtieth Judicial District
54. The Honorable Lisa Michelle Baird, Thirty-First Judicial 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:kw

Attachment

cc: Division of Legislative Automated Systems  
Shannon Heard Rosser, Division of Legislative Services

## **Judicial Performance Evaluation Program Information for General Assembly Members – 2024**

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

Data obtained through the Judicial Performance Evaluation surveys may be subject to biases that can be difficult or impossible to measure. Aside from real differences in judicial performance, analyses have shown that survey responses may be influenced by the evaluators' biases related to the judge's race, ethnicity, and/or gender. The survey instruments were modified in 2016 to minimize such biases, but personal biases among the evaluators may remain.

Also, ratings of judges in different jurisdictions may not be truly comparable because of differences in the respondents to the surveys, the numbers or types of cases heard in different jurisdictions, or other unique contextual factors. Statistical comparisons by jurisdiction can be influenced by small numbers of judges being evaluated, real differences seen in ratings of judges who are low or high outliers, the particular mix of judges who are up for evaluation in the year, and unique characteristics of the jurisdictions themselves.

Therefore, as the process of judicial evaluation, including the survey instrument, was not designed to make comparisons, attempting to make comparisons among judges should be avoided.

Below are factors you may wish to consider when reviewing the evaluations.

- All judges were evaluated by attorneys and other respondent groups, which vary by the type of court. All responses are aggregated in the reports, except for juror responses in the circuit court reports.
  - Judges at all trial court 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 may not have received any juror survey responses -- either because no jury trials were conducted during the relevant period, or the jurors chose not to respond. Juror responses are shown separately from all other respondent groups.
  - 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 clerks' offices are managed. Some 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 or observed the specific judge. Thus, even 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 fewer than 250 potential respondents identified.
- In order to be eligible to complete an evaluation, an attorney must have appeared before or observed 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 William Edward Tomko, III**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
6th Judicial Circuit

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



## **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 22 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 18 of the 22 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between January 19, 2024, and July 18, 2024, also received surveys that included 12 of the 22 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. Part A reflects the responses of all surveyed groups other than jurors. Part B reflects juror responses. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 98 completed surveys for Judge William Edward Tomko, III for groups other than jurors, and a total of 18 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge William Edward Tomko, III: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.85

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	69.4% 68	25.5% 25	4.1% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.7% 81	11.2% 11	6.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	81.3% 78	15.6% 15	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.4% 78	15.5% 15	3.1% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.7% 82	12.2% 12	4.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.2% 81	12.8% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.8% 89	8.2% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.5% 82	11.3% 11	4.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	86.3% 82	11.6% 11	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.3% 60	6.2% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.8% 86	11.2% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.5% 85	10.4% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.5% 58	16.4% 12	2.7% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.7% 56	16.4% 12	4.1% 3	2.7% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	79.5% 58	15.1% 11	2.7% 2	2.7% 2	0.0% 0



**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge William Edward Tomko, III: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.5% 75	17.4% 17	5.1% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.2% 72	19.6% 19	3.1% 3	2.1% 2	1.0% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.4% 76	16.5% 16	3.1% 3	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.5% 82	14.4% 14	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.4% 76	17.5% 17	3.1% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	79 82.3%
	Good	12 12.5%
	Needs Improvement	4 4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18 23.7%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	58 76.3%

**PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge William Edward Tomko, III: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.2% 15	11.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	88.2% 15	11.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	18 100.0%
	Good	0 0.0%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%



# Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •  
Websites: [www.vcsc.virginia.gov](http://www.vcsc.virginia.gov) • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

## **ADDENDUM** **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2018 – FY 2024**

**The Honorable William Edward Tomko, III**  
**6<sup>th</sup> 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.”

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Guidelines Received</b>	<b>Departure Reason Required</b>	<b>Missing Departure Reason</b>
2018	174	24	0
2019	205	33	0
2020	138	23	0
2021	151	26	0
2022	122	33	0
2023	136	36	0
2024*	100	25	0

\*FY 2024 may not be complete for courts sending handwritten Guidelines or not using SWIFT.

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Christopher R. Papile**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
7th Judicial Circuit

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 22 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 18 of the 22 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between January 19, 2024, and July 18, 2024, also received surveys that included 12 of the 22 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. Part A reflects the responses of all surveyed groups other than jurors. Part B reflects juror responses. 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 Christopher R. Papile for groups other than jurors, and a total of 17 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge Christopher R. Papile: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.48

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	83.8% 119	14.1% 20	0.7% 1	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.3% 133	4.3% 6	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	92.2% 130	5.7% 8	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.6% 130	6.3% 9	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.6% 132	5.0% 7	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.6% 124	9.3% 13	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.4% 134	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.9% 124	9.2% 13	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.1% 127	7.8% 11	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	93.4% 113	5.8% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.3% 131	6.3% 9	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.5% 129	7.1% 10	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.0% 113	12.0% 16	2.3% 3	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.0% 113	10.5% 14	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	1.5% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	87.3% 117	9.7% 13	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	1.5% 2

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge Christopher R. Papile: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	88.7% 126	9.2% 13	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.5% 113	15.3% 21	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.7% 120	11.4% 16	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.1% 122	10.7% 15	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.2% 114	12.4% 17	4.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	118 83.7%
	Good	19 13.5%
	Needs Improvement	3 2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14 11.9%
	Worse	3 2.5%
	Stayed the Same	101 85.6%

**PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Christopher R. Papile: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.2% 15	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	5.9% 1
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	88.2% 15	11.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.6% 12	17.7% 3	11.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	17 100.0%
	Good	0 0.0%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%





# Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •  
Websites: [www.vcsc.virginia.gov](http://www.vcsc.virginia.gov) • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

## **ADDENDUM** **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2018 – FY 2024**

**The Honorable Christopher R. Papile**  
**7<sup>th</sup> 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.”

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Guidelines Received</b>	<b>Departure Reason Required</b>	<b>Missing Departure Reason</b>
2018	100	10	0
2019	111	14	0
2020	49	6	0
2021	76	6	0
2022	77	12	0
2023	60	21	0
2024*	73	18	0

\*FY 2024 may not be complete for courts sending handwritten Guidelines or not using SWIFT.

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable David A. Oblon**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
19th Judicial Circuit

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 22 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 18 of the 22 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between January 19, 2024, and July 18, 2024, also received surveys that included 12 of the 22 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. Part A reflects the responses of all surveyed groups other than jurors. Part B reflects juror responses. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 145 completed surveys for Judge David A. Oblon for groups other than jurors, and a total of 29 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge David A. Oblon: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 20.93

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 1 to 5

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	82.6% 119	17.4% 25	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.0% 123	13.3% 19	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.4% 123	13.9% 20	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.0% 123	12.6% 18	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.0% 129	9.0% 13	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.3% 115	15.2% 21	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.9% 126	12.4% 18	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.4% 115	12.6% 18	6.3% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.0% 115	12.7% 18	5.6% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.4% 96	8.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.3% 130	9.7% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.1% 128	9.9% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.5% 108	19.6% 28	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.1% 106	18.9% 27	7.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	79.6% 113	13.4% 19	6.3% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge David A. Oblon: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.0% 116	16.6% 24	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.3% 113	14.4% 20	4.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.4% 112	16.3% 23	4.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.2% 108	12.0% 16	6.0% 8	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.6% 111	17.5% 25	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	107 74.8%
	Good	29 20.3%
	Needs Improvement	7 4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15 14.4%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	89 85.6%

**PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge David A. Oblon: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	100.0% 26	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 28	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	100.0% 29	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29 100.0%
	Good	0 0.0%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%



# Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •  
Websites: [www.vcsc.virginia.gov](http://www.vcsc.virginia.gov) • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

## **ADDENDUM** **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2018 – FY 2024**

**The Honorable David A. Oblon**  
**19<sup>th</sup> 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.”

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Guidelines Received</b>	<b>Departure Reason Required</b>	<b>Missing Departure Reason</b>
2018	30	6	0
2019	58	8	0
2020	22	5	0
2021	8	1	0
2022	14	3	0
2023	16	4	0
2024*	20	3	0

\*FY 2024 may not be complete for courts sending handwritten Guidelines or not using SWIFT.

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable James R. Swanson**

Judge of the Circuit Court  
23rd Judicial Circuit

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024





## **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 22 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 18 of the 22 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between January 19, 2024, and July 18, 2024, also received surveys that included 12 of the 22 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. Part A reflects the responses of all surveyed groups other than jurors. Part B reflects juror responses. Where a respondent selected the response “Not Applicable” or simply did not select any response for a particular performance factor, it is treated as a non-response to that factor. Accordingly, you may observe that the number of responses varies from factor to factor.

This report reflects a total of 134 completed surveys for Judge James R. Swanson for groups other than jurors, and a total of 9 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 25.08

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	79.7% 106	18.1% 24	2.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.1% 118	11.9% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	94.0% 125	4.5% 6	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.8% 123	7.5% 10	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.7% 122	8.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.4% 114	10.9% 14	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	93.3% 125	5.2% 7	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.1% 118	9.7% 13	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.2% 120	9.0% 12	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.5% 103	5.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.7% 121	8.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.4% 122	7.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.9% 104	14.5% 18	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.3% 102	16.1% 20	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.9% 106	10.7% 13	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk  
Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.6% 116	12.7% 17	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.2% 119	8.3% 11	1.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	88.6% 117	10.6% 14	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	90.8% 118	8.5% 11	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	89.4% 118	9.9% 13	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	116 87.2%
	Good	15 11.3%
	Needs Improvement	1 0.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2 1.7%
	Worse	1 0.9%
	Stayed the Same	112 97.4%

**PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge James R. Swanson: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	100.0% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.5% 7	12.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	100.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	9 100.0%
	Good	0 0.0%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%



# Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

100 North Ninth Street • Richmond, Virginia 23219 • Tel. 804.225.4398 • FAX 804.786.3934 •  
Websites: [www.vcsc.virginia.gov](http://www.vcsc.virginia.gov) • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

## **ADDENDUM** **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2018 – FY 2024**

**The Honorable James R. Swanson**  
**23<sup>rd</sup> 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.”

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Guidelines Received</b>	<b>Departure Reason Required</b>	<b>Missing Departure Reason</b>
2018	194	38	1
2019	194	46	0
2020	185	36	0
2021	154	36	0
2022	134	49	0
2023	123	33	0
2024*	134	42	0

\*FY 2024 may not be complete for courts sending handwritten Guidelines or not using SWIFT.

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Erin L. Evans-Bedois**

Judge of the General District Court  
1st Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Erin L. Evans-Bedois.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Erin L. Evans-Bedois: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.25

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	86.4% 133	12.3% 19	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.0% 137	9.1% 14	1.3% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.9% 140	7.1% 11	1.3% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.6% 138	8.4% 13	1.3% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.2% 142	6.5% 10	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.5% 136	9.2% 14	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.9% 140	8.4% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	85.7% 132	12.3% 19	0.7% 1	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	86.4% 133	11.0% 17	1.3% 2	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.3% 116	8.7% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.9% 139	9.2% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.9% 139	8.5% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	86.7% 124	11.2% 16	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	80.6% 116	13.9% 20	4.9% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.8% 125	10.4% 15	1.4% 2	1.4% 2	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Erin L. Evans-Bedois: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.9% 133	11.1% 17	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	93.5% 144	6.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.9% 140	8.4% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.2% 131	11.8% 18	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.3% 139	7.8% 12	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	122 80.8%
	Good	25 16.6%
	Needs Improvement	3 2.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	26 18.4%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	115 81.6%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Sandra S. Menago**

Judge of the General District Court  
2nd Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Sandra S. Menago.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Sandra S. Menago: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.98

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	75.3% 76	17.8% 18	5.9% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	87.1% 88	7.9% 8	5.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.2% 90	8.8% 9	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.9% 88	8.1% 8	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.2% 84	9.9% 10	5.0% 5	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.9% 86	9.1% 9	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.1% 89	8.9% 9	1.0% 1	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.8% 78	13.1% 13	5.1% 5	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.2% 78	14.9% 15	5.0% 5	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.9% 72	7.4% 6	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.1% 89	8.9% 9	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.0% 92	4.0% 4	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	78.8% 78	14.1% 14	4.0% 4	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.8% 77	14.1% 14	5.1% 5	3.0% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	78.8% 78	15.2% 15	3.0% 3	2.0% 2	1.0% 1

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Sandra S. Menago: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.1% 87	7.9% 8	5.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.1% 91	6.9% 7	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.1% 90	5.0% 5	3.0% 3	3.0% 3	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.0% 82	12.0% 12	4.0% 4	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.0% 90	5.0% 5	5.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	80 80.0%
	Good	15 15.0%
	Needs Improvement	3 3.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2 2.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	17 18.3%
	Worse	3 3.2%
	Stayed the Same	73 78.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Nicole A. Belote**

Judge of the General District Court  
5th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



## **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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Nicole A. Belote.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Nicole A. Belote: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.56

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	52.0% 52	34.0% 34	9.0% 9	4.0% 4	1.0% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	61.4% 62	24.8% 25	8.9% 9	3.0% 3	2.0% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.3% 75	19.6% 19	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.8% 76	20.2% 20	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	65.0% 65	21.0% 21	10.0% 10	2.0% 2	2.0% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	74.2% 72	21.7% 21	2.1% 2	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.2% 83	13.9% 14	3.0% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	68.0% 68	22.0% 22	6.0% 6	2.0% 2	2.0% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	70.0% 70	15.0% 15	11.0% 11	3.0% 3	1.0% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.4% 70	9.8% 8	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.0% 87	13.0% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.7% 85	11.2% 11	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	64.5% 60	23.7% 22	9.7% 9	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	73.1% 68	21.5% 20	5.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	76.1% 70	19.6% 18	3.3% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Nicole A. Belote: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.8% 77	18.2% 18	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.0% 86	12.0% 12	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.0% 82	16.0% 16	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.5% 71	17.4% 17	7.1% 7	1.0% 1	2.0% 2
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.0% 84	13.0% 13	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	1.0% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	62 63.3%
	Good	25 25.5%
	Needs Improvement	9 9.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2 2.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9 10.7%
	Worse	3 3.6%
	Stayed the Same	72 85.7%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Elbert D. Mumphery, IV**

Judge of the General District Court  
6th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 80 completed surveys for Judge Elbert D. Mumphery, IV.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Elbert D. Mumphery, IV: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.04

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	90.0% 72	8.8% 7	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.0% 72	8.8% 7	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.5% 70	12.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.8% 67	13.8% 11	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.0% 72	7.5% 6	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.0% 67	13.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.0% 72	7.5% 6	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.5% 70	10.0% 8	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.8% 71	10.0% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	93.6% 58	6.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.1% 68	12.7% 10	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.0% 67	11.7% 9	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	86.8% 59	10.3% 7	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.4% 56	11.8% 8	5.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	82.4% 56	13.2% 9	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Elbert D. Mumphery, IV: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	82.5% 66	15.0% 12	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.3% 65	17.5% 14	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.5% 66	13.8% 11	3.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	91.0% 71	7.7% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.0% 64	10.1% 8	8.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	58 73.4%
	Good	20 25.3%
	Needs Improvement	1 1.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10 13.7%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	63 86.3%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Robert G. Saunders**

Judge of the General District Court  
7th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 137 completed surveys for Judge Robert G. Saunders.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Robert G. Saunders: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.69

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	72.6% 98	17.8% 24	7.4% 10	0.7% 1	1.5% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	74.8% 101	16.3% 22	5.9% 8	0.7% 1	2.2% 3
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.3% 110	12.4% 17	3.7% 5	2.2% 3	1.5% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.1% 107	15.3% 21	3.7% 5	1.5% 2	1.5% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.6% 105	12.4% 17	8.0% 11	0.0% 0	2.9% 4
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.0% 111	11.7% 16	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	2.2% 3
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.6% 109	13.9% 19	5.1% 7	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.1% 107	12.4% 17	5.8% 8	0.7% 1	2.9% 4
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.6% 105	13.1% 18	6.6% 9	0.7% 1	2.9% 4
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.2% 99	12.6% 15	1.7% 2	0.8% 1	1.7% 2
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.7% 113	14.1% 19	0.7% 1	1.5% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.8% 112	13.9% 19	2.2% 3	0.7% 1	1.5% 2
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.0% 105	10.5% 14	7.5% 10	0.8% 1	2.3% 3
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.7% 106	11.3% 15	5.3% 7	3.8% 5	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.2% 108	8.3% 11	6.0% 8	2.3% 3	2.3% 3



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Robert G. Saunders: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	82.4% 112	12.5% 17	3.7% 5	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.7% 116	11.7% 16	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.5% 113	10.2% 14	5.1% 7	1.5% 2	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.4% 108	8.8% 12	8.1% 11	0.7% 1	2.9% 4
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.3% 107	11.9% 16	8.2% 11	0.7% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	105 77.2%
	Good	19 14.0%
	Needs Improvement	7 5.2%
	Unsatisfactory	5 3.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23 17.8%
	Worse	5 3.9%
	Stayed the Same	101 78.3%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jody H. Fariss**

Judge of the General District Court  
10th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 83 completed surveys for Judge Jody H. Fariss.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Jody H. Fariss: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.32

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 1 to 5

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	77.1% 64	20.5% 17	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.8% 72	9.6% 8	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.6% 71	9.8% 8	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.4% 70	12.2% 10	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.3% 70	10.8% 9	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.0% 64	17.3% 14	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.0% 73	10.8% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.7% 67	11.0% 9	7.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.0% 68	8.6% 7	6.2% 5	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.1% 57	9.4% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.0% 73	8.4% 7	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.2% 69	12.4% 10	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	74.0% 54	23.3% 17	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.6% 53	23.3% 17	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.9% 59	13.9% 10	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Jody H. Fariss: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.7% 67	13.3% 11	6.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.3% 70	13.3% 11	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.9% 68	12.1% 10	6.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.0% 68	9.9% 8	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.2% 69	11.0% 9	3.7% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64 79.0%
	Good	15 18.5%
	Needs Improvement	2 2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4 5.7%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	66 94.3%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Darrel W. Puckett**

Judge of the General District Court  
10th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Darrel W. Puckett.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Darrel W. Puckett: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.18

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.1% 44	31.9% 23	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	76.4% 55	19.4% 14	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.2% 57	16.7% 12	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	77.5% 55	15.5% 11	5.6% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.3% 60	9.7% 7	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.3% 62	12.7% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.9% 64	11.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.5% 55	15.5% 11	5.6% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	75.0% 54	13.9% 10	9.7% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.5% 47	12.3% 7	1.8% 1	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.1% 62	12.5% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.5% 63	12.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.3% 51	18.2% 12	3.0% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.2% 43	25.8% 17	7.6% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	67.7% 44	24.6% 16	6.2% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Darrel W. Puckett: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.1% 54	19.7% 14	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	56.9% 41	18.1% 13	16.7% 12	8.3% 6	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.4% 55	13.9% 10	9.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	73.2% 52	18.3% 13	5.6% 4	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	39.4% 28	16.9% 12	31.0% 22	9.9% 7	2.8% 2

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	43 59.7%
	Good	21 29.2%
	Needs Improvement	8 11.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23 36.5%
	Worse	3 4.8%
	Stayed the Same	37 58.7%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Calvin S. Spencer, Jr.**

Judge of the General District Court  
10th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 99 completed surveys for Judge Calvin S. Spencer, Jr.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Calvin S. Spencer, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.48

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	86.9% 86	12.1% 12	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.9% 93	6.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	91.9% 91	8.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.9% 88	11.1% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.9% 91	8.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.7% 87	10.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	91.9% 91	8.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.9% 88	10.1% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.9% 90	9.1% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.5% 84	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.9% 87	12.1% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.8% 89	9.2% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	88.3% 83	10.6% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	93.6% 88	6.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	90.4% 85	9.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Calvin S. Spencer, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.8% 88	10.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.8% 86	11.2% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	88.9% 88	11.1% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	90.6% 87	9.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.9% 88	9.1% 9	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	89 90.8%
	Good	9 9.2%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12 13.5%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	77 86.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Thomas Stark, IV**

Judge of the General District Court  
11th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Thomas Stark, IV.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Thomas Stark, IV: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 26.27

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.1% 74	11.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	95.2% 80	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	94.1% 79	4.8% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.7% 77	7.1% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	95.2% 80	3.6% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.6% 71	12.2% 10	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	91.7% 77	8.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	85.7% 72	11.9% 10	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.3% 70	10.8% 9	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.5% 64	4.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.5% 76	9.5% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.4% 75	9.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	90.4% 66	6.9% 5	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.2% 60	12.3% 9	5.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	80.8% 59	13.7% 10	5.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Thomas Stark, IV: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	91.7% 77	7.1% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	91.7% 77	8.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	91.5% 75	8.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.2% 74	8.4% 7	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	89.2% 74	9.6% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	73 86.9%
	Good	10 11.9%
	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	8 10.8%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	66 89.2%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Keith Nelson Hurley**

Judge of the General District Court  
12th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 55 completed surveys for Judge Keith Nelson Hurley.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Keith Nelson Hurley: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 18.65

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.8% 34	32.7% 18	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	78.2% 43	20.0% 11	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.2% 46	13.0% 7	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.3% 48	12.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.8% 45	12.7% 7	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.6% 46	16.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.5% 47	12.7% 7	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.4% 42	21.8% 12	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.8% 45	12.7% 7	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.9% 40	11.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.7% 51	7.3% 4	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	75.0% 36	20.8% 10	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.0% 36	22.9% 11	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	72.9% 35	25.0% 12	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Keith Nelson Hurley: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
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	88.9% 48	11.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	92.6% 50	7.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.3% 45	13.0% 7	3.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.7% 49	9.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48 88.9%
	Good	6 11.1%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2 4.1%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	47 95.9%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable L. B. Cann, III**

Judge of the General District Court  
13th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 47 completed surveys for Judge L. B. Cann, III.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge L. B. Cann, III: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.38

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 1 to 5

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	87.2% 41	12.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	87.2% 41	10.6% 5	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.1% 40	14.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.7% 37	17.0% 8	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.4% 42	8.5% 4	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.3% 36	13.0% 6	8.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.1% 40	6.4% 3	8.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.6% 36	19.2% 9	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.3% 36	15.2% 7	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.4% 34	2.8% 1	2.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.7% 37	19.2% 9	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.6% 38	17.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	84.8% 39	13.0% 6	0.0% 0	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.7% 33	17.4% 8	10.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	71.7% 33	21.7% 10	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of L. B. Cann, III: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.6% 36	19.2% 9	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.5% 35	21.3% 10	2.1% 1	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.6% 36	14.9% 7	8.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.2% 37	13.3% 6	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	66.0% 31	21.3% 10	10.6% 5	2.1% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	35 76.1%
	Good	6 13.0%
	Needs Improvement	5 10.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2 5.0%
	Worse	4 10.0%
	Stayed the Same	34 85.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Lauren Ann Caudill**

Judge of the General District Court  
14th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 68 completed surveys for Judge Lauren Ann Caudill.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Lauren Ann Caudill: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.29

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	67.7% 46	23.5% 16	5.9% 4	2.9% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	77.6% 52	16.4% 11	4.5% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.1% 57	13.4% 9	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.1% 57	11.9% 8	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	77.9% 53	13.2% 9	7.4% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.7% 57	9.2% 6	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.7% 61	10.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.6% 54	10.5% 7	7.5% 5	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.5% 51	12.3% 8	6.2% 4	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.8% 53	5.1% 3	1.7% 1	1.7% 1	1.7% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.9% 58	9.1% 6	3.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.9% 60	7.6% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.7% 50	8.1% 5	9.7% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.8% 49	17.5% 11	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	79.7% 51	15.6% 10	3.1% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Lauren Ann Caudill: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	88.2% 60	11.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	94.1% 64	4.4% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.9% 60	7.6% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.1% 53	10.5% 7	7.5% 5	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.8% 54	18.2% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	49 74.2%
	Good	11 16.7%
	Needs Improvement	5 7.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 11.3%
	Worse	3 5.7%
	Stayed the Same	44 83.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable George Barton Chucker**

Judge of the General District Court  
14th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 111 completed surveys for Judge George Barton Chucker.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge George Barton Chucker: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.96

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	69.4% 77	25.2% 28	3.6% 4	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	78.4% 87	18.0% 20	2.7% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.2% 89	16.2% 18	2.7% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.7% 91	12.7% 14	2.7% 3	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	79.3% 88	13.5% 15	5.4% 6	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.6% 87	17.6% 19	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.5% 96	11.7% 13	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.5% 86	13.5% 15	7.2% 8	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.4% 87	12.6% 14	7.2% 8	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.9% 80	10.0% 9	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.7% 94	13.5% 15	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.6% 93	12.7% 14	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.6% 81	18.2% 20	6.4% 7	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.9% 78	21.8% 24	6.4% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	76.4% 84	14.6% 16	8.2% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of George Barton Chucker: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.2% 89	14.4% 16	5.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.2% 83	19.3% 21	4.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.1% 90	17.1% 19	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.9% 86	13.8% 15	5.5% 6	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.8% 83	19.8% 22	4.5% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	87 78.4%
	Good	14 12.6%
	Needs Improvement	8 7.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2 1.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 5.8%
	Worse	3 2.9%
	Stayed the Same	94 91.3%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Hugh S. Campbell**

Judge of the General District Court  
15th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Hugh S. Campbell.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Hugh S. Campbell: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.91

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	59.8% 55	29.4% 27	8.7% 8	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	69.9% 65	23.7% 22	6.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	72.8% 67	23.9% 22	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.1% 70	19.6% 18	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	69.9% 65	21.5% 20	6.5% 6	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.1% 72	17.6% 16	2.2% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	78.5% 73	19.4% 18	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	68.8% 64	19.4% 18	9.7% 9	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.7% 66	16.3% 15	8.7% 8	3.3% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.6% 55	15.7% 11	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	79.6% 74	20.4% 19	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.4% 74	18.5% 17	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	66.7% 60	23.3% 21	8.9% 8	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.8% 61	23.3% 21	8.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	71.1% 64	20.0% 18	7.8% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Hugh S. Campbell: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.3% 71	19.4% 18	3.2% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.8% 77	16.1% 15	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.7% 75	18.3% 17	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.5% 66	16.5% 15	8.8% 8	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.6% 67	18.7% 17	6.6% 6	0.0% 0	1.1% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64 69.6%
	Good	21 22.8%
	Needs Improvement	6 6.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 6.8%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	82 93.2%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Angela M. O'Connor**

Judge of the General District Court  
15th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Angela M. O’Connor.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Angela M. O'Connor: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 19.97

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	62.1% 59	28.4% 27	7.4% 7	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	68.1% 64	23.4% 22	6.4% 6	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.5% 70	23.4% 22	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.0% 76	15.8% 15	3.2% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	72.0% 67	15.1% 14	11.8% 11	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	75.8% 72	22.1% 21	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.4% 82	12.5% 12	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.6% 68	14.7% 14	11.6% 11	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	70.5% 67	14.7% 14	10.5% 10	3.2% 3	1.1% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.1% 63	13.5% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.3% 82	12.6% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.4% 82	12.5% 12	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.7% 69	16.7% 15	4.4% 4	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.6% 59	24.4% 22	7.8% 7	0.0% 0	2.2% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	71.1% 64	22.2% 20	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	2.2% 2



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Angela M. O'Connor: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.0% 73	21.9% 21	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.3% 78	17.7% 17	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.4% 81	14.6% 14	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.6% 69	11.6% 11	12.6% 12	2.1% 2	1.1% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.7% 71	17.9% 17	7.4% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	69 71.9%
	Good	13 13.5%
	Needs Improvement	11 11.5%
	Unsatisfactory	3 3.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20 23.5%
	Worse	5 5.9%
	Stayed the Same	60 70.6%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Matthew J. Quatrara**

Judge of the General District Court  
16th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 129 completed surveys for Judge Matthew J. Quatrara.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Matthew J. Quatrara: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.46

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	58.9% 76	36.4% 47	3.9% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	76.0% 98	20.2% 26	3.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.7% 117	8.5% 11	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.9% 116	10.1% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.0% 98	20.2% 26	3.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	90.6% 115	7.9% 10	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	95.3% 122	3.9% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.4% 105	14.7% 19	2.3% 3	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.5% 103	14.1% 18	4.7% 6	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	97.3% 106	2.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	94.5% 121	5.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.7% 119	6.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.4% 105	10.6% 13	4.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.8% 106	13.6% 17	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.4% 108	10.4% 13	2.4% 3	0.8% 1	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Matthew J. Quatrara: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.5% 109	13.2% 17	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.1% 117	7.1% 9	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	91.3% 116	7.9% 10	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.6% 107	11.2% 14	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.8% 97	14.8% 19	8.6% 11	0.0% 0	0.8% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	107 83.0%
	Good	18 14.0%
	Needs Improvement	4 3.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	25 21.6%
	Worse	2 1.7%
	Stayed the Same	89 76.7%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jason S. Rucker**

Judge of the General District Court  
17th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Jason S. Rucker.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Jason S. Rucker: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.79

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	90.7% 146	6.8% 11	1.9% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.4% 152	4.4% 7	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	91.4% 148	5.6% 9	2.5% 4	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.0% 149	5.6% 9	1.9% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.4% 152	3.7% 6	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	90.5% 143	8.2% 13	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	95.7% 155	2.5% 4	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.0% 140	8.7% 14	3.1% 5	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.6% 141	9.9% 16	0.6% 1	1.9% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	97.0% 98	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.0% 144	9.4% 15	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.4% 151	5.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.3% 122	11.2% 16	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.3% 120	10.4% 15	4.9% 7	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.1% 124	8.3% 12	3.5% 5	2.1% 3	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Jason S. Rucker: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	88.3% 143	11.1% 18	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	89.2% 140	10.8% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.7% 146	7.5% 12	1.2% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	88.7% 141	9.4% 15	0.6% 1	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.3% 138	10.1% 16	1.9% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	142 87.1%
	Good	14 8.6%
	Needs Improvement	6 3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.6%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	21 14.9%
	Worse	3 2.1%
	Stayed the Same	117 83.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Susan Friedlander Earman**

Judge of the General District Court  
19th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 112 completed surveys for Judge Susan Friedlander Earman.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Susan Friedlander Earman: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.92

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.8% 77	13.4% 15	13.4% 15	4.5% 5	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	72.3% 81	15.2% 17	11.6% 13	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.9% 85	10.7% 12	11.6% 13	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.6% 85	11.7% 13	9.9% 11	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.6% 85	9.0% 10	9.0% 10	5.4% 6	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	76.4% 84	16.4% 18	5.5% 6	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	77.7% 87	15.2% 17	5.4% 6	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.4% 80	12.5% 14	7.1% 8	8.9% 10	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	72.1% 80	11.7% 13	7.2% 8	8.1% 9	0.9% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	80.0% 76	12.6% 12	4.2% 4	3.2% 3	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.7% 87	18.8% 21	2.7% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.6% 88	17.0% 19	2.7% 3	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	71.3% 77	13.0% 14	12.0% 13	3.7% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	66.4% 73	15.5% 17	10.9% 12	7.3% 8	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	72.1% 80	11.7% 13	6.3% 7	9.9% 11	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Susan Friedlander Earman: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	71.4% 80	16.1% 18	10.7% 12	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.2% 83	20.2% 22	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	74.6% 82	16.4% 18	8.2% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.9% 78	9.4% 10	10.3% 11	6.5% 7	0.9% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.0% 84	16.1% 18	7.1% 8	0.9% 1	0.9% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	80 72.7%
	Good	11 10.0%
	Needs Improvement	16 14.6%
	Unsatisfactory	3 2.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8 8.1%
	Worse	7 7.1%
	Stayed the Same	84 84.9%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Joan Ziglar**

Judge of the General District Court  
21st Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 52 completed surveys for Judge Joan Ziglar.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Joan Ziglar: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.34

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	59.6% 31	23.1% 12	13.5% 7	3.9% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.2% 37	21.2% 11	5.8% 3	0.0% 0	1.9% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	66.7% 34	23.5% 12	3.9% 2	3.9% 2	2.0% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	66.7% 34	23.5% 12	3.9% 2	3.9% 2	2.0% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	71.2% 37	19.2% 10	5.8% 3	1.9% 1	1.9% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.0% 41	14.0% 7	2.0% 1	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.8% 42	11.5% 6	3.9% 2	1.9% 1	1.9% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	58.8% 30	23.5% 12	9.8% 5	3.9% 2	3.9% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	58.8% 30	21.6% 11	11.8% 6	3.9% 2	3.9% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.1% 37	7.0% 3	0.0% 0	4.7% 2	2.3% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.5% 46	7.7% 4	0.0% 0	3.9% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.5% 45	7.7% 4	1.9% 1	3.9% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	59.2% 29	24.5% 12	12.2% 6	2.0% 1	2.0% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	48.0% 24	24.0% 12	22.0% 11	6.0% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	51.0% 25	24.5% 12	16.3% 8	4.1% 2	4.1% 2



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Joan Ziglar: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	57.7% 30	23.1% 12	11.5% 6	5.8% 3	1.9% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	71.2% 37	23.1% 12	1.9% 1	3.9% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	65.4% 34	19.2% 10	7.7% 4	1.9% 1	5.8% 3
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	49.0% 25	31.4% 16	13.7% 7	2.0% 1	3.9% 2
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	54.0% 27	28.0% 14	10.0% 5	2.0% 1	6.0% 3

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	26 51.0%
	Good	13 25.5%
	Needs Improvement	8 15.7%
	Unsatisfactory	4 7.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9 18.4%
	Worse	3 6.1%
	Stayed the Same	37 75.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Christopher M. Billias**

Judge of the General District Court  
25th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 94 completed surveys for Judge Christopher M. Billias.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Christopher M. Billias: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.52

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
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	85.1% 80	11.7% 11	2.1% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.2% 81	10.6% 10	2.1% 2	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.3% 83	9.6% 9	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.0% 79	9.6% 9	5.3% 5	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.1% 82	9.8% 9	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.4% 84	9.6% 9	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.7% 74	13.8% 13	6.4% 6	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.7% 74	12.8% 12	7.5% 7	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.1% 68	10.1% 8	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	93.6% 88	5.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.3% 84	6.5% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.6% 70	17.1% 15	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.7% 70	15.7% 14	3.4% 3	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	79.8% 71	12.4% 11	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	1.1% 1

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Christopher M. Billias: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.2% 81	12.8% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	91.2% 83	6.6% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.3% 83	6.5% 6	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.6% 76	13.0% 12	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.0% 81	8.7% 8	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	1.1% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	74 78.7%
	Good	14 14.9%
	Needs Improvement	5 5.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11 12.6%
	Worse	1 1.2%
	Stayed the Same	75 86.2%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Travis B. Lee**

Judge of the General District Court  
28th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Travis B. Lee.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Travis B. Lee: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.40

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	75.3% 61	21.0% 17	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	79.0% 64	16.1% 13	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.3% 61	18.8% 15	2.5% 2	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	75.0% 60	20.0% 16	5.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.3% 65	14.8% 12	2.5% 2	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	74.4% 58	19.2% 15	2.6% 2	2.6% 2	1.3% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	78.8% 63	16.3% 13	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.0% 60	20.0% 16	5.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	74.7% 59	20.3% 16	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.3% 51	14.5% 9	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	73.4% 58	20.3% 16	3.8% 3	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	75.6% 59	18.0% 14	3.9% 3	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.8% 53	18.8% 13	1.5% 1	2.9% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	58.6% 41	25.7% 18	8.6% 6	5.7% 4	1.4% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	70.0% 49	20.0% 14	5.7% 4	2.9% 2	1.4% 1



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Travis B. Lee: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	48.8% 39	30.0% 24	11.3% 9	8.8% 7	1.3% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	75.0% 60	20.0% 16	2.5% 2	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	69.1% 56	18.5% 15	11.1% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.2% 61	14.1% 11	5.1% 4	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	65.4% 53	27.2% 22	4.9% 4	2.5% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	49 61.3%
	Good	23 28.8%
	Needs Improvement	4 5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	4 5.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23 30.3%
	Worse	1 1.3%
	Stayed the Same	52 68.4%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Henry A. Barringer**

Judge of the General District Court  
29th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 83 completed surveys for Judge Henry A. Barringer.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Henry A. Barringer: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.89

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	66.3% 55	27.7% 23	3.6% 3	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	73.5% 61	24.1% 20	0.0% 0	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.6% 62	22.0% 18	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.5% 66	16.9% 14	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.7% 67	16.9% 14	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.1% 64	19.5% 16	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.5% 66	18.1% 15	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.3% 65	19.3% 16	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.5% 66	18.1% 15	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.5% 54	8.2% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.3% 65	18.1% 15	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	75.6% 62	18.3% 15	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	74.2% 49	21.2% 14	3.0% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	66.7% 44	22.7% 15	6.1% 4	3.0% 2	1.5% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	69.7% 46	22.7% 15	4.6% 3	1.5% 1	1.5% 1

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Henry A. Barringer: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	68.7% 57	26.5% 22	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.3% 65	15.9% 13	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.1% 64	16.9% 14	3.6% 3	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.7% 67	13.4% 11	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	72.0% 59	20.7% 17	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	2.4% 2

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	62 74.7%
	Good	15 18.1%
	Needs Improvement	5 6.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8 10.1%
	Worse	3 3.8%
	Stayed the Same	68 86.1%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Turkessa B. Rollins**

Judge of the General District Court  
31st Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Turkessa B. Rollins.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Turkessa B. Rollins: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.16

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	84.3% 118	11.4% 16	3.6% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.6% 124	8.6% 12	2.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.3% 118	10.7% 15	3.6% 5	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.7% 113	12.1% 17	4.3% 6	2.1% 3	0.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.6% 124	7.9% 11	3.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.7% 121	7.3% 10	4.4% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.5% 123	8.6% 12	2.2% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.9% 116	8.6% 12	6.4% 9	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.7% 115	8.6% 12	6.5% 9	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.2% 98	5.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	89.3% 125	7.1% 10	2.9% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.3% 125	6.4% 9	3.6% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.1% 106	13.4% 18	5.2% 7	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.6% 96	10.5% 14	10.5% 14	6.0% 8	1.5% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	72.6% 98	12.6% 17	8.9% 12	4.4% 6	1.5% 2



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Turkessa B. Rollins: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.4% 114	10.7% 15	6.4% 9	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.9% 116	11.1% 15	2.2% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.4% 114	11.4% 16	5.0% 7	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.2% 109	12.5% 17	3.7% 5	2.9% 4	0.7% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.6% 103	16.7% 23	5.8% 8	2.2% 3	0.7% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	94 68.1%
	Good	28 20.3%
	Needs Improvement	11 8.0%
	Unsatisfactory	5 3.6%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19 16.1%
	Worse	2 1.7%
	Stayed the Same	97 82.2%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

### **The Honorable Lori Beth Galbraith**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# **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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Lori Beth Galbraith.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Lori Beth Galbraith: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.64

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.8% 47	26.3% 20	9.2% 7	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	68.4% 52	21.1% 16	9.2% 7	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.3% 58	17.1% 13	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.0% 60	17.1% 13	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	69.7% 53	21.1% 16	6.6% 5	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	77.0% 57	20.3% 15	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	78.7% 59	14.7% 11	6.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.1% 54	18.4% 14	7.9% 6	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	74.7% 56	14.7% 11	8.0% 6	2.7% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.1% 54	9.7% 6	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.9% 63	14.5% 11	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.3% 61	16.0% 12	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	67.6% 48	25.4% 18	7.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	69.4% 50	22.2% 16	5.6% 4	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	76.4% 55	12.5% 9	8.3% 6	2.8% 2	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Lori Beth Galbraith: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	75.0% 57	18.4% 14	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.3% 61	15.8% 12	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.0% 57	21.1% 16	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.3% 58	16.0% 12	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.0% 57	23.7% 18	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	55 74.3%
	Good	12 16.2%
	Needs Improvement	6 8.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11 15.7%
	Worse	1 1.4%
	Stayed the Same	58 82.9%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Cheshire I'Anson Eveleigh**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Cheshire I'Anson Eveleigh.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Cheshire I'Anson Eveleigh: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.67

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	76.4% 55	19.4% 14	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	83.1% 59	12.7% 9	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.9% 61	14.1% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.1% 62	12.5% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.9% 59	12.5% 9	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.3% 60	16.7% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.9% 64	9.7% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.1% 59	14.1% 10	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.9% 59	15.3% 11	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.0% 50	18.0% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.7% 61	15.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.5% 63	12.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.0% 56	14.3% 10	5.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.3% 59	14.3% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	80.0% 56	17.1% 12	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Cheshire I'Anson Eveleigh: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.1% 62	8.3% 6	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.7% 60	12.9% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.1% 62	12.5% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.3% 60	15.3% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.4% 55	19.4% 14	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

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	4 6.0%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	63 94.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Timothy J. Quick**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Timothy J. Quick.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Timothy J. Quick: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.91

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	33.7% 31	25.0% 23	30.4% 28	9.8% 9	1.1% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	33.7% 31	32.6% 30	23.9% 22	9.8% 9	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	54.4% 50	23.9% 22	17.4% 16	3.3% 3	1.1% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	52.2% 48	28.3% 26	16.3% 15	2.2% 2	1.1% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	43.0% 40	21.5% 20	25.8% 24	9.7% 9	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	58.9% 53	31.1% 28	7.8% 7	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	62.4% 58	24.7% 23	10.8% 10	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	49.5% 46	26.9% 25	12.9% 12	10.8% 10	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	50.0% 46	26.1% 24	14.1% 13	8.7% 8	1.1% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.1% 57	15.1% 11	4.1% 3	2.7% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	71.0% 66	24.7% 23	3.2% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	76.9% 70	16.5% 15	6.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	46.7% 43	27.2% 25	17.4% 16	7.6% 7	1.1% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	53.3% 49	20.7% 19	22.8% 21	3.3% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	55.4% 51	20.7% 19	20.7% 19	3.3% 3	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Timothy J. Quick: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	55.9% 52	25.8% 24	10.8% 10	6.5% 6	1.1% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	67.4% 62	23.9% 22	6.5% 6	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	65.9% 60	20.9% 19	11.0% 10	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	56.7% 51	25.6% 23	11.1% 10	5.6% 5	1.1% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	61.3% 57	28.0% 26	7.5% 7	2.2% 2	1.1% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	39 41.9%
	Good	26 28.0%
	Needs Improvement	23 24.7%
	Unsatisfactory	5 5.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12 13.8%
	Worse	6 6.9%
	Stayed the Same	69 79.3%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Lauri DiEnno Hogge**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



## **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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 82 completed surveys for Judge Lauri DiEnno Hogge.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Lauri DiEnno Hogge: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.00

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	70.7% 58	19.5% 16	7.3% 6	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	76.8% 63	17.1% 14	6.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.1% 64	17.1% 14	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.1% 64	17.1% 14	4.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	79.3% 65	12.2% 10	8.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.3% 65	17.3% 14	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.2% 69	12.2% 10	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	67.1% 55	24.4% 20	6.1% 5	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	70.4% 57	16.1% 13	11.1% 9	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.1% 58	8.7% 6	4.4% 3	2.9% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.4% 70	12.2% 10	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.6% 71	12.2% 10	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	68.8% 55	22.5% 18	6.3% 5	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	72.5% 58	22.5% 18	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	72.5% 58	20.0% 16	7.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Lauri DiEnno Hogge: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.2% 69	14.6% 12	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.8% 67	16.3% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.7% 67	15.9% 13	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.5% 58	15.0% 12	8.8% 7	2.5% 2	1.3% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.7% 59	22.8% 18	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	58 71.6%
	Good	17 21.0%
	Needs Improvement	6 7.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4 5.7%
	Worse	3 4.3%
	Stayed the Same	63 90.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Devon R. Paige**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 92 completed surveys for Judge Devon R. Paige.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Devon R. Paige: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 19.69

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	71.7% 66	21.7% 20	6.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	80.4% 74	15.2% 14	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.2% 73	11.0% 10	7.7% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.1% 70	16.3% 15	6.5% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	82.6% 76	13.0% 12	2.2% 2	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 72	16.7% 15	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.4% 74	10.9% 10	7.6% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.3% 72	14.1% 13	5.4% 5	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.0% 71	13.2% 12	4.4% 4	4.4% 4	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	79.2% 61	14.3% 11	1.3% 1	5.2% 4	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	79.4% 73	17.4% 16	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.2% 73	14.3% 13	5.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.9% 65	17.1% 15	6.8% 6	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.3% 67	16.9% 15	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	79.6% 70	13.6% 12	3.4% 3	3.4% 3	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Devon R. Paige: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.3% 72	16.3% 15	5.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.4% 75	13.2% 12	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.4% 75	12.1% 11	5.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.0% 71	13.2% 12	3.3% 3	5.5% 5	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	72.8% 67	15.2% 14	7.6% 7	3.3% 3	1.1% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71 78.0%
	Good	13 14.3%
	Needs Improvement	5 5.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2 2.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7 8.6%
	Worse	4 4.9%
	Stayed the Same	70 86.4%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Christopher B. Ackerman**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
6th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 97 completed surveys for Judge Christopher B. Ackerman.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Christopher B. Ackerman: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.32

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	85.6% 83	14.4% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.8% 90	6.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.7% 88	9.3% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.7% 86	10.3% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.8% 90	5.2% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.3% 82	11.6% 11	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.8% 90	7.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.7% 87	10.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.6% 87	9.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	93.5% 72	6.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.4% 79	14.4% 14	3.1% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.7% 86	11.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	86.8% 72	10.8% 9	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.9% 68	15.9% 13	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.6% 71	12.2% 10	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Christopher B. Ackerman: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.5% 82	14.4% 14	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.3% 80	15.6% 15	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.5% 82	14.4% 14	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.4% 84	9.6% 9	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	72.9% 70	19.8% 19	4.2% 4	3.1% 3	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	77 80.2%
	Good	18 18.8%
	Needs Improvement	1 1.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20 23.0%
	Worse	1 1.2%
	Stayed the Same	66 75.9%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Rebecca M. Robinson**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 42 completed surveys for Judge Rebecca M. Robinson.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Rebecca M. Robinson: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.03

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	76.2% 32	16.7% 7	7.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.0% 34	14.3% 6	4.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.1% 32	17.1% 7	4.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.5% 33	9.8% 4	7.3% 3	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.0% 34	11.9% 5	7.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.5% 33	17.1% 7	2.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 36	11.9% 5	2.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.2% 32	14.3% 6	7.1% 3	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.6% 33	14.3% 6	4.8% 2	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.4% 32	8.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.3% 35	14.3% 6	2.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.2% 37	4.9% 2	4.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.3% 29	21.1% 8	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.2% 24	26.3% 10	10.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	71.1% 27	18.4% 7	10.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Rebecca M. Robinson: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.8% 31	21.4% 9	4.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.1% 32	17.1% 7	4.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.3% 35	11.9% 5	4.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.5% 33	15.0% 6	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.0% 28	22.5% 9	5.0% 2	2.5% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	30 71.4%
	Good	8 19.1%
	Needs Improvement	4 9.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	0 0.0%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	35 100.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jeffrey C. Rountree**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 49 completed surveys for Judge Jeffrey C. Rountree.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Jeffrey C. Rountree: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 19.93

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	67.4% 33	24.5% 12	8.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	73.5% 36	22.5% 11	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.5% 35	23.4% 11	0.0% 0	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	72.9% 35	25.0% 12	0.0% 0	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.3% 39	12.5% 6	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.0% 39	12.8% 6	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	72.9% 35	25.0% 12	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.6% 34	15.6% 7	6.7% 3	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.7% 37	10.6% 5	8.5% 4	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.2% 34	7.7% 3	5.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	76.6% 36	14.9% 7	8.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.6% 38	18.4% 9	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.8% 31	19.1% 8	4.8% 2	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	74.4% 32	20.9% 9	2.3% 1	2.3% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.0% 34	9.5% 4	7.1% 3	2.4% 1	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Jeffrey C. Rountree: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	66.7% 32	27.1% 13	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	67.4% 31	23.9% 11	6.5% 3	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.9% 34	21.7% 10	2.2% 1	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.3% 36	17.4% 8	2.2% 1	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.8% 30	23.4% 11	12.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	38 77.6%
	Good	8 16.3%
	Needs Improvement	3 6.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2 5.0%
	Worse	1 2.5%
	Stayed the Same	37 92.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Gregory C. Bane**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
8th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 48 completed surveys for Judge Gregory C. Bane.

## Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Gregory C. Bane: Evaluation Summary

### Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 16.93

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	64.6% 31	29.2% 14	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	79.2% 38	18.8% 9	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.6% 36	17.0% 8	4.3% 2	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	75.0% 36	18.8% 9	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	2.1% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.0% 36	18.8% 9	4.2% 2	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	75.0% 36	22.9% 11	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.2% 38	14.6% 7	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	2.1% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.9% 35	10.4% 5	12.5% 6	2.1% 1	2.1% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	70.2% 33	10.6% 5	14.9% 7	4.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	75.6% 31	17.1% 7	7.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	75.0% 36	20.8% 10	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.1% 37	16.7% 8	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.6% 34	11.1% 5	8.9% 4	4.4% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.1% 32	20.0% 9	6.7% 3	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	71.1% 32	17.8% 8	6.7% 3	2.2% 1	2.2% 1

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Gregory C. Bane: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.2% 38	14.6% 7	2.1% 1	2.1% 1	2.1% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	75.0% 36	14.6% 7	8.3% 4	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.1% 37	20.8% 10	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.8% 34	14.6% 7	10.4% 5	4.2% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	61.7% 29	17.0% 8	10.6% 5	8.5% 4	2.1% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	31 64.6%
	Good	12 25.0%
	Needs Improvement	3 6.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2 4.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 13.6%
	Worse	2 4.6%
	Stayed the Same	36 81.8%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jay Edward Dugger**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
8th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 82 completed surveys for Judge Jay Edward Dugger.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Jay Edward Dugger: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 21.63

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	67.1% 55	25.6% 21	4.9% 4	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	73.2% 60	20.7% 17	6.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.5% 66	15.0% 12	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.5% 66	17.5% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.5% 66	12.4% 10	6.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.3% 65	13.8% 11	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.1% 73	8.6% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.8% 59	19.8% 16	7.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	70.4% 57	23.5% 19	6.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.5% 60	12.7% 9	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.7% 71	12.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.7% 71	9.9% 8	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	71.4% 55	20.8% 16	7.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.8% 67	13.9% 11	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.0% 64	15.2% 12	3.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Jay Edward Dugger: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.7% 67	15.9% 13	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.2% 74	9.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.0% 73	9.8% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	74.1% 60	18.5% 15	7.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.0% 64	17.3% 14	2.5% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	62 76.5%
	Good	15 18.5%
	Needs Improvement	4 4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7 9.2%
	Worse	1 1.3%
	Stayed the Same	68 89.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Robert B. Wilson, V**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
8th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 64 completed surveys for Judge Robert B. Wilson, V.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Robert B. Wilson, V: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 24.43

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	82.5% 52	14.3% 9	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.1% 57	10.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.1% 54	12.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.7% 50	19.4% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.3% 55	12.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.1% 53	14.3% 9	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	81.0% 51	17.5% 11	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.0% 51	19.1% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.4% 50	20.6% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.6% 48	9.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.5% 52	15.9% 10	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.1% 53	14.3% 9	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.1% 49	17.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.3% 45	22.0% 13	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	78.0% 46	22.0% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Robert B. Wilson, V: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.7% 51	20.3% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.7% 54	14.3% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.1% 53	15.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.0% 51	19.1% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.4% 50	14.3% 9	4.8% 3	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	51 82.3%
	Good	10 16.1%
	Needs Improvement	1 1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	1 1.7%
	Worse	1 1.7%
	Stayed the Same	58 96.7%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Phillip T. DiStanislao**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 51 completed surveys for Judge Phillip T. DiStanislao.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Phillip T. DiStanislaio: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.88

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	76.5% 39	19.6% 10	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.3% 44	9.8% 5	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.3% 43	11.8% 6	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.3% 43	11.8% 6	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.3% 44	13.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.3% 43	11.8% 6	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	2.0% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.2% 46	9.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.4% 41	13.7% 7	5.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.0% 38	18.0% 9	6.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.2% 37	11.1% 5	6.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.3% 44	11.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.0% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.0% 42	12.0% 6	2.0% 1	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.3% 39	14.6% 7	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.3% 40	10.4% 5	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.3% 39	12.5% 6	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Phillip T. DiStanislaio: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.3% 44	9.8% 5	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.3% 44	13.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.3% 44	11.8% 6	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.0% 39	14.0% 7	8.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.4% 42	9.8% 5	7.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	41 80.4%
	Good	7 13.7%
	Needs Improvement	3 5.9%
	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	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	43 89.6%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Theresa J. Royall**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 86 completed surveys for Judge Theresa J. Royall.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Theresa J. Royall: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.31

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	31.4% 27	36.1% 31	26.7% 23	4.7% 4	1.2% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	38.4% 33	34.9% 30	19.8% 17	7.0% 6	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	50.0% 42	26.2% 22	14.3% 12	7.1% 6	2.4% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	50.6% 43	25.9% 22	16.5% 14	5.9% 5	1.2% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	42.4% 36	24.7% 21	22.4% 19	8.2% 7	2.4% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	57.1% 48	22.6% 19	16.7% 14	2.4% 2	1.2% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	58.3% 49	25.0% 21	14.3% 12	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	39.5% 34	26.7% 23	19.8% 17	11.6% 10	2.3% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	38.1% 32	27.4% 23	21.4% 18	10.7% 9	2.4% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	63.6% 42	24.2% 16	9.1% 6	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	67.4% 58	26.7% 23	4.7% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	70.6% 60	20.0% 17	5.9% 5	3.5% 3	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	41.0% 32	24.4% 19	26.9% 21	7.7% 6	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	41.0% 32	20.5% 16	33.3% 26	2.6% 2	2.6% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	42.9% 33	23.4% 18	20.8% 16	10.4% 8	2.6% 2

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Theresa J. Royall: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	50.0% 43	27.9% 24	18.6% 16	2.3% 2	1.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	68.2% 58	22.4% 19	9.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	60.0% 51	29.4% 25	10.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	44.6% 37	28.9% 24	15.7% 13	8.4% 7	2.4% 2
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	49.4% 42	28.2% 24	18.8% 16	2.4% 2	1.2% 1

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29 34.5%
	Good	26 31.0%
	Needs Improvement	21 25.0%
	Unsatisfactory	8 9.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4 5.6%
	Worse	8 11.3%
	Stayed the Same	59 83.1%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Brice Edward Lambert**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 77 completed surveys for Judge Brice Edward Lambert.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Brice Edward Lambert: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.78

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	93.4% 71	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	96.1% 73	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	92.0% 69	6.7% 5	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.0% 69	6.7% 5	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.1% 70	6.6% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.2% 66	9.5% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.9% 70	9.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.6% 69	10.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.3% 68	10.4% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.6% 60	9.0% 6	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.3% 68	10.4% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.3% 68	9.1% 7	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.5% 65	11.8% 9	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.9% 63	15.8% 12	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.8% 66	13.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Brice Edward Lambert: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	93.5% 72	6.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.8% 69	9.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.0% 67	11.7% 9	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.2% 64	15.8% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.7% 59	21.3% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	67 88.2%
	Good	9 11.8%
	Needs Improvement	0 0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3 4.6%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	63 95.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Joseph A. Vance, IV**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Joseph A. Vance, IV.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Joseph A. Vance, IV: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 20.06

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.2% 97	10.9% 12	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.9% 100	8.2% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.4% 95	12.7% 14	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.4% 95	10.0% 11	3.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.8% 101	7.3% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.4% 95	11.8% 13	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.5% 94	14.6% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.4% 92	12.8% 14	2.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	85.5% 94	12.7% 14	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.7% 90	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	89.1% 98	9.1% 10	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.0% 99	9.1% 10	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.6% 83	15.5% 16	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.3% 86	10.8% 11	4.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	86.1% 87	7.9% 8	5.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Joseph A. Vance, IV: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.1% 98	9.1% 10	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.5% 94	12.7% 14	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.4% 95	9.1% 10	3.6% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.0% 94	11.1% 12	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.5% 83	18.2% 20	4.6% 5	1.8% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	93 86.1%
	Good	12 11.1%
	Needs Improvement	3 2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11 10.8%
	Worse	3 2.9%
	Stayed the Same	88 86.3%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Gilbert H. Berger**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 89 completed surveys for Judge Gilbert H. Berger.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Gilbert H. Berger: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.12

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	34.1% 30	33.0% 29	26.1% 23	6.8% 6	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	40.5% 36	33.7% 30	18.0% 16	6.7% 6	1.1% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	39.8% 35	34.1% 30	15.9% 14	8.0% 7	2.3% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	35.6% 31	33.3% 29	17.2% 15	9.2% 8	4.6% 4
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	46.0% 40	25.3% 22	18.4% 16	9.2% 8	1.2% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	41.2% 35	34.1% 29	17.7% 15	7.1% 6	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	47.1% 41	32.2% 28	18.4% 16	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	39.8% 35	28.4% 25	21.6% 19	8.0% 7	2.3% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	40.2% 35	25.3% 22	21.8% 19	11.5% 10	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	66.7% 46	21.7% 15	7.3% 5	1.5% 1	2.9% 2
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	42.5% 37	32.2% 28	17.2% 15	6.9% 6	1.2% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	45.4% 39	32.6% 28	16.3% 14	4.7% 4	1.2% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	43.0% 34	24.1% 19	19.0% 15	12.7% 10	1.3% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	32.5% 26	28.8% 23	23.8% 19	10.0% 8	5.0% 4
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	40.7% 33	23.5% 19	21.0% 17	9.9% 8	4.9% 4



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Gilbert H. Berger: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	25.0% 22	21.6% 19	26.1% 23	20.5% 18	6.8% 6
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	28.2% 24	24.7% 21	20.0% 17	20.0% 17	7.1% 6
18. The judge's decisions are clear	19.3% 17	28.4% 25	26.1% 23	18.2% 16	8.0% 7
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	38.8% 33	35.3% 30	16.5% 14	5.9% 5	3.5% 3
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	14.8% 13	13.6% 12	33.0% 29	21.6% 19	17.1% 15

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	14 16.3%
	Good	28 32.6%
	Needs Improvement	25 29.1%
	Unsatisfactory	19 22.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 8.0%
	Worse	13 17.3%
	Stayed the Same	56 74.7%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Barbara G. Lowe**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Barbara G. Lowe.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Barbara G. Lowe: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.41

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	45.8% 33	47.2% 34	4.2% 3	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	66.7% 48	26.4% 19	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.5% 60	12.7% 9	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.7% 61	12.5% 9	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	72.2% 52	23.6% 17	1.4% 1	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.9% 56	16.9% 12	2.8% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.9% 64	11.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	65.3% 47	20.8% 15	12.5% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	66.7% 48	22.2% 16	9.7% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.0% 61	9.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.7% 58	18.3% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.5% 60	12.7% 9	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	67.6% 48	26.8% 19	4.2% 3	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.4% 55	19.4% 14	2.8% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	76.4% 55	19.4% 14	2.8% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Barbara G. Lowe: Evaluation Summary**

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.4% 50	19.7% 14	8.5% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	71.4% 50	24.3% 17	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.8% 51	25.4% 18	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	73.9% 51	14.5% 10	10.1% 7	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	55.6% 40	31.9% 23	9.7% 7	2.8% 2	0.0% 0

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	49 68.1%
	Good	19 26.4%
	Needs Improvement	4 5.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15 23.4%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	49 76.6%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Maha-Rebekah Ramos Abejuela**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Maha-Rebekah Ramos Abejuela.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Maha-Rebekah Ramos Abejuela: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 20.37

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 1 to 5

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	82.4% 117	15.5% 22	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.4% 126	9.9% 14	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.5% 122	12.1% 17	0.0% 0	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.6% 117	14.3% 20	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.5% 122	11.4% 16	2.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.6% 114	16.7% 23	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.9% 124	11.4% 16	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.1% 118	13.4% 19	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	85.8% 121	9.9% 14	3.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.2% 103	8.0% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.8% 121	14.2% 20	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.2% 123	12.8% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.9% 111	19.4% 27	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.9% 111	13.7% 19	5.0% 7	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.2% 112	13.8% 19	2.9% 4	1.5% 2	0.7% 1



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Maha-Rebekah Ramos Abejuela: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.5% 120	12.0% 17	2.8% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.6% 123	12.0% 17	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.4% 119	12.1% 17	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.7% 115	12.2% 17	4.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.0% 115	18.3% 26	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	111 78.2%
	Good	27 19.0%
	Needs Improvement	3 2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1 0.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18 15.1%
	Worse	1 0.8%
	Stayed the Same	100 84.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Kimberly R. Belongia**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
21st Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Kimberly R. Belongia.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Kimberly R. Belongia: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 20.54

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	63.6% 35	32.7% 18	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	83.6% 46	14.6% 8	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.5% 49	8.9% 5	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 48	10.7% 6	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.8% 45	16.4% 9	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.8% 45	16.4% 9	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.1% 49	9.1% 5	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.1% 46	12.5% 7	3.6% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.4% 45	16.1% 9	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.4% 38	11.1% 5	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.6% 46	14.6% 8	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.3% 48	10.9% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.5% 39	17.7% 9	5.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.5% 39	15.7% 8	5.9% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	78.4% 40	13.7% 7	5.9% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Kimberly R. Belongia: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.6% 44	19.6% 11	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.1% 46	16.1% 9	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.9% 47	14.3% 8	1.8% 1	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 uses courtroom time efficiently	80.0% 44	16.4% 9	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	44 78.6%
	Good	9 16.1%
	Needs Improvement	2 3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10 19.6%
	Worse	1 2.0%
	Stayed the Same	40 78.4%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Stephanie Mutter-Ayers**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Stephanie Mutter-Ayers.

## Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Stephanie Mutter-Ayers: Evaluation Summary

### Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.81

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.4% 52	27.6% 21	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.6% 62	17.1% 13	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.9% 63	15.8% 12	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.9% 63	17.1% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	82.9% 63	10.5% 8	6.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.6% 62	17.1% 13	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.7% 65	13.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.6% 59	15.8% 12	6.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	72.4% 55	19.7% 15	7.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.3% 55	10.6% 7	4.6% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.8% 66	13.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.3% 64	14.7% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	72.2% 52	22.2% 16	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	80.0% 56	12.9% 9	7.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	74.7% 53	19.7% 14	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Stephanie Mutter-Ayers: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	82.9% 63	15.8% 12	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.8% 69	7.9% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.2% 64	13.2% 10	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.7% 59	13.3% 10	6.7% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.0% 60	18.4% 14	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	54 71.1%
	Good	20 26.3%
	Needs Improvement	2 2.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9 12.9%
	Worse	0 0.0%
	Stayed the Same	61 87.1%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Jennifer E. Stille**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Jennifer E. Stille.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Jennifer E. Stille: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 19.15

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	43.6% 27	41.9% 26	12.9% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	58.7% 37	28.6% 18	12.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	52.5% 32	37.7% 23	6.6% 4	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	50.8% 31	41.0% 25	6.6% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	66.1% 41	19.4% 12	12.9% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	60.7% 37	29.5% 18	9.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	62.9% 39	30.7% 19	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	59.0% 36	27.9% 17	11.5% 7	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	57.4% 35	31.2% 19	9.8% 6	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	67.4% 33	28.6% 14	2.0% 1	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	69.4% 43	27.4% 17	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	69.4% 43	24.2% 15	6.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	54.4% 31	35.1% 20	10.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	40.4% 23	40.4% 23	10.5% 6	7.0% 4	1.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	50.9% 29	31.6% 18	8.8% 5	7.0% 4	1.8% 1

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Jennifer E. Stille: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	50.0% 31	35.5% 22	9.7% 6	4.8% 3	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	66.1% 41	27.4% 17	4.8% 3	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	53.2% 33	32.3% 20	11.3% 7	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	61.7% 37	21.7% 13	11.7% 7	3.3% 2	1.7% 1
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	40.3% 25	35.5% 22	17.7% 11	3.2% 2	3.2% 2

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29 47.5%
	Good	21 34.4%
	Needs Improvement	9 14.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2 3.3%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19 32.8%
	Worse	1 1.7%
	Stayed the Same	38 65.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Susan B. Read**

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

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

## **III. Report Content**

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

This report reflects a total of 64 completed surveys for Judge Susan B. Read.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Susan B. Read: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 19.98

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.9% 39	28.6% 18	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	68.3% 43	28.6% 18	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	68.3% 43	27.0% 17	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	61.9% 39	28.6% 18	9.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	65.1% 41	22.2% 14	11.1% 7	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	62.3% 38	31.2% 19	6.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	71.9% 46	25.0% 16	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	60.9% 39	23.4% 15	14.1% 9	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	64.5% 40	24.2% 15	8.1% 5	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.4% 41	14.6% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	57.8% 37	34.4% 22	6.3% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	60.9% 39	31.3% 20	7.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	53.7% 29	24.1% 13	18.5% 10	3.7% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	54.7% 29	24.5% 13	17.0% 9	3.8% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	60.4% 32	20.8% 11	15.1% 8	3.8% 2	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Susan B. Read: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	56.3% 36	32.8% 21	9.4% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	58.1% 36	32.3% 20	8.1% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	59.4% 38	34.4% 22	4.7% 3	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	65.6% 40	24.6% 15	4.9% 3	4.9% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	54.0% 34	22.2% 14	17.5% 11	3.2% 2	3.2% 2

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	27 43.6%
	Good	27 43.6%
	Needs Improvement	5 8.1%
	Unsatisfactory	3 4.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4 7.3%
	Worse	4 7.3%
	Stayed the Same	47 85.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Rachel E. Figura**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
26th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 Rachel E. Figura.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Rachel E. Figura: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 22.60

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	89.3% 50	8.9% 5	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.1% 51	8.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.9% 48	9.3% 5	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.3% 48	10.9% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.9% 52	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.0% 44	15.1% 8	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.9% 52	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.3% 50	8.9% 5	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.3% 48	7.3% 4	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.0% 46	8.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.8% 45	16.4% 9	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.8% 45	14.6% 8	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	82.7% 43	11.5% 6	5.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.7% 43	13.5% 7	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	84.6% 44	11.5% 6	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Rachel E. Figura: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.3% 50	8.9% 5	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.6% 50	7.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.6% 48	9.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.1% 49	3.6% 2	7.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.9% 47	14.3% 8	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	46 83.6%
	Good	7 12.7%
	Needs Improvement	2 3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6 12.0%
	Worse	1 2.0%
	Stayed the Same	43 86.0%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Chad A. Logan**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
26th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 73 completed surveys for Judge Chad A. Logan.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Chad A. Logan: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 23.62

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	49.3% 35	31.0% 22	14.1% 10	5.6% 4	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	61.1% 44	27.8% 20	8.3% 6	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	68.6% 48	25.7% 18	5.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	70.0% 49	22.9% 16	7.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	62.5% 45	18.1% 13	12.5% 9	6.9% 5	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	64.3% 45	30.0% 21	5.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.3% 60	12.5% 9	2.8% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	58.3% 42	22.2% 16	12.5% 9	6.9% 5	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	54.9% 39	21.1% 15	15.5% 11	8.5% 6	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	82.5% 47	12.3% 7	3.5% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.3% 57	18.3% 13	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.0% 56	17.1% 12	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	55.4% 36	27.7% 18	12.3% 8	4.6% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.6% 42	21.2% 14	12.1% 8	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	61.5% 40	23.1% 15	9.2% 6	6.2% 4	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Chad A. Logan: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.2% 52	22.2% 16	2.8% 2	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.4% 57	18.6% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.1% 54	21.1% 15	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	58.0% 40	21.7% 15	14.5% 10	5.8% 4	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.1% 57	12.3% 9	8.2% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	41 57.8%
	Good	18 25.4%
	Needs Improvement	11 15.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1 1.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5 7.8%
	Worse	4 6.3%
	Stayed the Same	55 85.9%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Kimberly M. Jenkins**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
30th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 49 completed surveys for Judge Kimberly M. Jenkins.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Kimberly M. Jenkins: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 19.52

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	63.3% 31	28.6% 14	6.1% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	73.5% 36	24.5% 12	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.6% 38	16.3% 8	6.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.6% 39	16.3% 8	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.5% 37	22.5% 11	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	75.5% 37	20.4% 10	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 42	14.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	79.2% 38	14.6% 7	4.2% 2	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	73.5% 36	18.4% 9	6.1% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	77.3% 34	18.2% 8	4.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.7% 41	14.3% 7	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.7% 41	14.3% 7	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.3% 33	24.4% 11	0.0% 0	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.1% 32	15.6% 7	13.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	71.1% 32	24.4% 11	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Kimberly M. Jenkins: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.6% 40	18.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.7% 42	14.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.6% 40	16.3% 8	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.2% 38	8.3% 4	12.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.0% 36	18.8% 9	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	33 67.4%
	Good	13 26.5%
	Needs Improvement	3 6.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0 0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11 23.4%
	Worse	1 2.1%
	Stayed the Same	35 74.5%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

### **The Honorable Elizabeth S. Wills**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
30th Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 35 completed surveys for Judge Elizabeth S. Wills.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Elizabeth S. Wills: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 20.32

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	45.7% 16	28.6% 10	17.1% 6	8.6% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	51.4% 18	31.4% 11	14.3% 5	2.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	57.1% 20	17.1% 6	20.0% 7	5.7% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	62.9% 22	17.1% 6	14.3% 5	5.7% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	60.0% 21	17.1% 6	17.1% 6	5.7% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	62.9% 22	28.6% 10	8.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	74.3% 26	17.1% 6	5.7% 2	2.9% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	57.1% 20	20.0% 7	17.1% 6	5.7% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	51.4% 18	25.7% 9	14.3% 5	8.6% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	53.3% 16	20.0% 6	13.3% 4	10.0% 3	3.3% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	71.4% 25	20.0% 7	8.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	68.6% 24	25.7% 9	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	45.2% 14	19.4% 6	25.8% 8	9.7% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.3% 19	22.6% 7	9.7% 3	6.5% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	51.6% 16	32.3% 10	9.7% 3	6.5% 2	0.0% 0



**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Elizabeth S. Wills: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	71.4% 25	22.9% 8	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.9% 29	14.3% 5	2.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.1% 27	11.4% 4	11.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	54.3% 19	25.7% 9	11.4% 4	8.6% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.4% 27	11.8% 4	5.9% 2	2.9% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	18 52.9%
	Good	9 26.5%
	Needs Improvement	5 14.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2 5.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	1 2.9%
	Worse	2 5.9%
	Stayed the Same	31 91.2%

# JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

## REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

---

Evaluation of:

**The Honorable Lisa Michelle Baird**

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court  
31st Judicial District

*Submitted to:*

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice  
The Chair 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

2024



# 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 and 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 22 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 18 of the 22 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 12 of the 22 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 126 completed surveys for Judge Lisa Michelle Baird.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Judge Lisa Michelle Baird: Evaluation Summary**

**Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents**

Average Years in Practice: 18.89

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

<b>Performance Factor</b>	<b>Every Time</b>	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Some of the Time</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	67.7% 84	25.0% 31	5.7% 7	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	77.0% 97	15.9% 20	6.4% 8	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.0% 100	14.4% 18	4.8% 6	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.6% 102	12.8% 16	3.2% 4	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.6% 92	20.0% 25	3.2% 4	3.2% 4	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.6% 89	19.8% 24	5.8% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	78.4% 98	17.6% 22	2.4% 3	1.6% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.6% 90	20.2% 25	4.8% 6	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	75.4% 92	17.2% 21	3.3% 4	3.3% 4	0.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.0% 80	11.8% 11	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.1% 103	15.3% 19	1.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.1% 103	12.1% 15	4.8% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.2% 81	23.9% 28	3.4% 4	3.4% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.5% 91	12.9% 15	8.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	78.5% 91	12.1% 14	7.8% 9	1.7% 2	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter  
Evaluation of Lisa Michelle Baird: Evaluation Summary**

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
16. The judge communicates effectively	75.2% 94	16.8% 21	7.2% 9	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.8% 101	16.8% 21	2.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.4% 96	18.6% 23	4.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.7% 98	13.8% 17	4.1% 5	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.2% 95	20.3% 25	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	93 75.0%
	Good	22 17.7%
	Needs Improvement	7 5.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2 1.6%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8 7.5%
	Worse	3 2.8%
	Stayed the Same	96 89.7%