

SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY &
LEGAL COUNSEL
ALISA W. PADDEN

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



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

JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
JOBY KNUTH, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL SERVICES
PAUL F. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

LEGAL RESEARCH
EILEEN A. LONGENECKER, DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS
VACANT

MAGISTRATE SERVICES
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

November 14, 2025

DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL

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

The Honorable Patrick A. Hope, Chair
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 Senator Surovell and Delegate 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 2026 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.

You may recall that in the surveys used for the 2023 evaluations, the performance factor “[t]he judge convenes court without undue delay” was removed, in part due to concerns of racial and gender bias related to this question. Recognizing the importance of measuring timeliness, the Judicial Performance Evaluation (“JPE”) Advisory Committee continued to study the issue and asked JPE evaluation staff at Virginia Commonwealth University’s Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory (“VCU-SERL”) in the L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs to further examine the survey results. Further analysis by VCU-SERL, which included results of *all* survey respondents (except for jurors), not just attorneys, found no bias in this survey question. Accordingly, for the judges evaluated in 2025, the performance factor “[t]he judge convenes court without undue delay” was added back into the survey and the results for this factor are included in the attached reports.

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 Rufus A. Banks, Jr., First Judicial Circuit
2. The Honorable Stephen C. Mahan, Second Judicial Circuit
3. The Honorable Michael A. Gaten, Eighth Judicial Circuit
4. The Honorable Dale B. Durrer, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit
5. The Honorable Michael F. Devine, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit
6. The Honorable Charles N. Dorsey, Twenty-Third Judicial Circuit
7. The Honorable Joel R. Branscom, Twenty-Fifth Judicial Circuit
8. The Honorable Michael Lee Moore, Twenty-Ninth Judicial Circuit
9. The Honorable Brian K. Patton, Twenty-Ninth Judicial Circuit

General District Court Judges

10. The Honorable Elizabeth S. Foster, Second Judicial District
11. The Honorable Paul David Merullo, Second Judicial District
12. The Honorable Michael C. Rosenblum, Fourth Judicial District
13. The Honorable Stephanie M. Revere, Ninth Judicial District
14. The Honorable Kenneth A. Blalock, Eleventh Judicial District
15. The Honorable Matthew Donald Nelson, Twelfth Judicial District
16. The Honorable Kenneth Andrew Sneathern, Sixteenth Judicial District
17. The Honorable Donald M. Haddock, Jr., Eighteenth Judicial District
18. The Honorable Sonya L. Sacks, Eighteenth Judicial District
19. The Honorable Lorrie Ann Sinclair Taylor, Twentieth Judicial District
20. The Honorable Robin J. Mayer, Twenty-Fifth Judicial District
21. The Honorable Mary Louise Costello Daniel, Twenty-Sixth Judicial District
22. The Honorable George Robert Brittain, Twenty-Ninth Judicial District
23. The Honorable Shawn L. Hines, Thirtieth Judicial District

24. The Honorable Andrew L. Johnson, Thirtieth Judicial District
25. The Honorable Wallace Semeon Covington, III, Thirty-First Judicial District

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges

26. The Honorable Adrienne L. Bennett, Second Judicial District
27. The Honorable Philip C. Hollowell, Second Judicial District
28. The Honorable Cheryl J. Wilson, Eleventh Judicial District
29. The Honorable Vanessa L. Jones, Twelfth Judicial District
30. The Honorable Marilyn C. Goss, Thirteenth Judicial District
31. The Honorable Marcel D. Jones, Fifteenth Judicial District
32. The Honorable Deborah S. Tinsley, Sixteenth Judicial District
33. The Honorable Thomas Kevin Cullen, Eighteenth Judicial District
34. The Honorable Frank W. Rogers, III, Twenty-Third Judicial District
35. The Honorable Linda Schorsch Jones, Twenty-Fifth Judicial District
36. The Honorable Kimberly Marion Athey, Twenty-Sixth Judicial District
37. The Honorable Stephanie Murray Shortt, Twenty-Seventh Judicial District
38. The Honorable Bradley G. Dalton, Twenty-Seventh Judicial District
39. The Honorable Jacqueline W. Lucas, Thirty-First Judicial District
40. The Honorable Carlos Javier Flores Laboy, Thirty-First Judicial District
41. The Honorable Cela J. Burge, Two-A 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Karl R. Hade" followed by "(by AWP)" in parentheses. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

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 – 2025

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 Rufus A. Banks, Jr.

Judge of the Circuit Court
1st 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 106 completed surveys for Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr. for groups other than jurors, and a total of 16 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.20

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	91.5% 97	8.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	95.3% 101	4.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	96.2% 100	1.0% 1	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	90.5% 95	6.7% 7	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	95.2% 100	1.0% 1	3.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.4% 83	13.7% 14	4.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.7% 93	11.3% 12	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.4% 93	5.8% 6	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	88.6% 93	6.7% 7	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	97.3% 73	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.5% 86	14.6% 15	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.6% 88	13.5% 14	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	86.2% 75	11.5% 10	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.9% 66	16.1% 14	6.9% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	83.0% 73	12.5% 11	3.4% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.7% 90	11.4% 12	1.9% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.8% 88	11.4% 12	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.7% 90	10.5% 11	3.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	93.3% 98	4.8% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	91.4% 95	7.7% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.5% 91	11.5% 12	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	93	90.3%
	Good	8	7.8%
	Needs Improvement	2	1.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	10.8%
	Worse	2	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	72	86.8%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Rufus A. Banks, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	100.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	93.8% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	6.3% 1
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.8% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	6.3% 1
9. The judge communicates effectively	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	81.3% 13	18.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.0% 12	25.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	16	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Rufus A. Banks, Jr.
1st 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.”

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	122	13	0
2020	137	24	0
2021	117	7	0
2022	180	24	0
2023	114	13	0
2024	156	22	0
2025*	52	11	0

*FY 2025 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 Stephen C. Mahan

Judge of the Circuit Court
2nd 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 113 completed surveys for Judge Stephen C. Mahan for groups other than jurors, and a total of 0 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.26

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	71.7% 81	19.5% 22	8.0% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	77.9% 88	10.6% 12	8.9% 10	2.7% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.1% 83	15.2% 17	6.3% 7	4.5% 5	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	69.4% 77	16.2% 18	9.0% 10	5.4% 6	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	77.9% 88	10.6% 12	8.0% 9	2.7% 3	0.9% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.3% 88	12.6% 14	6.3% 7	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.1% 92	14.3% 16	3.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.1% 86	8.9% 10	9.7% 11	5.3% 6	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	74.3% 84	10.6% 12	8.9% 10	6.2% 7	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.6% 78	9.0% 8	1.1% 1	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.3% 93	15.0% 17	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.0% 93	11.6% 13	4.5% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.2% 72	17.3% 18	8.7% 9	4.8% 5	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.3% 70	20.2% 21	10.6% 11	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	70.2% 73	16.4% 17	10.6% 11	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.5% 83	16.8% 19	6.2% 7	3.5% 4	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	54.5% 61	23.2% 26	12.5% 14	7.1% 8	2.7% 3

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	66.7% 74	25.2% 28	6.3% 7	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.8% 84	7.4% 8	10.2% 11	4.6% 5	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	59.5% 66	23.4% 26	13.5% 15	2.7% 3	0.9% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	52.2% 59	24.8% 28	17.7% 20	3.5% 4	1.8% 2

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71	64.0%
	Good	23	20.7%
	Needs Improvement	13	11.7%
	Unsatisfactory	4	3.6%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	4.3%
	Worse	4	4.3%
	Stayed the Same	86	91.5%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Stephen C. Mahan: Evaluation Summary

[No Juror Surveys were received for Judge Stephen C. Mahan]



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

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

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Stephen C. Mahan
2nd Circuit

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

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	117	12	1
2020	94	10	0
2021	105	5	0
2022	118	12	0
2023	93	7	0
2024	136	12	1
2025*	131	10	0

*FY 2025 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 Michael A. Gaten

Judge of the Circuit Court
8th 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 97 completed surveys for Judge Michael A. Gaten for groups other than jurors, and a total of 7 completed juror surveys.

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

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.73

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	97.9% 95	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	99.0% 96	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	93.8% 91	4.1% 4	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.7% 87	6.2% 6	4.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 97	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.5% 85	10.4% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.9% 92	5.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.5% 85	9.4% 9	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.6% 85	10.3% 10	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.2% 81	5.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.7% 88	8.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.8% 89	7.2% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	93.7% 89	4.2% 4	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.0% 79	13.8% 13	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	90.4% 85	5.3% 5	4.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	91.8% 89	7.2% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.6% 83	12.4% 12	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

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

18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.7% 88	8.3% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	90.7% 88	7.2% 7	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	92.8% 90	5.2% 5	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	86.6% 84	8.3% 8	4.1% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	82	87.2%
	Good	10	10.6%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	16.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	69	83.1%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Michael A. Gaten: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	100.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 7	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% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.7% 6	14.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	85.7% 6	14.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	50.0% 3	33.3% 2	16.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	71.4% 5	14.3% 1	14.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	6 85.7%
	Good	1 14.3%
	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Michael A. Gaten
8th Circuit

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

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	82	19	0
2020	113	27	0
2021	84	22	0
2022	79	20	0
2023	72	16	0
2024	105	19	0
2025*	161	31	0

*FY 2025 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 Dale B. Durrer

Judge of the Circuit Court
16th 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 120 completed surveys for Judge Dale B. Durrer for groups other than jurors, and a total of 24 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Dale B. Durrer: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.33

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% 99	15.0% 18	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.6% 109	7.6% 9	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.0% 105	8.5% 10	2.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.8% 103	10.8% 13	3.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.5% 111	6.7% 8	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.8% 99	10.5% 12	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.3% 106	10.0% 12	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.3% 94	16.7% 20	3.3% 4	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.8% 93	14.4% 17	4.2% 5	2.5% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.7% 78	9.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	94.2% 113	5.8% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.1% 108	6.0% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.0% 79	17.0% 17	3.0% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	81.0% 81	15.0% 15	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	79.2% 80	15.8% 16	4.0% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.7% 104	8.3% 10	5.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.6% 92	18.0% 21	2.6% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Dale B. Durrer: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.8% 93	17.0% 20	3.4% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.1% 96	12.0% 14	3.4% 4	2.6% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	88.1% 104	10.2% 12	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.0% 100	11.8% 14	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	102	86.4%
	Good	11	9.3%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.7%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	15.1%
	Worse	2	2.2%
	Stayed the Same	77	82.8%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Dale B. Durrer: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	95.7% 22	4.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 24	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 24	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% 22	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 23	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 23	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 23	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	95.8% 23	4.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	95.8% 23	4.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 24	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	95.8% 23	4.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	100.0% 23	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	23 95.8%
	Good	1 4.2%
	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Dale B. Durrer
16th Circuit

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

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	123	27	0
2020	92	21	0
2021	143	18	0
2022	182	21	0
2023	157	22	0
2024	207	33	0
2025*	187	35	0

*FY 2025 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 Michael F. Devine

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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 164 completed surveys for Judge Michael F. Devine for groups other than jurors, and a total of 12 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.28

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	64.6% 106	26.2% 43	8.5% 14	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.3% 117	20.7% 34	7.9% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.1% 137	13.5% 22	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.0% 141	11.1% 18	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.6% 124	18.3% 30	6.1% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.9% 127	16.8% 26	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.4% 145	10.4% 17	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.7% 134	13.6% 22	3.1% 5	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.8% 134	10.6% 17	5.0% 8	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.7% 99	6.5% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.5% 150	8.5% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.6% 149	7.5% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.4% 105	21.7% 31	4.2% 6	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.9% 115	15.3% 22	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	81.7% 116	13.4% 19	4.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	87.1% 142	10.4% 17	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.1% 133	16.3% 26	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.6% 133	16.2% 26	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.0% 140	9.3% 15	3.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	83.3% 135	16.7% 27	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.2% 142	11.2% 18	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	136	82.9%
	Good	23	14.0%
	Needs Improvement	5	3.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	8.4%
	Worse	5	3.8%
	Stayed the Same	115	87.8%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Michael F. Devine: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	83.3% 10	16.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 12	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% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	91.7% 11	8.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	83.3% 10	16.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	12	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Michael F. Devine
19th Circuit

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

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	82	28	0
2020	41	14	0
2021	21	11	0
2022	28	12	0
2023	25	6	0
2024	33	12	0
2025*	24	9	0

*FY 2025 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 Charles N. Dorsey

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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 99 completed surveys for Judge Charles N. Dorsey for groups other than jurors, and a total of 21 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.43

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	50.0% 49	30.6% 30	15.3% 15	3.1% 3	1.0% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	59.6% 59	27.3% 27	8.1% 8	4.0% 4	1.0% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	73.7% 73	17.2% 17	6.1% 6	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	72.7% 72	18.2% 18	6.1% 6	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	66.7% 66	17.2% 17	11.1% 11	3.0% 3	2.0% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.2% 76	17.7% 17	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	74.8% 74	20.2% 20	5.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	70.7% 70	21.2% 21	5.1% 5	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	69.1% 67	22.7% 22	5.2% 5	2.1% 2	1.0% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.4% 61	8.7% 6	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	89.9% 89	9.1% 9	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.6% 85	10.3% 10	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	58.3% 49	23.8% 20	13.1% 11	4.8% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.1% 56	25.6% 22	5.8% 5	2.3% 2	1.2% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	70.6% 60	17.7% 15	8.2% 7	2.4% 2	1.2% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	68.7% 68	17.2% 17	11.1% 11	3.0% 3	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	68.0% 66	21.7% 21	5.2% 5	3.1% 3	2.1% 2

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	68.7% 68	20.2% 20	9.1% 9	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.2% 70	17.5% 17	7.2% 7	2.1% 2	1.0% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	76.0% 73	20.8% 20	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.6% 77	19.4% 19	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	65	69.2%
	Good	22	23.4%
	Needs Improvement	4	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	3	3.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	6.2%
	Worse	2	2.5%
	Stayed the Same	74	91.4%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Charles N. Dorsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	71.4% 15	28.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.7% 18	14.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	95.2% 20	4.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.2% 16	15.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.5% 19	9.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	90.5% 19	9.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.5% 19	9.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.7% 18	14.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	81.0% 17	19.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	94.7% 18	5.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	81.0% 17	19.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.5% 19	9.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	21 100.0%
	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Charles N. Dorsey
23rd 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.”

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	213	50	0
2020	195	42	1
2021	169	38	0
2022	109	33	2
2023	99	28	2
2024	167	56	2
2025*	127	36	1

*FY 2025 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 Joel R. Branscom

Judge of the Circuit Court
25th 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 89 completed surveys for Judge Joel R. Branscom for groups other than jurors, and a total of 4 completed juror surveys.

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

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.50

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	87.6% 78	12.4% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.4% 84	5.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.6% 78	11.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.4% 76	13.6% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.0% 81	9.0% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.2% 75	10.6% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.8% 79	10.2% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	92.1% 81	8.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	89.8% 79	10.2% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	91.3% 63	8.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.5% 77	11.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.7% 78	8.1% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	88.3% 68	10.4% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.0% 60	17.1% 13	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	84.2% 64	11.8% 9	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.1% 74	14.8% 13	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.2% 75	13.6% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

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

18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.4% 76	11.2% 10	3.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.7% 78	9.2% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	86.4% 76	12.5% 11	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	86.5% 77	12.4% 11	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	80	89.9%
	Good	8	9.0%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	19.7%
	Worse	1	1.4%
	Stayed the Same	56	78.9%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Joel R. Branscom: Evaluation Summary

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

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	4	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Joel R. Branscom
25th 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.”

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	104	20	0
2020	185	39	0
2021	182	38	0
2022	164	37	2
2023	100	23	0
2024	143	37	0
2025*	119	33	2

*FY 2025 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 Michael Lee Moore

Judge of the Circuit Court
29th 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 40 completed surveys for Judge Michael Lee Moore 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 Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.06

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	84.2% 32	13.2% 5	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	87.2% 34	7.7% 3	5.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.0% 36	7.5% 3	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.7% 35	7.7% 3	0.0% 0	2.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.5% 35	7.5% 3	5.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.2% 32	13.2% 5	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.2% 34	7.7% 3	5.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.5% 35	7.5% 3	2.5% 1	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.0% 36	5.0% 2	2.5% 1	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.2% 23	7.4% 2	7.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.1% 35	5.3% 2	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.7% 35	7.7% 3	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.9% 26	9.7% 3	6.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.4% 27	9.4% 3	0.0% 0	6.3% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	84.4% 27	12.5% 4	0.0% 0	3.1% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.0% 34	10.0% 4	5.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.6% 33	15.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.5% 33	15.0% 6	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.0% 34	10.0% 4	2.5% 1	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	92.3% 36	7.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	92.3% 36	7.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	33	82.5%
	Good	6	15.0%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	2.5%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	1	2.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	33	97.1%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Michael Lee Moore: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.9% 8	11.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.9% 8	11.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 8	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% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	77.8% 7	22.2% 2	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	88.9% 8	11.1% 1	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 convenes court without undue delay	88.9% 8	11.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.9% 8	11.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Michael Lee Moore
29th 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.”

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	73	24	2
2020	54	21	0
2021	44	15	0
2022	64	11	0
2023	45	10	0
2024	52	9	0
2025*	30	8	0

*FY 2025 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 Brian K. Patton

Judge of the Circuit Court
29th 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

2025



I. Program Purpose and Use of this Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for judges and information for use by the General Assembly in the judicial re-election process. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100. This report is submitted, as required under that section, to be used in the re-election process. Judges have also had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and “shall not be disclosed” by the judge. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation method was written surveys. For all judges, surveys were submitted by attorneys who had appeared before the judge within a specified time period: 12 months for district court judges; 3 years for circuit court judges. The survey instrument completed by attorneys contained 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served between December 13, 2024, and June 12, 2025, also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

For each performance factor on the survey, this report presents the aggregate number of responses and the corresponding percentage of responses for each category. 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 63 completed surveys for Judge Brian K. Patton for groups other than jurors, and a total of 2 completed juror surveys.

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Brian K. Patton: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.89

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	65.1% 41	15.9% 10	15.9% 10	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.4% 45	14.3% 9	7.9% 5	4.8% 3	1.6% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.8% 49	9.5% 6	9.5% 6	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	73.0% 46	14.3% 9	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	3.2% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	69.8% 44	11.1% 7	9.5% 6	6.4% 4	3.2% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	71.4% 45	17.5% 11	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.4% 50	11.1% 7	7.9% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	69.8% 44	12.7% 8	11.1% 7	3.2% 2	3.2% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	71.4% 45	9.5% 6	11.1% 7	3.2% 2	4.8% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.0% 34	7.1% 3	7.1% 3	2.4% 1	2.4% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.8% 49	17.5% 11	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.0% 50	9.8% 6	6.6% 4	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	64.4% 29	17.8% 8	8.9% 4	6.7% 3	2.2% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	64.4% 29	15.6% 7	8.9% 4	4.4% 2	6.7% 3
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	68.9% 31	13.3% 6	6.7% 3	4.4% 2	6.7% 3
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.0% 46	12.7% 8	7.9% 5	4.8% 3	1.6% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	73.0% 46	17.5% 11	6.4% 4	1.6% 1	1.6% 1

**PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Brian K. Patton: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.0% 46	12.7% 8	9.5% 6	3.2% 2	1.6% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	71.4% 45	14.3% 9	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	4.8% 3
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	79.4% 50	11.1% 7	7.9% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.0% 46	17.5% 11	7.9% 5	0.0% 0	1.6% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	41	65.1%
	Good	13	20.6%
	Needs Improvement	4	6.4%
	Unsatisfactory	5	7.9%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	19.3%
	Worse	4	7.0%
	Stayed the Same	42	73.7%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Brian K. Patton: Evaluation Summary

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

Performance Factor	Survey Responses	
	Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	1 50.0%
	Good	1 50.0%
	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 • Mobile: <http://bycell.co/cgac>

ADDENDUM **JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM** **REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA** **FY 2019 – FY 2025**

The Honorable Brian K. Patton
29th 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.”

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2019	93	28	0
2020	154	39	0
2021	150	47	0
2022	186	39	0
2023	127	28	0
2024	148	32	0
2025*	77	15	0

*FY 2025 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 Elizabeth S. Foster

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 94 completed surveys for Judge Elizabeth S. Foster.

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

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.71

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	91.5% 86	7.5% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.5% 86	7.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.3% 83	9.6% 9	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	88.3% 83	10.6% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.6% 88	5.3% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	90.4% 85	8.5% 8	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.4% 85	9.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.9% 77	11.7% 11	6.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.9% 76	12.8% 12	6.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.1% 80	3.5% 3	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.2% 81	12.8% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.4% 84	10.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.3% 75	12.2% 11	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.4% 65	18.7% 17	8.8% 8	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	76.1% 70	15.2% 14	8.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.4% 84	7.5% 7	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.6% 87	6.4% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

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

18. The judge's decisions are clear	90.3% 84	6.5% 6	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.0% 79	10.8% 10	4.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	90.3% 84	7.5% 7	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.4% 85	7.5% 7	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	74	78.7%
	Good	18	19.2%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	6.8%
	Worse	2	2.3%
	Stayed the Same	80	90.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Paul David Merullo

Judge of the General District Court
2nd Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 84 completed surveys for Judge Paul David Merullo.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Paul David Merullo: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.41

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	78.6% 66	20.2% 17	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.7% 72	13.1% 11	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.3% 65	16.9% 14	3.6% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	72.6% 61	19.1% 16	6.0% 5	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	85.7% 72	13.1% 11	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.3% 65	17.1% 14	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.8% 67	15.5% 13	3.6% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.6% 66	13.1% 11	7.1% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.1% 64	15.7% 13	6.0% 5	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	83.6% 56	14.9% 10	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.1% 64	14.5% 12	7.2% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.3% 65	16.9% 14	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	74.1% 60	16.1% 13	9.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	59.8% 49	20.7% 17	6.1% 5	12.2% 10	1.2% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	67.9% 55	14.8% 12	9.9% 8	6.2% 5	1.2% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.6% 61	15.5% 13	10.7% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.2% 64	15.5% 13	8.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Paul David Merullo: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	67.9% 57	15.5% 13	14.3% 12	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.3% 65	13.3% 11	7.2% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	89.0% 73	9.8% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.2% 64	14.3% 12	8.3% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	56	66.7%
	Good	15	17.9%
	Needs Improvement	12	14.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	4.1%
	Worse	2	2.7%
	Stayed the Same	68	93.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael C. Rosenblum

Judge of the General 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 119 completed surveys for Judge Michael C. Rosenblum.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Michael C. Rosenblum: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.58

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	93.3% 111	5.9% 7	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	95.8% 113	4.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	94.9% 112	4.2% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	93.1% 108	6.0% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.1% 112	5.0% 6	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	93.2% 110	6.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.1% 111	5.1% 6	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	90.8% 108	6.7% 8	1.7% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	92.4% 110	5.0% 6	1.7% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	93.2% 96	5.8% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.5% 107	8.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.4% 109	7.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	91.2% 104	7.9% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	88.5% 100	8.9% 10	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	90.4% 103	5.3% 6	3.5% 4	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	93.3% 111	6.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.3% 108	7.7% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Michael C. Rosenblum: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	94.1% 111	5.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	92.4% 109	4.2% 5	2.5% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	94.9% 112	5.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	92.3% 108	6.8% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	109	92.4%
	Good	5	4.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	11.4%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	92	87.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stephanie M. Revere

Judge of the General District Court
9th 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 88 completed surveys for Judge Stephanie M. Revere.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Judge Stephanie M. Revere: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.64

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	69.0% 60	24.1% 21	4.6% 4	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	76.1% 67	17.1% 15	5.7% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.9% 73	13.8% 12	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.1% 74	12.6% 11	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	79.3% 69	12.6% 11	5.8% 5	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.9% 73	12.8% 11	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.5% 77	9.2% 8	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.4% 70	12.8% 11	4.7% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.5% 70	14.9% 13	2.3% 2	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	90.0% 54	10.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.4% 76	11.5% 10	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.5% 77	10.3% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.2% 57	15.3% 11	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.0% 54	18.1% 13	5.6% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	84.5% 60	11.3% 8	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.1% 74	12.6% 11	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.2% 75	10.6% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Stephanie M. Revere: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	88.1% 74	10.7% 9	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.9% 73	11.5% 10	3.5% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	82.8% 72	12.6% 11	3.5% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.9% 73	9.2% 8	4.6% 4	2.3% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	65	77.4%
	Good	14	16.7%
	Needs Improvement	4	4.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	14.5%
	Worse	1	1.2%
	Stayed the Same	70	84.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kenneth A. Blalock

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 72 completed surveys for Judge Kenneth A. Blalock.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Kenneth A. Blalock: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.62

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	66.2% 47	23.9% 17	7.0% 5	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	73.2% 52	22.5% 16	1.4% 1	2.8% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.5% 60	11.3% 8	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.9% 59	13.9% 10	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	77.8% 56	13.9% 10	6.9% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.1% 59	14.1% 10	2.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	81.9% 59	12.5% 9	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.9% 56	14.1% 10	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.3% 57	12.7% 9	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.3% 50	7.1% 4	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.9% 61	12.7% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.1% 62	12.5% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.4% 47	18.8% 12	4.7% 3	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.1% 50	15.6% 10	3.1% 2	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	82.8% 53	9.4% 6	4.7% 3	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.6% 58	12.5% 9	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.1% 61	11.4% 8	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Kenneth A. Blalock: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.9% 58	14.3% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.3% 57	14.1% 10	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	85.7% 60	12.9% 9	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.6% 53	22.2% 16	2.8% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	71.4%
	Good	16	22.9%
	Needs Improvement	3	4.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	11.7%
	Worse	1	1.7%
	Stayed the Same	52	86.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Matthew Donald Nelson

Judge of the General District Court
12th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 99 completed surveys for Judge Matthew Donald Nelson.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Matthew Donald Nelson: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.93

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	79.8% 79	19.2% 19	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.9% 89	9.1% 9	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.8% 87	9.2% 9	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.7% 83	13.3% 13	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.9% 88	9.1% 9	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.6% 77	19.4% 19	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.8% 86	11.2% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.5% 84	9.4% 9	1.0% 1	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.5% 81	13.4% 13	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.0% 66	10.7% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.7% 82	15.3% 15	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.6% 85	11.3% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	84.5% 71	14.3% 12	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.2% 59	23.8% 20	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	81.0% 68	16.7% 14	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.9% 85	13.1% 13	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.8% 87	10.2% 10	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Matthew Donald Nelson: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.7% 83	14.3% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.8% 86	8.2% 8	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	79.6% 78	19.4% 19	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.4% 77	19.6% 19	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	83	84.7%
	Good	12	12.2%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	10.0%
	Worse	2	2.2%
	Stayed the Same	79	87.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kenneth Andrew Sneathern

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 69 completed surveys for Judge Kenneth Andrew Sneathern.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Judge Kenneth Andrew Sneathern: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.34

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	71.0% 49	24.6% 17	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.5% 59	11.6% 8	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.3% 58	11.8% 8	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.8% 59	8.8% 6	2.9% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.1% 58	13.0% 9	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.2% 60	10.3% 7	0.0% 0	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	89.9% 62	10.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.2% 56	11.6% 8	4.4% 3	2.9% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.6% 57	8.7% 6	5.8% 4	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.1% 43	13.2% 7	3.8% 2	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.6% 57	14.5% 10	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.4% 61	10.1% 7	0.0% 0	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.7% 42	19.3% 11	5.3% 3	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	68.4% 39	21.1% 12	7.0% 4	1.8% 1	1.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	74.1% 43	15.5% 9	6.9% 4	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.5% 59	11.6% 8	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.6% 57	15.9% 11	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Kenneth Andrew Sneathern: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.5% 59	10.1% 7	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.1% 53	11.9% 8	6.0% 4	3.0% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	85.3% 58	11.8% 8	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.6% 57	13.0% 9	2.9% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	54	79.4%
	Good	10	14.7%
	Needs Improvement	4	5.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	15.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	53	84.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Donald M. Haddock, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
18th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 88 completed surveys for Judge Donald M. Haddock, Jr.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Judge Donald M. Haddock, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.19

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	78.4% 69	17.1% 15	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.1% 74	11.4% 10	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.8% 79	8.0% 7	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.8% 79	8.0% 7	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.5% 77	10.2% 9	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.4% 76	12.6% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.1% 81	8.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.8% 72	9.1% 8	8.0% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.9% 73	6.9% 6	6.9% 6	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.7% 67	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.0% 80	5.8% 5	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.9% 79	7.0% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	87.1% 74	7.1% 6	5.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	90.7% 78	3.5% 3	5.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	87.2% 75	7.0% 6	4.7% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	90.9% 80	8.0% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	94.3% 83	4.6% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Donald M. Haddock, Jr.: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.7% 78	9.2% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.4% 76	6.8% 6	5.7% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	80.7% 71	14.8% 13	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.5% 77	10.3% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	74	84.1%
	Good	9	10.2%
	Needs Improvement	5	5.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	9.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	70	90.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Sonya L. Sacks

Judge of the General District Court
18th 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 97 completed surveys for Judge Sonya L. Sacks.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Sonya L. Sacks: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 19.61

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	34.4% 33	26.0% 25	28.1% 27	10.4% 10	1.0% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	42.6% 40	16.0% 15	33.0% 31	8.5% 8	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	50.0% 47	17.0% 16	17.0% 16	14.9% 14	1.1% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	51.6% 49	17.9% 17	15.8% 15	14.7% 14	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	42.7% 41	21.9% 21	18.8% 18	15.6% 15	1.0% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	51.7% 47	23.1% 21	17.6% 16	6.6% 6	1.1% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	63.9% 62	15.5% 15	10.3% 10	10.3% 10	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	44.8% 43	14.6% 14	14.6% 14	24.0% 23	2.1% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	44.2% 42	12.6% 12	15.8% 15	24.2% 23	3.2% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	75.0% 51	16.2% 11	4.4% 3	4.4% 3	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	56.7% 55	27.8% 27	11.3% 11	4.1% 4	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	55.8% 53	27.4% 26	10.5% 10	6.3% 6	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	42.6% 40	23.4% 22	14.9% 14	17.0% 16	2.1% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	37.2% 35	22.3% 21	14.9% 14	21.3% 20	4.3% 4
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	45.7% 43	16.0% 15	11.7% 11	23.4% 22	3.2% 3
16. The judge communicates effectively	49.0% 47	19.8% 19	16.7% 16	14.6% 14	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	62.4% 58	21.5% 20	9.7% 9	6.5% 6	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Sonya L. Sacks: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	54.3% 51	19.2% 18	13.8% 13	12.8% 12	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	48.4% 46	14.7% 14	12.6% 12	16.8% 16	7.4% 7
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	54.2% 52	16.7% 16	20.8% 20	8.3% 8	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	49.5% 47	14.7% 14	19.0% 18	15.8% 15	1.1% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	35	36.8%
	Good	23	24.2%
	Needs Improvement	16	16.8%
	Unsatisfactory	21	22.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	25	30.9%
	Worse	6	7.4%
	Stayed the Same	50	61.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Lorrie Ann Sinclair Taylor

Judge of the General District Court
20th 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 104 completed surveys for Judge Lorrie Ann Sinclair Taylor.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Lorrie Ann Sinclair Taylor: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.07

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	56.3% 58	20.4% 21	16.5% 17	4.9% 5	1.9% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	60.2% 62	20.4% 21	11.7% 12	5.8% 6	1.9% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	63.1% 65	21.4% 22	11.7% 12	2.9% 3	1.0% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	68.6% 70	16.7% 17	13.7% 14	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	62.1% 64	16.5% 17	15.5% 16	3.9% 4	1.9% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	72.2% 70	20.6% 20	4.1% 4	2.1% 2	1.0% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	76.0% 76	16.0% 16	5.0% 5	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	59.6% 62	18.3% 19	10.6% 11	10.6% 11	1.0% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	59.8% 61	18.6% 19	10.8% 11	8.8% 9	2.0% 2
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	80.8% 84	16.4% 17	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.5% 86	13.6% 14	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	55.0% 55	23.0% 23	11.0% 11	9.0% 9	2.0% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	55.5% 56	21.8% 22	14.9% 15	6.9% 7	1.0% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	58.4% 59	18.8% 19	11.9% 12	9.9% 10	1.0% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	62.5% 65	24.0% 25	9.6% 10	1.9% 2	1.9% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.3% 70	26.7% 27	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	1.0% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Lorrie Ann Sinclair Taylor: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	65.7% 67	23.5% 24	7.8% 8	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	62.8% 64	14.7% 15	10.8% 11	10.8% 11	1.0% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	70.9% 73	23.3% 24	2.9% 3	1.9% 2	1.0% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	65.1% 67	17.5% 18	13.6% 14	2.9% 3	1.0% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48	47.1%
	Good	28	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	20	19.6%
	Unsatisfactory	6	5.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	13.0%
	Worse	8	8.7%
	Stayed the Same	72	78.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robin J. Mayer

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 74 completed surveys for Judge Robin J. Mayer.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter **Evaluation of Judge Robin J. Mayer: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.11

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	86.5% 64	13.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.9% 68	6.8% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.8% 62	10.8% 8	4.1% 3	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.1% 60	14.9% 11	2.7% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.5% 67	6.8% 5	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.1% 62	9.7% 7	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.7% 64	11.0% 8	0.0% 0	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.9% 59	9.7% 7	6.9% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.9% 59	9.7% 7	6.9% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.3% 48	5.5% 3	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.9% 62	11.0% 8	2.7% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.7% 64	5.5% 4	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	89.1% 57	7.8% 5	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.9% 46	20.3% 13	6.3% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	79.7% 51	9.4% 6	9.4% 6	0.0% 0	1.6% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.6% 61	15.1% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.7% 64	11.0% 8	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Robin J. Mayer: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.9% 62	9.6% 7	5.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.2% 60	11.0% 8	5.5% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	84.7% 61	13.9% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.1% 57	17.8% 13	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	60	82.2%
	Good	8	11.0%
	Needs Improvement	4	5.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	16.4%
	Worse	3	4.5%
	Stayed the Same	53	79.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Mary Louise Costello Daniel

Judge of the General 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 63 completed surveys for Judge Mary Louise Costello Daniel.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Judge Mary Louise Costello Daniel: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.97

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	88.9% 56	9.5% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.1% 58	6.4% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	81.0% 51	14.3% 9	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.4% 50	17.5% 11	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.5% 57	4.8% 3	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	75.0% 45	18.3% 11	3.3% 2	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 54	12.7% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.2% 48	14.3% 9	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.4% 50	9.5% 6	9.5% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	85.2% 46	11.1% 6	3.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	70.5% 43	21.3% 13	6.6% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	74.6% 47	17.5% 11	4.8% 3	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.1% 47	19.7% 12	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.9% 39	28.6% 18	6.4% 4	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	77.8% 49	14.3% 9	4.8% 3	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	74.2% 46	22.6% 14	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.1% 53	15.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Mary Louise Costello Daniel: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.4% 45	23.8% 15	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.0% 49	12.9% 8	6.5% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	82.5% 52	14.3% 9	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.8% 49	15.9% 10	6.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	45	72.6%
	Good	13	21.0%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	2	3.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	13.7%
	Worse	1	2.0%
	Stayed the Same	43	84.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable George Robert Brittain

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 48 completed surveys for Judge George Robert Brittain.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge George Robert Brittain: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.66

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	63.8% 30	25.5% 12	10.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	70.2% 33	23.4% 11	6.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.7% 37	21.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.9% 38	19.2% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.0% 36	18.8% 9	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	83.3% 40	12.5% 6	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.6% 36	19.2% 9	2.1% 1	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.6% 36	17.0% 8	4.3% 2	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.4% 27	15.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.2% 37	15.6% 7	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.9% 38	14.9% 7	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	74.3% 26	20.0% 7	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.8% 28	13.9% 5	8.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	77.8% 28	19.4% 7	2.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.7% 37	17.0% 8	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.1% 40	12.8% 6	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of George Robert Brittain: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.0% 39	14.9% 7	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.4% 37	15.2% 7	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	83.0% 39	12.8% 6	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.1% 40	10.6% 5	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	35	76.1%
	Good	10	21.7%
	Needs Improvement	1	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	7.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	39	92.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Shawn L. Hines

Judge of the General District Court
30th Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 49 completed surveys for Judge Shawn L. Hines.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Shawn L. Hines: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.26

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	85.7% 42	12.2% 6	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.7% 42	12.2% 6	0.0% 0	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 42	10.2% 5	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.4% 41	10.4% 5	2.1% 1	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.8% 44	8.2% 4	0.0% 0	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.3% 40	8.3% 4	6.3% 3	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.8% 43	8.2% 4	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	83.7% 41	6.1% 3	4.1% 2	6.1% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.7% 41	6.1% 3	4.1% 2	6.1% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.7% 35	7.7% 3	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.3% 40	16.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.7% 41	12.2% 6	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	87.5% 35	7.5% 3	5.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.5% 31	10.0% 4	7.5% 3	5.0% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	85.0% 34	2.5% 1	10.0% 4	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.3% 40	12.5% 6	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	87.8% 43	8.2% 4	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Shawn L. Hines: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.4% 41	8.3% 4	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	87.8% 43	4.1% 2	6.1% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	87.8% 43	10.2% 5	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.5% 42	8.3% 4	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	35	71.4%
	Good	11	22.5%
	Needs Improvement	2	4.1%
	Unsatisfactory	1	2.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	4.3%
	Worse	2	4.3%
	Stayed the Same	43	91.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Andrew L. Johnson

Judge of the General 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 46 completed surveys for Judge Andrew L. Johnson.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter **Evaluation of Judge Andrew L. Johnson: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.07

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	71.7% 33	21.7% 10	4.4% 2	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	70.5% 31	25.0% 11	2.3% 1	2.3% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.4% 37	15.2% 7	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.6% 38	13.0% 6	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	78.3% 36	15.2% 7	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.4% 37	13.0% 6	4.4% 2	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	78.3% 36	17.4% 8	2.2% 1	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.1% 35	13.0% 6	8.7% 4	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.1% 35	13.0% 6	8.7% 4	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	81.1% 30	13.5% 5	2.7% 1	0.0% 0	2.7% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.3% 36	13.0% 6	2.2% 1	6.5% 3	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.4% 37	10.9% 5	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.8% 31	16.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.0% 30	15.8% 6	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	2.6% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	73.7% 28	21.1% 8	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	2.6% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.4% 37	17.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.1% 35	21.7% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.2% 1

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Andrew L. Johnson: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.4% 37	17.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	76.1% 35	15.2% 7	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	75.6% 34	17.8% 8	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.3% 36	13.0% 6	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	2.2% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	38	82.6%
	Good	5	10.9%
	Needs Improvement	2	4.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1	2.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	24.4%
	Worse	1	2.4%
	Stayed the Same	30	73.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Wallace Semeon Covington, III

Judge of the General District Court
31st Judicial District

Submitted to:

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 97 completed surveys for Judge Wallace Semeon Covington, III.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Judge Wallace Semeon Covington, III: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.36

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	76.0% 73	21.9% 21	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	83.5% 81	13.4% 13	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	80.2% 77	14.6% 14	5.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.6% 72	17.0% 16	6.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.7% 86	6.2% 6	5.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.8% 77	12.9% 12	4.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	73.2% 71	21.7% 21	5.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	74.0% 71	16.7% 16	7.3% 7	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.1% 74	17.7% 17	3.1% 3	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	89.9% 71	10.1% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.6% 84	13.4% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.5% 81	14.4% 14	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.6% 74	16.1% 15	4.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	69.5% 66	22.1% 21	8.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	73.4% 69	17.0% 16	8.5% 8	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.4% 77	13.4% 13	6.2% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	91.5% 86	6.4% 6	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Wallace Semeon Covington, III: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	80.4% 78	13.4% 13	6.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.1% 77	11.6% 11	5.3% 5	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	81.3% 78	12.5% 12	5.2% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	86.3% 82	12.6% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	69	72.6%
	Good	20	21.1%
	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	6	6.8%
	Worse	4	4.6%
	Stayed the Same	78	88.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Adrienne L. Bennett

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 105 completed surveys for Judge Adrienne L. Bennett.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Adrienne L. Bennett: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.86

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	81.0% 85	16.2% 17	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.4% 96	5.7% 6	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.7% 91	9.5% 10	3.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.6% 84	13.6% 14	4.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.6% 93	8.6% 9	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.6% 92	9.5% 10	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.6% 92	9.5% 10	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.9% 86	10.5% 11	6.7% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.7% 85	11.5% 12	4.8% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	87.4% 83	9.5% 9	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	84.8% 89	12.4% 13	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.0% 85	17.1% 18	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	82.7% 86	10.6% 11	6.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.9% 80	16.4% 17	4.8% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	79.8% 83	13.5% 14	4.8% 5	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.8% 88	13.3% 14	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.7% 85	15.4% 16	1.9% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Adrienne L. Bennett: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.5% 86	13.6% 14	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.6% 84	13.6% 14	2.9% 3	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	78.1% 82	19.1% 20	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.6% 70	20.6% 21	10.8% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	80	78.4%
	Good	18	17.7%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	13.7%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	82	86.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Philip C. Hollowell

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 90 completed surveys for Judge Philip C Hollowell.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Philip C. Hollowell: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.74

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	47.8% 43	36.7% 33	13.3% 12	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	65.6% 59	24.4% 22	10.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	72.2% 65	16.7% 15	8.9% 8	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	74.4% 67	14.4% 13	8.9% 8	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	63.3% 57	22.2% 20	14.4% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	70.0% 63	22.2% 20	7.8% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	75.6% 68	16.7% 15	5.6% 5	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	61.1% 55	18.9% 17	15.6% 14	4.4% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	62.2% 56	18.9% 17	12.2% 11	6.7% 6	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	80.3% 61	11.8% 9	7.9% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.2% 74	14.6% 13	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.8% 72	15.9% 14	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	62.2% 56	22.2% 20	11.1% 10	4.4% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.8% 61	20.0% 18	7.8% 7	4.4% 4	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	65.6% 59	17.8% 16	13.3% 12	2.2% 2	1.1% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.3% 66	17.8% 16	7.8% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	77.8% 70	20.0% 18	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Philip C. Hollowell: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	74.4% 67	16.7% 15	7.8% 7	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	63.5% 54	16.5% 14	15.3% 13	3.5% 3	1.2% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	73.3% 66	18.9% 17	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	71.6% 63	19.3% 17	6.8% 6	2.3% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48	53.9%
	Good	29	32.6%
	Needs Improvement	8	9.0%
	Unsatisfactory	4	4.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	4.7%
	Worse	3	3.5%
	Stayed the Same	79	91.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Cheryl J. Wilson

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 56 completed surveys for Judge Cheryl J. Wilson.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Cheryl J. Wilson: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.50

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	55.4% 31	37.5% 21	5.4% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	66.1% 37	26.8% 15	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.0% 42	23.2% 13	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.2% 43	21.8% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.2% 41	23.2% 13	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 44	18.2% 10	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.5% 49	10.7% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.4% 40	23.2% 13	5.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	72.7% 40	21.8% 12	3.6% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	80.4% 37	19.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.1% 46	17.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.1% 46	16.1% 9	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.6% 36	21.6% 11	7.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	62.8% 32	29.4% 15	5.9% 3	0.0% 0	2.0% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	66.7% 34	27.5% 14	3.9% 2	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	69.6% 39	28.6% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.6% 46	14.6% 8	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Cheryl J. Wilson: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.0% 42	23.2% 13	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.1% 43	15.1% 8	1.9% 1	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	68.5% 37	20.4% 11	7.4% 4	1.9% 1	1.9% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	69.1% 38	20.0% 11	9.1% 5	0.0% 0	1.8% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	38	69.1%
	Good	14	25.5%
	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	4	7.7%
	Worse	1	1.9%
	Stayed the Same	47	90.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Vanessa L. Jones

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 59 completed surveys for Judge Vanessa L Jones.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Vanessa L. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.63

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	84.8% 50	13.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.7% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.5% 54	8.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.1% 52	11.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.8% 50	11.9% 7	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	1.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.8% 53	10.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.0% 49	14.0% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.1% 52	11.9% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.7% 52	10.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	89.7% 52	8.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	97.9% 47	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.4% 51	13.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.8% 48	17.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.4% 41	17.7% 9	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	79.3% 42	17.0% 9	1.9% 1	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	84.6% 44	15.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.4% 51	13.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	89.3% 50	10.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Vanessa L. Jones: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.7% 50	10.5% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	94.8% 55	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	80.4% 45	19.6% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.1% 49	15.3% 9	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	46	80.7%
	Good	9	15.8%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.5%
	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	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	44	88.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Marilyn C. Goss

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 46 completed surveys for Judge Marilyn C. Goss.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Marilyn C. Goss: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.16

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	71.7% 33	21.7% 10	4.4% 2	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	87.0% 40	4.4% 2	6.5% 3	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.6% 38	8.7% 4	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.6% 38	8.7% 4	4.4% 2	2.2% 1	2.2% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.8% 39	6.5% 3	4.4% 2	4.4% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.7% 39	11.1% 5	0.0% 0	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.0% 40	6.5% 3	2.2% 1	4.4% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.8% 39	8.7% 4	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.4% 38	6.7% 3	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	4.4% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	88.1% 37	7.1% 3	2.4% 1	0.0% 0	2.4% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.0% 40	6.5% 3	2.2% 1	2.2% 1	2.2% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.8% 39	10.9% 5	0.0% 0	4.4% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	84.4% 38	11.1% 5	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	80.4% 37	13.0% 6	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	80.4% 37	13.0% 6	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	87.0% 40	6.5% 3	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.7% 39	13.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Marilyn C. Goss: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	82.2% 37	13.3% 6	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.7% 39	6.7% 3	2.2% 1	2.2% 1	2.2% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	75.6% 34	17.8% 8	4.4% 2	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.4% 37	15.2% 7	2.2% 1	2.2% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	38	82.6%
	Good	5	10.9%
	Needs Improvement	2	4.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1	2.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	6.8%
	Worse	1	2.3%
	Stayed the Same	40	90.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Marcel D. Jones

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 88 completed surveys for Judge Marcel D. Jones.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Marcel D. Jones: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.18

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	87.4% 76	12.6% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.6% 78	11.4% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	81.4% 70	15.1% 13	2.3% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	77.0% 67	18.4% 16	3.5% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	88.6% 78	9.1% 8	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 68	15.3% 13	4.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.0% 73	15.9% 14	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.5% 70	13.8% 12	5.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.8% 72	12.6% 11	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.4% 68	5.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.2% 69	12.9% 11	5.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.6% 71	16.1% 14	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.3% 61	18.8% 15	5.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.5% 54	17.5% 14	8.8% 7	6.3% 5	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	76.3% 61	11.3% 9	7.5% 6	5.0% 4	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	73.9% 65	19.3% 17	4.6% 4	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.1% 67	18.2% 16	5.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Marcel D. Jones: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	74.7% 65	13.8% 12	9.2% 8	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.2% 69	15.1% 13	4.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	73.6% 64	18.4% 16	8.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.1% 61	18.4% 16	8.1% 7	2.3% 2	1.2% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	64	73.6%
	Good	13	14.9%
	Needs Improvement	9	10.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	16.5%
	Worse	1	1.3%
	Stayed the Same	65	82.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Deborah S. Tinsley

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 54 completed surveys for Judge Deborah S. Tinsley.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Deborah S. Tinsley: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.23

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	50.0% 27	27.8% 15	20.4% 11	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	59.3% 32	24.1% 13	14.8% 8	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.1% 40	20.4% 11	5.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	72.2% 39	20.4% 11	7.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	63.0% 34	22.2% 12	13.0% 7	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.0% 44	5.7% 3	11.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.3% 45	14.8% 8	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.5% 40	15.1% 8	7.6% 4	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	66.0% 35	22.6% 12	9.4% 5	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	95.0% 38	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.6% 48	9.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.7% 47	9.4% 5	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	64.4% 29	22.2% 10	11.1% 5	2.2% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.6% 34	15.6% 7	8.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	77.8% 35	11.1% 5	11.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.2% 39	18.5% 10	9.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.5% 44	14.8% 8	3.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Deborah S. Tinsley: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.6% 43	14.8% 8	5.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.1% 43	5.7% 3	11.3% 6	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	79.3% 42	18.9% 10	0.0% 0	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.4% 41	13.2% 7	7.6% 4	1.9% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	39	73.6%
	Good	10	18.9%
	Needs Improvement	3	5.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	6.7%
	Worse	1	2.2%
	Stayed the Same	41	91.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Thomas Kevin Cullen

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
18th 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 96 completed surveys for Judge Thomas Kevin Cullen.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Thomas Kevin Cullen: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 18.61

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	28.1% 27	16.7% 16	39.6% 38	12.5% 12	3.1% 3
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	32.6% 31	22.1% 21	30.5% 29	11.6% 11	3.2% 3
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	33.0% 31	21.3% 20	29.8% 28	12.8% 12	3.2% 3
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	33.0% 31	25.5% 24	23.4% 22	13.8% 13	4.3% 4
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	29.2% 28	17.7% 17	27.1% 26	20.8% 20	5.2% 5
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	39.5% 34	34.9% 30	17.4% 15	4.7% 4	3.5% 3
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	47.4% 45	33.7% 32	13.7% 13	2.1% 2	3.2% 3
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	27.7% 26	20.2% 19	28.7% 27	18.1% 17	5.3% 5
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	27.7% 26	20.2% 19	27.7% 26	18.1% 17	6.4% 6
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	60.0% 42	11.4% 8	14.3% 10	10.0% 7	4.3% 3
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	52.2% 48	32.6% 30	9.8% 9	2.2% 2	3.3% 3
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	48.9% 43	35.2% 31	12.5% 11	0.0% 0	3.4% 3
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	27.2% 25	26.1% 24	25.0% 23	16.3% 15	5.4% 5
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	23.9% 22	22.8% 21	33.7% 31	17.4% 16	2.2% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	26.1% 24	18.5% 17	31.5% 29	19.6% 18	4.4% 4
16. The judge communicates effectively	34.4% 33	17.7% 17	26.0% 25	19.8% 19	2.1% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	41.1% 37	41.1% 37	13.3% 12	3.3% 3	1.1% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Thomas Kevin Cullen: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	31.5% 29	29.4% 27	26.1% 24	9.8% 9	3.3% 3
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	30.1% 28	17.2% 16	21.5% 20	21.5% 20	9.7% 9
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	33.7% 30	36.0% 32	20.2% 18	7.9% 7	2.3% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	28.6% 26	25.3% 23	24.2% 22	15.4% 14	6.6% 6

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	25	26.3%
	Good	15	15.8%
	Needs Improvement	26	27.4%
	Unsatisfactory	29	30.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	13.1%
	Worse	21	25.0%
	Stayed the Same	52	61.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Frank W. Rogers, III

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
23rd 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 47 completed surveys for Judge Frank W. Rogers, III.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter **Evaluation of Judge Frank W. Rogers, III: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 18.26

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	63.8% 30	31.9% 15	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	72.3% 34	25.5% 12	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.6% 36	21.3% 10	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.6% 38	17.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	74.5% 35	21.3% 10	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	76.6% 36	12.8% 6	8.5% 4	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.1% 40	12.8% 6	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.3% 34	19.2% 9	6.4% 3	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.7% 37	12.8% 6	6.4% 3	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.6% 33	15.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.1% 40	12.8% 6	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.0% 40	10.9% 5	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	75.0% 33	20.5% 9	4.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.3% 34	20.5% 9	2.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	72.7% 32	18.2% 8	9.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.7% 37	17.0% 8	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.9% 38	19.2% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Frank W. Rogers, III: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.3% 34	25.5% 12	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	75.6% 34	17.8% 8	6.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	76.6% 36	19.2% 9	2.1% 1	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.7% 37	17.0% 8	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	34	73.9%
	Good	8	17.4%
	Needs Improvement	4	8.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	11.4%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	39	88.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Linda Schorsch Jones

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 44 completed surveys for Judge Linda Schorsch Jones.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter

Evaluation of Judge Linda Schorsch Jones: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 18.87

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	51.2% 22	37.2% 16	11.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	55.8% 24	39.5% 17	4.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.0% 33	18.2% 8	4.6% 2	2.3% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.1% 34	18.6% 8	2.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	60.5% 26	23.3% 10	16.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	76.7% 33	20.9% 9	2.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.7% 36	14.0% 6	2.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.4% 30	14.3% 6	11.9% 5	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	60.5% 26	23.3% 10	9.3% 4	7.0% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	68.6% 24	22.9% 8	5.7% 2	2.9% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	73.8% 31	23.8% 10	2.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.0% 34	16.7% 7	2.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	60.5% 23	23.7% 9	13.2% 5	2.6% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.0% 26	27.5% 11	5.0% 2	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	72.5% 29	20.0% 8	5.0% 2	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.7% 36	16.3% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	83.3% 35	11.9% 5	4.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Linda Schorsch Jones: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.4% 35	14.0% 6	4.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.7% 29	19.5% 8	7.3% 3	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	79.1% 34	16.3% 7	4.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.6% 33	11.9% 5	9.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	33	75.0%
	Good	7	15.9%
	Needs Improvement	4	9.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	7.9%
	Worse	1	2.6%
	Stayed the Same	34	89.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kimberly Marion Athey

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 41 completed surveys for Judge Kimberly Marion Athey.

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Judge Kimberly Marion Athey: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 18.88

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	43.9% 18	31.7% 13	22.0% 9	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	53.7% 22	29.3% 12	17.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	52.5% 21	22.5% 9	22.5% 9	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	41.0% 16	35.9% 14	18.0% 7	5.1% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	58.5% 24	14.6% 6	24.4% 10	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	55.0% 22	25.0% 10	17.5% 7	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	56.1% 23	22.0% 9	22.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	51.2% 21	19.5% 8	22.0% 9	4.9% 2	2.4% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	50.0% 20	17.5% 7	25.0% 10	5.0% 2	2.5% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	69.7% 23	12.1% 4	12.1% 4	3.0% 1	3.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	60.0% 24	25.0% 10	15.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	65.9% 27	22.0% 9	12.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	57.5% 23	20.0% 8	17.5% 7	5.0% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	45.0% 18	22.5% 9	20.0% 8	12.5% 5	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	53.9% 21	10.3% 4	23.1% 9	12.8% 5	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	48.8% 20	24.4% 10	22.0% 9	4.9% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	62.5% 25	27.5% 11	7.5% 3	2.5% 1	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Kimberly Marion Athey: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	52.5% 21	30.0% 12	12.5% 5	5.0% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	55.0% 22	10.0% 4	20.0% 8	15.0% 6	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	53.9% 21	23.1% 9	18.0% 7	2.6% 1	2.6% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	51.3% 20	23.1% 9	15.4% 6	7.7% 3	2.6% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	19	47.5%
	Good	9	22.5%
	Needs Improvement	10	25.0%
	Unsatisfactory	2	5.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	23.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	26	76.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stephanie Murray Shortt

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
27th 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 58 completed surveys for Judge Stephanie Murray Shortt.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Stephanie Murray Shortt: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.57

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	67.2% 39	22.4% 13	5.2% 3	5.2% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	75.9% 44	13.8% 8	5.2% 3	5.2% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.9% 44	13.8% 8	5.2% 3	5.2% 3	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	74.1% 43	13.8% 8	8.6% 5	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.7% 42	15.8% 9	3.5% 2	7.0% 4	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	71.4% 40	21.4% 12	3.6% 2	3.6% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.9% 47	10.7% 6	5.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	73.7% 42	17.5% 10	3.5% 2	5.3% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.6% 45	10.3% 6	8.6% 5	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	78.3% 36	13.0% 6	4.4% 2	2.2% 1	2.2% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	71.9% 41	19.3% 11	7.0% 4	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	75.9% 44	19.0% 11	3.5% 2	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	57.1% 28	26.5% 13	12.2% 6	2.0% 1	2.0% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.2% 30	22.5% 11	10.2% 5	4.1% 2	2.0% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	66.7% 32	22.9% 11	2.1% 1	8.3% 4	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.7% 41	17.2% 10	8.6% 5	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.1% 43	20.7% 12	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Stephanie Murray Shortt: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	70.7% 41	17.2% 10	8.6% 5	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.4% 42	15.5% 9	5.2% 3	5.2% 3	1.7% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	77.6% 45	12.1% 7	8.6% 5	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	74.1% 43	10.3% 6	6.9% 4	6.9% 4	1.7% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	39	68.4%
	Good	8	14.0%
	Needs Improvement	5	8.8%
	Unsatisfactory	5	8.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	17.0%
	Worse	4	7.6%
	Stayed the Same	40	75.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Bradley G. Dalton

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
27th 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 63 completed surveys for Judge Bradley G. Dalton.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Bradley G. Dalton: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.46

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	88.9% 56	9.5% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.7% 59	6.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 54	14.3% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.1% 54	12.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.7% 59	6.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.4% 50	19.1% 12	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.1% 58	7.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	85.7% 54	12.7% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.0% 51	17.5% 11	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	92.6% 50	5.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.9% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.5% 57	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.1% 58	6.4% 4	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.3% 46	19.0% 11	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	91.5% 54	8.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	89.8% 53	10.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.7% 54	12.7% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.9% 56	11.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Bradley G. Dalton: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.1% 53	14.3% 9	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.5% 53	9.7% 6	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	87.3% 55	12.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.7% 54	12.7% 8	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	54	85.7%
	Good	7	11.1%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	15.8%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	48	84.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jacqueline W. Lucas

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 70 completed surveys for Judge Jacqueline W. Lucas.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter **Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline W. Lucas: Evaluation Summary**

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 17.61

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	78.6% 55	21.4% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	88.6% 62	11.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.9% 58	14.3% 10	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.6% 55	17.1% 12	2.9% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	82.9% 58	17.1% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.7% 55	18.8% 13	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.9% 58	15.7% 11	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.0% 56	11.4% 8	7.1% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.4% 57	10.0% 7	7.1% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	86.3% 44	13.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	79.7% 55	20.3% 14	0.0% 0	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	82.1% 55	16.4% 11	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.6% 48	16.4% 11	10.5% 7	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	79.1% 53	13.4% 9	6.0% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.4% 57	17.1% 12	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.0% 56	20.0% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Jacqueline W. Lucas: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.6% 55	20.0% 14	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.2% 56	13.0% 9	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	71.0% 49	24.6% 17	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.6% 55	17.1% 12	2.9% 2	1.4% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	54	79.4%
	Good	12	17.7%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	19.1%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	51	81.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Carlos Javier Flores Laboy

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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 76 completed surveys for Judge Carlos Javier Flores Laboy.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Carlos Javier Flores Laboy: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 19.13

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	88.2% 67	10.5% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.8% 69	6.6% 5	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.8% 66	9.2% 7	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.5% 65	10.5% 8	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.1% 70	2.6% 2	4.0% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.3% 59	14.3% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.8% 69	9.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	80.3% 61	11.8% 9	4.0% 3	2.6% 2	1.3% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.9% 63	10.5% 8	4.0% 3	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	94.6% 52	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.7% 68	8.0% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.4% 66	8.2% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.7% 58	14.1% 10	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.0% 54	23.6% 17	1.4% 1	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
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.7% 65	12.0% 9	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	90.3% 65	9.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Carlos Javier Flores Laboy: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.5% 64	13.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.1% 60	10.8% 8	6.8% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	82.4% 61	16.2% 12	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.1% 63	13.5% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	58	77.3%
	Good	15	20.0%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	9.8%
	Worse	2	3.3%
	Stayed the Same	53	86.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Cela J. Burge

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
Two-A 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

2025



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 23 performance-based factors drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Attorney surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

Bailiffs and court reporters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk’s office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

For judges in circuit courts, jurors who served during a period of six months before the compilation of this report also received surveys that included 13 of the 23 performance-based factors. The juror surveys were handed out, together with preaddressed, postage paid envelopes, at the conclusion of jury service. The surveys were returned by the jurors to VCU-SERL by mail.

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 28 completed surveys for Judge Cela J. Burge.

Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter Evaluation of Judge Cella J. Burge: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.00

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	75.0% 21	17.9% 5	7.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.1% 23	7.1% 2	10.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.6% 22	7.1% 2	10.7% 3	3.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.6% 22	10.7% 3	7.1% 2	3.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.0% 21	10.7% 3	14.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	82.1% 23	14.3% 4	3.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 24	10.7% 3	3.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.4% 20	10.7% 3	17.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	75.0% 21	10.7% 3	10.7% 3	3.6% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate <i>ex parte</i> communications	84.2% 16	5.3% 1	10.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.7% 24	10.7% 3	3.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.9% 26	7.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	63.6% 14	18.2% 4	13.6% 3	4.6% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	54.6% 12	27.3% 6	4.6% 1	13.6% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	63.6% 14	18.2% 4	4.6% 1	13.6% 3	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	78.6% 22	10.7% 3	3.6% 1	7.1% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	85.7% 24	7.1% 2	7.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

**Attorney, Bailiff, and Court Reporter
Evaluation of Cela J. Burge: Evaluation Summary**

18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.0% 21	14.3% 4	3.6% 1	7.1% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.6% 22	7.1% 2	14.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	78.6% 22	3.6% 1	14.3% 4	3.6% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.0% 17	14.8% 4	7.4% 2	11.1% 3	3.7% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	20	71.4%
	Good	4	14.3%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	4	14.3%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	16.7%
	Worse	3	12.5%
	Stayed the Same	17	70.8%