SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY & LEGAL COUNSEL
ALISA W. PADDEN

COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
KRISTI S. WRIGHT, DIRECTOR

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
CAROLINE E. KIRKPATRICK, DIRECTOR

FISCAL SERVICES
STUART B. SMITH, DIRECTOR

HUMAN RESOURCES
RENÉE FLEMING MILLS, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
JOBY KNUTH, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL SERVICES
PAUL F. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

LEGAL RESEARCH
EILEEN A. LONGENECKER, DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS
BRANDY S. SINGLETON, DIRECTOR

MAGISTRATE SERVICES
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

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

November 17, 2026

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 2027 Session of the General Assembly. Each has had at least one interim evaluation conducted during their terms, which, as you know, are used for self-improvement purposes and "shall not be disclosed" pursuant to paragraph C of the aforesaid statute.

Please note that beginning in 2026, foreign language interpreters joined court reporters and bailiffs for all trial courts, and jurors and in-court clerk's office staff in the circuit courts, as non-attorney survey respondents. Foreign language interpreters (both staff and in-person, certified, contract interpreters), who observed the trial court judges, were asked to complete a survey of the judges being evaluated. To help foreign language interpreters understand the JPE Program and the importance of their participation, we held informational sessions about the Program to prepare the interpreters for their participation in the process.

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).

Supreme Court of Virginia Justice

1. The Honorable D. Arthur Kelsey

Court of Appeals of Virginia Judge

2. The Honorable Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.

Circuit Court Judges

3. The Honorable Matthew A. Glassman, Fifth Judicial Circuit
4. The Honorable Carson E. Saunders, Jr., Sixth Judicial Circuit
5. The Honorable Randall G. Johnson, Jr., Fourteenth Judicial Circuit
6. The Honorable William E. Glover, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit
7. The Honorable Timothy K. Sanner, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit
8. The Honorable Claude V. Worrell, II, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit
9. The Honorable Judith L. Wheat, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit
10. The Honorable Dontae L. Bugg, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit
11. The Honorable James P. Fisher, Twentieth Judicial Circuit
12. The Honorable James E. Plowman, Jr., Twentieth Judicial Circuit
13. The Honorable Marcus A. Brinks, Twenty-First Judicial Circuit
14. The Honorable James F. Watson, Twenty-Fourth Judicial Circuit
15. The Honorable Frank Patrick Yeatts, Twenty-Fourth Judicial Circuit
16. The Honorable Paul A. Dryer, Twenty-Fifth Judicial Circuit
17. The Honorable Edward K. Stein, Twenty-Fifth Judicial Circuit
18. The Honorable Brett L. Geisler, Twenty-Seventh Judicial Circuit
19. The Honorable John C. Kilgore, Thirtieth Judicial Circuit
20. The Honorable Angela L. Horan, Thirty-First Judicial Circuit

General District Court Judges

21. The Honorable Tanya L. Lomax, First Judicial District
22. The Honorable Vivian F. Henderson, Second Judicial District
23. The Honorable Tameeka M. Williams, Fourth Judicial District
24. The Honorable Charisse M. Mullen, Seventh Judicial District
25. The Honorable Michael S. Stein, Seventh Judicial District
26. The Honorable David M. Hicks, Thirteenth Judicial District
27. The Honorable Mansi J. Shah, Thirteenth Judicial District
28. The Honorable B. Craig Dunkum, Fourteenth Judicial District

29. The Honorable John K. Honey, Jr., Fourteenth Judicial District
30. The Honorable Gary H. Moliken, Nineteenth Judicial District
31. The Honorable Jessica H. Foster, Twentieth Judicial District
32. The Honorable Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi, Twenty-Third Judicial District
33. The Honorable Stephanie S. Maddox, Twenty-Fourth Judicial District
34. The Honorable Amy B. Tisinger, Twenty-Sixth Judicial District
35. The Honorable Erin J. DeHart, Twenty-Seventh Judicial District
36. The Honorable Robert L. Hobbs, Twenty-Eighth Judicial District
37. The Honorable Che C. Rogers, Thirty-First Judicial District

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judges

38. The Honorable Lyn M. Simmons, Fourth Judicial District
39. The Honorable Jacqueline R. Waymack, Sixth Judicial District
40. The Honorable Kimberly A. Kurkjian, Seventh Judicial District
41. The Honorable Shawn W. Overbey, Seventh Judicial District
42. The Honorable Mara M. Matthews, Ninth Judicial District
43. The Honorable Brian J. Smalls, Ninth Judicial District
44. The Honorable Travis R. Williams, Twelfth Judicial District
45. The Honorable Stacy E. Lee, Fourteenth Judicial District
46. The Honorable John E. Franklin, Fifteenth Judicial District
47. The Honorable Andrea M. Stewart, Fifteenth Judicial District
48. The Honorable Frank G. Uvanni, Fifteenth Judicial District
49. The Honorable Melissa S. Cardoce, Nineteenth Judicial District
50. The Honorable Thomas P. Sotelo, Nineteenth Judicial District
51. The Honorable Melinda L. VanLowe, Nineteenth Judicial District
52. The Honorable Deanna P. Stone, Twenty-Second Judicial District
53. The Honorable Heather P. Ferguson, Twenty-Third Judicial District
54. The Honorable Hilary D. Griffith, Twenty-Third Judicial District
55. The Honorable Joseph B. Lyle, Twenty-Eighth Judicial District
56. The Honorable Michael J. Bush, Twenty-Ninth Judicial District
57. The Honorable Martha P. Ketron, Twenty-Ninth 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,

KRH

Karl R. Hade

KRH:rd

Attachment

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

Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
Information for General Assembly Members – 2026

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, court reporters, and foreign language interpreters (both staff and in-person, certified, contract interpreters) 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 D. Arthur Kelsey

Justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia

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

2026



I. Program Purpose and Use of This Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for justices and 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. The evaluated justice has had at least one interim performance evaluation for self-improvement purposes. The interim evaluation is confidential and "shall not be disclosed" by the justice. Code of Virginia § 17.1-100(C).

II. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation methods were written surveys and opinion reviews. The justice was reviewed by three groups: attorneys who appeared before the justice within the past three years, circuit court judges, and an Appellate Opinion Review Committee. The Committee is appointed by the Chief Justice and is comprised of one retired Supreme Court justice, two retired Court of Appeals judges, two retired circuit court judges, and a law professor.

The survey completed by the attorneys contained 15 performance-based factors (or questions) drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct related to observable, mostly in-court behaviors, and a 10-question section related to opinion writing. Surveys completed by circuit court judges contained only the opinion writing section.

The Appellate Opinion Review Committee reviewed four opinions written by the evaluated justice within the past three years. The justice selected the opinions, which were required to come from the following categories:

a. One criminal opinion,
b. One civil opinion,
c. One additional opinion, and
d. One concurrence or dissent, if available.

The Committee had the option of reviewing additional opinions at the Committee's discretion. The Committee met in May 2026 and, for each opinion, reported a consensus score and optional narrative for each factor contained on a scoring template provided to the Committee.

III. Report Content

This report has two parts. Part I is organized as follows: Section A shows the collective results of all surveys submitted by attorneys who reviewed the justice's performance. Section B shows the collective results from circuit court judges. Section C contains an aggregate of attorney and circuit court judge results on the survey's opinion section.

For each performance factor on the survey, the report presents the percentage for each category: Every Time, Frequently, Some of the Time, Rarely, or Never. It also reflects the number of responses for each category. Responses of "Not Applicable" are treated as non-responses and are not included in the number of responses or percentage calculation. The number of responses will vary among the performance factors because of non-responses. This report reflects a total of 167 completed surveys for Justice Kelsey (57 circuit court judge surveys and 110 attorney surveys).

Part II of this report consists of the opinion review results provided by the Appellate Opinion Review Committee. The Committee's consensus is included for each of the opinions the evaluated justice selected for review.

PART I
SECTION A

ATTORNEY SURVEYS

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey Evaluation Summary

Performance Factors: Oral Argument	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.5% 67	22.0% 24	12.8% 14	1.8% 2	1.8% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	69.7% 76	18.3% 20	6.4% 7	3.7% 4	1.8% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	89.5% 94	5.7% 6	3.8% 4	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	90.5% 95	5.7% 6	2.9% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	70.9% 78	15.5% 17	5.5% 6	4.5% 5	3.6% 4
6. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	88.2% 97	8.2% 9	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	1.8% 2
7. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.6% 78	13.8% 15	7.3% 8	5.5% 6	1.8% 2
8. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	73.4% 80	12.8% 14	6.4% 7	4.6% 5	2.8% 3
9. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	96.8% 60	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.2% 2
10. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	95.1% 98	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
11. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.2% 72	16.3% 17	6.7% 7	5.8% 6	1.9% 2
12. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.7% 90	7.6% 8	4.8% 5	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
13. The judge communicates effectively	80.4% 86	10.3% 11	6.5% 7	1.9% 2	0.9% 1
14. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.9% 81	7.7% 8	7.7% 8	4.8% 5	1.9% 2
15. The judge asks relevant questions	80.7% 88	9.2% 10	7.3% 8	2.8% 3	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor: Written Opinions	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge writes opinions that exhibit the proper application of judicial precedents	69.3% 61	19.3% 17	8.0% 7	3.4% 3	0.0% 0
2. The judge writes opinions that adequately explain the basis of the court's decision	77.9% 67	11.6% 10	7.0% 6	2.3% 2	1.2% 1
3. The judge writes opinions that provide an applicable standard of review for the case, if any	82.6% 71	10.5% 9	4.7% 4	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge writes opinions that provide clear direction to the lower tribunal or court	75.3% 64	14.1% 12	9.4% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge writes opinions that clearly set forth any rules of law to be used in future cases	71.3% 62	19.5% 17	6.9% 6	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
6. The judge writes opinions that clearly present the facts needed to decide the case before the court	77.5% 69	12.4% 11	6.7% 6	2.2% 2	1.1% 1
7. The judge writes opinions that accurately summarize the relevant procedural history in the lower tribunal or court	77.6% 66	15.3% 13	3.5% 3	2.4% 2	1.2% 1
8. The judge writes separate opinions that are appropriate in tone	74.6% 53	12.7% 9	8.5% 6	2.8% 2	1.4% 1
9. The judge writes opinions that are clear	70.1% 61	19.5% 17	8.0% 7	2.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge writes opinions in which the legal reasoning is easy to follow	64.8% 57	21.6% 19	9.1% 8	3.4% 3	1.1% 1

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	83	79.8%
	Good	8	7.7%
	Needs Improvement	8	7.7%
	Unsatisfactory	5	4.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	7.8%
	Worse	5	7.8%
	Stayed the Same	54	84.4%

PART I
SECTION B

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE SURVEYS

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor: Written Opinions	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge writes opinions that exhibit the proper application of judicial precedents	87.7% 50	10.5% 6	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge writes opinions that adequately explain the basis of the court's decision	91.2% 52	7.0% 4	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge writes opinions that provide an applicable standard of review for the case, if any	91.2% 52	7.0% 4	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge writes opinions that provide clear direction to the lower tribunal or court	78.9% 45	17.5% 10	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge writes opinions that clearly set forth any rules of law to be used in future cases	83.9% 47	12.5% 7	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge writes opinions that clearly present the facts needed to decide the case before the court	86.0% 49	12.3% 7	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge writes opinions that accurately summarize the relevant procedural history in the lower tribunal or court	85.5% 47	14.5% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge writes separate opinions that are appropriate in tone	80.4% 37	10.9% 5	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	2.2% 1
9. The judge writes opinions that are clear	76.8% 43	19.6% 11	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge writes opinions in which the legal reasoning is easy to follow	70.2% 40	28.1% 16	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	53	94.6%
	Good	2	3.6%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	3.6%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	54	96.4%

PART I
SECTION C

COMBINED SURVEYS:
ATTORNEYS AND CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge writes opinions that exhibit the proper application of judicial precedents	76.6% 111	15.9% 23	4.8% 7	2.8% 4	0.0% 0
2. The judge writes opinions that adequately explain the basis of the court's decision	83.2% 119	9.8% 14	4.2% 6	2.1% 3	0.7% 1
3. The judge writes opinions that provide an applicable standard of review for the case, if any	86.0% 123	9.1% 13	2.8% 4	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
4. The judge writes opinions that provide clear direction to the lower tribunal or court	76.8% 109	15.5% 22	6.3% 9	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge writes opinions that clearly set forth any rules of law to be used in future cases	76.2% 109	16.8% 24	4.9% 7	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
6. The judge writes opinions that clearly present the facts needed to decide the case before the court	80.8% 118	12.3% 18	4.8% 7	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
7. The judge writes opinions that accurately summarize the relevant procedural history in the lower tribunal or court	80.7% 113	15.0% 21	2.1% 3	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
8. The judge writes separate opinions that are appropriate in tone	76.9% 90	12.0% 14	7.7% 9	1.7% 2	1.7% 2
9. The judge writes opinions that are clear	72.7% 104	19.6% 28	5.6% 8	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge writes opinions in which the legal reasoning is easy to follow	66.9% 97	24.1% 35	5.5% 8	2.8% 4	0.7% 1

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	136	85.0%
	Good	10	6.3%
	Needs Improvement	8	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	6	3.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	5.8%
	Worse	5	4.2%
	Stayed the Same	108	90.0%

PART II

OPINION REVIEW
BY
APPELLATE OPINION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Vlaming v. West Point School Board

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: Opinion is well-crafted and supported by historical references and precedent: however, the only concern is that the author grounded the analysis in both a statutory and constitutional basis which may have ignored the doctrine of constitutional avoidance.

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Vlaming v. West Point School Board
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Vlaming v. West Point School Board

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Model of clarity and the historical references aid greatly in the reader's understanding of the evolution of the law in support of his analysis; one suggestion is whether more of a roadmap would be helpful, i.e. in addition to the roman numerals and letters and numbers, sub-headings might also be helpful.

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Vasquex v. Dotson

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: Well-written and well-reasoned and clear guidance for trial courts

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Vasquex v. Dotson
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Vasquex v. Dotson

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Clear, concise analysis

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Johnson-Bey v. Commonwealth

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: Could have explained the statutory change better

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Johnson-Bey v. Commonwealth
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Johnson-Bey v. Commonwealth

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Very clear and very helpful to the trial court

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Rebh v. County Board of Arlington

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: Useful opinion for trial courts

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Rebh v. County Board of Arlington

(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: Rebh v. County Board of Arlington

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Well-crafted and helpful

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: City of Hampton v. Williamson
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning, as this was a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: City of Hampton v. Williamson

Performance Factor: Fairness	
(For a concurring or dissenting opinion) The opinion is appropriate in tone	Agree

Comments: The dissent appropriately and respectfully discusses the analytical points where the author disagrees with the majority; very fair and collegial.

Evaluation of Justice D. Arthur Kelsey: Opinion Review
Case Name: City of Hampton v. Williamson

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Very good explanation of the author's position.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.

Judge of the Court of Appeals of Virginia

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

2026



I. Program Purpose and Use of This Report

The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Program provides a self-improvement resource for justices and 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. The evaluated judge has 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 methods were written surveys and opinion reviews. The judge was reviewed by three groups: attorneys who appeared before the judge within the past three years, circuit court judges, and an Appellate Opinion Review Committee. The Committee is appointed by the Chief Justice and is comprised of one retired Supreme Court justice, two retired Court of Appeals judges, two retired circuit court judges, and a law professor.

The survey completed by the attorneys contained 15 performance-based factors (or questions) drawn from the Canons of Judicial Conduct related to observable, mostly in-court behaviors, and a 10-question section related to opinion writing. Surveys completed by circuit court judges contained only the opinion writing section.

The Appellate Opinion Review Committee reviewed four opinions written by the evaluated judge within the past three years. The judge selected the opinions, which were required to come from the following categories:

a. One criminal opinion,
b. One civil opinion,
c. One additional opinion, and
d. One concurrence or dissent, if available.

The Committee had the option of reviewing additional opinions at the Committee's discretion. The Committee met in May 2026 and, for each opinion, reported a consensus score and optional narrative for each factor contained on a scoring template provided to the Committee.

III. Report Content

This report has two parts. Part I is organized as follows: Section A shows the collective results of all surveys submitted by attorneys who reviewed the judge's performance. Section B shows the collective results from circuit court judges. Section C contains an aggregate of attorney and circuit court judge results on the survey's opinion section.

For each performance factor on the survey, the report presents the percentage for each category: Every Time, Frequently, Some of the Time, Rarely, or Never. It also reflects the number of responses for each category. Responses of "Not Applicable" are treated as non-responses and are not included in the number of responses or percentage calculation. The number of responses will vary among the performance factors because of non-responses. This report reflects a total of 118 completed surveys for Judge Athey (48 circuit court judge surveys and 70 attorney surveys).

Part II of this report consists of the opinion review results provided by the Appellate Opinion Review Committee. The Committee's consensus is included for each of the opinions the evaluated judge selected for review.

PART I
SECTION A

ATTORNEY SURVEYS

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factors: Oral Argument	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	81.3% 52	14.1% 9	3.1% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.9% 62	8.7% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.3% 51	16.1% 10	0.0% 0	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.6% 51	13.1% 8	0.0% 0	3.3% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.1% 61	10.0% 7	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.9% 58	14.3% 10	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	79.4% 54	14.7% 10	4.4% 3	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.1% 55	13.4% 9	4.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	95.3% 41	4.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.0% 54	8.3% 5	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	82.1% 55	13.4% 9	3.0% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.2% 41	26.9% 18	9.0% 6	0.0% 0	3.0% 2
13. The judge communicates effectively	69.2% 45	24.6% 16	4.6% 3	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
14. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.3% 49	14.8% 9	4.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge asks relevant questions	66.7% 44	22.7% 15	9.1% 6	1.5% 1	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor: Written Opinions	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge writes opinions that exhibit the proper application of judicial precedents	58.0% 29	20.0% 10	18.0% 9	4.0% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge writes opinions that adequately explain the basis of the court's decision	58.8% 30	21.6% 11	17.6% 9	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge writes opinions that provide an applicable standard of review for the case, if any	72.0% 36	20.0% 10	6.0% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge writes opinions that provide clear direction to the lower tribunal or court	69.4% 34	18.4% 9	8.2% 4	4.1% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge writes opinions that clearly set forth any rules of law to be used in future cases	65.3% 32	20.4% 10	10.2% 5	4.1% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge writes opinions that clearly present the facts needed to decide the case before the court	65.3% 32	24.5% 12	8.2% 4	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge writes opinions that accurately summarize the relevant procedural history in the lower tribunal or court	64.6% 31	27.1% 13	6.3% 3	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge writes separate opinions that are appropriate in tone	73.8% 31	16.7% 7	7.1% 3	2.4% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge writes opinions that are clear	60.0% 30	22.0% 11	14.0% 7	4.0% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge writes opinions in which the legal reasoning is easy to follow	58.8% 30	21.6% 11	15.7% 8	3.9% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	42	67.7%
	Good	17	27.4%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2	3.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	20.0%
	Worse	1	3.3%
	Stayed the Same	23	76.7%

PART I
SECTION B

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE SURVEYS

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.:: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor: Written Opinions	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge writes opinions that exhibit the proper application of judicial precedents	64.6% 31	27.1% 13	8.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge writes opinions that adequately explain the basis of the court's decision	64.6% 31	31.3% 15	4.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge writes opinions that provide an applicable standard of review for the case, if any	70.8% 34	22.9% 11	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge writes opinions that provide clear direction to the lower tribunal or court	61.7% 29	27.7% 13	10.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge writes opinions that clearly set forth any rules of law to be used in future cases	61.7% 29	29.8% 14	8.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge writes opinions that clearly present the facts needed to decide the case before the court	77.1% 37	16.7% 8	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge writes opinions that accurately summarize the relevant procedural history in the lower tribunal or court	65.2% 30	28.3% 13	6.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge writes separate opinions that are appropriate in tone	71.4% 25	20.0% 7	8.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge writes opinions that are clear	64.6% 31	27.1% 13	6.3% 3	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge writes opinions in which the legal reasoning is easy to follow	61.7% 29	29.8% 14	8.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	31	66.0%
	Good	13	27.7%
	Needs Improvement	3	6.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	8.5%
	Worse	1	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	42	89.4%

PART I
SECTION C

COMBINED SURVEYS:
ATTORNEYS AND CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge writes opinions that exhibit the proper application of judicial precedents	61.2% 60	23.5% 23	13.3% 13	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge writes opinions that adequately explain the basis of the court's decision	61.6% 61	26.3% 26	11.1% 11	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge writes opinions that provide an applicable standard of review for the case, if any	71.4% 70	21.4% 21	6.1% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge writes opinions that provide clear direction to the lower tribunal or court	65.6% 63	22.9% 22	9.4% 9	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge writes opinions that clearly set forth any rules of law to be used in future cases	63.5% 61	25.0% 24	9.4% 9	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge writes opinions that clearly present the facts needed to decide the case before the court	71.1% 69	20.6% 20	7.2% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge writes opinions that accurately summarize the relevant procedural history in the lower tribunal or court	64.9% 61	27.7% 26	6.4% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge writes separate opinions that are appropriate in tone	72.7% 56	18.2% 14	7.8% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge writes opinions that are clear	62.2% 61	24.5% 24	10.2% 10	3.1% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge writes opinions in which the legal reasoning is easy to follow	60.2% 59	25.5% 25	12.2% 12	2.0% 2	0.0% 0

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	73	67.0%
	Good	30	27.5%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	13.0%
	Worse	2	2.6%
	Stayed the Same	65	84.4%

PART II

OPINION REVIEW
BY
APPELLATE OPINION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: DiLeonardo v. Fanous

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: The analysis may have been a little more convoluted than necessary since the issue was a straightforward procedural default issue, but explained the procedural issues in a somewhat murky area of the law

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: DiLeonardo v. Fanous
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: DiLeonardo v. Fanous

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Easy read and a good opinion for the trial courts.

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Burford v. Commonwealth

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: Good opinion - very useful in helping trial courts differentiate between "technical" and "non-technical" probation violations in determining appropriate sentences.

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Burford v. Commonwealth
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Burford v. Commonwealth

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Tuscarora Marketplace Partners LLC v. First National Bank

Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning	
The opinion adequately explains the basis of the court's decision	Agree
The opinion provides an applicable standard of review for the case	Agree
The opinion clearly sets forth rules of law, if any, to be used in future cases	Agree
The opinion provides clear direction to the trial courts	Agree

Comments: Good discussion of horizontal privity, covenants running with the land and English common law as adopted by the Commonwealth.

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Tuscarora Marketplace Partners LLC v. First National Bank
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Fairness, as this was not a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Tuscarora Marketplace Partners LLC v. First National Bank

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Author may need to be careful about use of footnotes as excessive use breaks up the flow of the opinion making it more difficult for the reader.

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Wallace v. Commonwealth
(No Data reported for Performance Factor: Legal Analysis and Reasoning, as this was a concurring or dissenting opinion)

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Wallace v. Commonwealth

Performance Factor: Fairness	
(For a concurring or dissenting opinion) The opinion is appropriate in tone	Agree

Comments: Appropriate tone and fair dissent in directly addressing the issue

Evaluation of Judge Clifford Lynwood Athey, Jr.: Opinion Review
Case Name: Wallace v. Commonwealth

Performance Factors: Clarity	
The opinion is clear	Agree
The opinion adequately summarizes the relevant facts in the case	Agree
The opinion's legal reasoning is easy to follow	Agree

Comments: Clear and good discussion; easy to apply.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Matthew A. Glassman

Judge of the Circuit Court
5th 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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 104 completed surveys for Judge Matthew A. Glassman for groups other than jurors, and a total of 6 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Matthew A. Glassman: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.09

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	67.3% 70	25.0% 26	6.7% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	74.8% 77	18.5% 19	5.8% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	79.8% 83	16.4% 17	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	82.5% 85	15.5% 16	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	74.5% 76	19.6% 20	4.9% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.0% 81	17.0% 17	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	87.4% 90	12.6% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.0% 78	20.2% 21	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.9% 81	17.3% 18	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	87.5% 63	12.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.6% 89	14.4% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.1% 91	9.9% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	73.3% 63	16.3% 14	9.3% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.9% 61	22.1% 19	7.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	75.3% 64	17.7% 15	7.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.2% 80	16.8% 17	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	80.6% 83	18.5% 19	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Matthew A. Glassman: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.8% 83	17.3% 18	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.2% 82	16.8% 17	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	82.4% 84	15.7% 16	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.8% 83	18.3% 19	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	79	77.5%
	Good	17	16.7%
	Needs Improvement	6	5.9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	17.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	66	82.5%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Matthew A. Glassman: Evaluation Summary

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

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	6	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Matthew A. Glassman
5th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	57	9	0
2021	49	13	0
2022	87	20	0
2023	44	4	0
2024	68	13	0
2025	94	16	0
2026	95	17	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Carson E. Saunders, Jr.

Judge of the Circuit Court
6th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 98 completed surveys for Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr. for groups other than jurors, and a total of 17 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.65

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	87.8% 86	12.2% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.7% 87	10.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.2% 79	14.7% 14	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	81.3% 78	14.6% 14	4.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.6% 85	12.4% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	81.9% 77	17.0% 16	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	83.7% 82	15.3% 15	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.6% 80	15.3% 15	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	81.4% 79	15.5% 15	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	91.4% 64	8.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.6% 77	19.4% 19	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.4% 81	15.6% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	80.3% 61	13.2% 10	6.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	68.8% 53	22.1% 17	7.8% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	75.3% 58	18.2% 14	5.2% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.6% 78	17.4% 17	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	62.1% 59	27.4% 26	6.3% 6	4.2% 4	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.1% 69	21.7% 21	7.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.3% 79	13.5% 13	4.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	72.9% 70	22.9% 22	4.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.9% 62	24.7% 24	8.3% 8	2.1% 2	1.0% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	75	78.1%
	Good	17	17.7%
	Needs Improvement	4	4.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	8.6%
	Worse	2	2.5%
	Stayed the Same	72	88.9%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Carson E. Saunders, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	94.1% 16	5.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	82.4% 14	17.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	76.5% 13	23.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

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

Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

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

ADDENDUM
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA
FY 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Carson E. Saunders, Jr.
6th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	131	24	0
2021	141	20	0
2022	135	28	0
2023	104	19	0
2024	92	16	0
2025	126	23	0
2026	118	15	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Randall G. Johnson, Jr.

Judge of the Circuit Court
14th 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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 Randall G. Johnson, Jr. for groups other than jurors, and a total of 0 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 27.11

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	89.0% 146	9.8% 16	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.6% 151	6.1% 10	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.8% 139	9.3% 15	4.3% 7	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.7% 138	8.7% 14	4.4% 7	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.8% 152	3.7% 6	1.9% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.9% 134	12.2% 19	1.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	90.2% 147	6.8% 11	3.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	85.7% 138	8.1% 13	5.0% 8	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.7% 138	10.4% 17	3.7% 6	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	95.2% 120	4.0% 5	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.3% 147	6.2% 10	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.6% 141	7.1% 11	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.3% 133	9.6% 15	3.9% 6	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.3% 119	16.0% 25	5.1% 8	2.6% 4	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.9% 127	11.0% 17	5.8% 9	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.0% 128	13.8% 22	6.3% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.8% 113	19.2% 29	4.6% 7	1.3% 2	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.0% 128	13.3% 21	5.1% 8	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	88.5% 139	6.4% 10	3.2% 5	1.3% 2	0.6% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	75.8% 119	15.9% 25	6.4% 10	1.3% 2	0.6% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.5% 119	15.4% 25	8.0% 13	2.5% 4	0.6% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	139	85.8%
	Good	13	8.0%
	Needs Improvement	9	5.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.6%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	8.3%
	Worse	1	0.8%
	Stayed the Same	121	91.0%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Randall G. Johnson, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

[No Juror Evaluations were received for Judge Johnson]

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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Randall G. Johnson, Jr.
14th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	147	26	0
2021	128	21	0
2022	170	26	0
2023	148	20	0
2024	159	15	0
2025	139	24	0
2026	163	21	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable William E. Glover

Judge of the Circuit Court
15th 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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 147 completed surveys for Judge William E. Glover for groups other than jurors, and a total of 28 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge William E. Glover: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.61

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	58.5% 86	27.2% 40	13.6% 20	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	70.8% 104	15.0% 22	12.9% 19	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.8% 112	16.7% 24	4.2% 6	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.9% 110	17.5% 25	4.2% 6	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	71.7% 104	13.8% 20	10.3% 15	3.5% 5	0.7% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.6% 121	11.9% 17	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	84.9% 124	11.6% 17	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	65.8% 96	20.6% 30	9.6% 14	3.4% 5	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	67.8% 99	18.5% 27	8.2% 12	4.8% 7	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	91.0% 91	7.0% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	89.7% 130	9.7% 14	0.0% 0	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	91.0% 132	6.9% 10	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	58.1% 72	26.6% 33	12.9% 16	2.4% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.2% 84	19.2% 24	11.2% 14	1.6% 2	0.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	69.6% 87	16.8% 21	9.6% 12	3.2% 4	0.8% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.0% 111	17.1% 25	4.8% 7	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	74.5% 108	17.9% 26	6.2% 9	1.4% 2	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge William E. Glover: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.6% 106	16.0% 23	7.6% 11	2.8% 4	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	69.5% 98	16.3% 23	8.5% 12	4.3% 6	1.4% 2
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	83.1% 118	15.5% 22	0.7% 1	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.5% 119	15.1% 22	2.1% 3	1.4% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	101	69.7%
	Good	25	17.2%
	Needs Improvement	15	10.3%
	Unsatisfactory	4	2.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	18	14.5%
	Worse	10	8.1%
	Stayed the Same	96	77.4%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge William E. Glover: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	92.6% 25	7.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	96.4% 27	3.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	92.9% 26	7.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.0% 22	12.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	92.9% 26	7.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	89.3% 25	10.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	89.3% 25	10.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	96.4% 27	3.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	89.3% 25	10.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	96.3% 26	3.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	92.3% 24	7.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.2% 23	14.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	25	92.6%
	Good	2	7.4%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable William E. Glover
15th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	176	53	0
2021	184	58	0
2022	129	37	0
2023	125	29	0
2024	138	33	0
2025	115	32	0
2026	100	28	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Timothy K. Sanner

Judge of the Circuit Court
16th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 Timothy K. Sanner for groups other than jurors, and a total of 6 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Timothy K. Sanner: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 29.80

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.1% 111	26.4% 43	5.5% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.7% 134	15.9% 26	2.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.9% 144	8.6% 14	1.9% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.5% 140	10.0% 16	1.9% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	82.9% 136	14.6% 24	1.8% 3	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.8% 129	14.9% 23	1.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	89.0% 146	9.8% 16	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.1% 129	14.5% 23	3.8% 6	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.8% 134	11.3% 18	4.4% 7	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	92.7% 114	6.5% 8	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.3% 147	7.5% 12	0.6% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.8% 141	8.9% 14	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.6% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.2% 112	17.7% 26	6.1% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	82.6% 123	12.1% 18	4.0% 6	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	79.6% 117	17.0% 25	2.7% 4	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	71.2% 116	15.3% 25	10.4% 17	3.1% 5	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.3% 122	18.1% 29	5.0% 8	0.6% 1	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Timothy K. Sanner: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.1% 124	16.0% 26	6.8% 11	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.2% 137	10.1% 16	2.5% 4	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	90.0% 144	7.5% 12	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.1% 129	15.3% 25	4.3% 7	1.2% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	133	81.6%
	Good	22	13.5%
	Needs Improvement	6	3.7%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.2%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	3.7%
	Worse	2	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	130	94.9%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Timothy K. Sanner: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	66.7% 4	33.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	83.3% 5	16.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.3% 5	16.7% 1	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% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	66.7% 4	33.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 6	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	66.7% 4	33.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	5	83.3%
	Good	1	16.7%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Timothy K. Sanner
16th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	106	16	0
2021	96	21	0
2022	85	17	0
2023	62	14	0
2024	53	14	0
2025	76	23	0
2026	79	9	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Claude V. Worrell, II

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 177 completed surveys for Judge Claude V. Worrell, II for groups other than jurors, and a total of 28 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Claude V. Worrell, II: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.57

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	59.1% 104	28.4% 50	10.2% 18	2.3% 4	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	69.1% 121	22.3% 39	6.9% 12	1.7% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	60.5% 107	22.0% 39	15.3% 27	2.3% 4	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	61.9% 107	19.1% 33	15.6% 27	3.5% 6	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	66.7% 118	23.7% 42	7.3% 13	2.3% 4	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	75.8% 125	20.6% 34	3.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	61.6% 109	19.2% 34	15.3% 27	3.4% 6	0.6% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	63.1% 111	19.9% 35	13.6% 24	3.4% 6	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	63.6% 110	23.1% 40	11.6% 20	1.7% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	84.3% 107	11.8% 15	3.2% 4	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	77.2% 132	21.6% 37	1.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.5% 131	18.3% 31	4.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	62.4% 103	23.0% 38	10.3% 17	3.0% 5	1.2% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	51.2% 85	28.3% 47	17.5% 29	3.0% 5	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	58.9% 99	20.8% 35	16.7% 28	3.6% 6	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	56.6% 99	25.7% 45	14.9% 26	2.9% 5	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	58.9% 103	28.6% 50	9.7% 17	2.9% 5	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Claude V. Worrell, II: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	56.5% 100	28.3% 50	12.4% 22	2.8% 5	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	67.3% 115	20.5% 35	10.5% 18	1.8% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	69.2% 119	23.3% 40	6.4% 11	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	66.3% 114	23.8% 41	7.6% 13	2.3% 4	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	107	61.9%
	Good	36	20.8%
	Needs Improvement	25	14.5%
	Unsatisfactory	5	2.9%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23	18.1%
	Worse	8	6.3%
	Stayed the Same	96	75.6%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Claude V. Worrell, II: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	100.0% 27	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 27	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 27	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% 24	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	100.0% 27	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	100.0% 27	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 27	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 26	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	85.2% 23	14.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 25	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	69.2% 18	23.1% 6	7.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	77.8% 21	18.5% 5	3.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	27	96.4%
	Good	1	3.6%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Claude V. Worrell
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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	119	26	0
2021	109	32	0
2022	100	10	0
2023	75	18	0
2024	68	21	0
2025	65	18	0
2026	71	15	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Judith L. Wheat

Judge of the Circuit Court
17th 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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 152 completed surveys for Judge Judith L. Wheat for groups other than jurors, and a total of 17 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Judith L. Wheat: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.63

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	61.6% 93	24.5% 37	11.9% 18	0.7% 1	1.3% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	73.0% 111	15.8% 24	9.9% 15	0.0% 0	1.3% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	77.2% 115	16.1% 24	5.4% 8	0.0% 0	1.3% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	75.7% 109	17.4% 25	4.9% 7	0.7% 1	1.4% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.7% 115	10.0% 15	12.0% 18	0.0% 0	1.3% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.4% 108	14.0% 19	6.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	82.9% 126	11.8% 18	4.0% 6	0.0% 0	1.3% 2
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	73.3% 110	13.3% 20	10.7% 16	2.0% 3	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	75.2% 112	10.7% 16	10.7% 16	2.7% 4	0.7% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	91.1% 92	5.9% 6	1.0% 1	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.8% 125	13.3% 20	3.3% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.8% 123	12.4% 18	2.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	68.7% 92	17.9% 24	11.2% 15	1.5% 2	0.8% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	60.5% 81	25.4% 34	10.5% 14	3.0% 4	0.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	68.2% 92	20.0% 27	8.2% 11	2.2% 3	1.5% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	67.8% 101	18.1% 27	11.4% 17	2.0% 3	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	64.6% 93	21.5% 31	9.0% 13	4.2% 6	0.7% 1

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Judith L. Wheat: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.2% 104	17.8% 26	8.9% 13	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.4% 113	15.1% 22	4.8% 7	1.4% 2	1.4% 2
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	66.2% 98	20.3% 30	8.8% 13	3.4% 5	1.4% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	61.2% 90	23.1% 34	10.2% 15	3.4% 5	2.0% 3

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	101	69.7%
	Good	29	20.0%
	Needs Improvement	12	8.3%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.1%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	16.1%
	Worse	8	6.8%
	Stayed the Same	91	77.1%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Judith L. Wheat: Evaluation Summary

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

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

Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

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

ADDENDUM
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA
FY 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Judith L. Wheat
17th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	33	12	0
2021	39	12	0
2022	17	6	0
2023	6	0	0
2024	43	14	0
2025	39	13	0
2026	23	7	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Dontae L. Bugg

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 150 completed surveys for Judge Dontae L. Bugg for groups other than jurors, and a total of 12 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Dontae L. Bugg: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.60

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	75.2% 112	18.1% 27	6.0% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.6% 123	12.8% 19	4.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.2% 120	15.8% 23	1.4% 2	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.1% 117	14.4% 21	4.8% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.4% 119	16.2% 24	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.6% 117	15.7% 22	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	77.6% 114	19.1% 28	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.6% 114	15.2% 22	5.5% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.7% 114	13.3% 19	7.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	94.6% 87	5.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.6% 123	12.0% 17	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.9% 118	17.4% 25	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	78.2% 97	19.4% 24	2.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.4% 85	23.9% 31	10.0% 13	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	72.7% 93	18.0% 23	9.4% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.3% 104	22.3% 33	7.4% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	75.4% 104	15.2% 21	7.3% 10	2.2% 3	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Dontae L. Bugg: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.7% 109	18.8% 27	4.9% 7	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.4% 111	14.5% 20	5.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	79.4% 112	19.9% 28	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.0% 111	21.6% 32	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	105	70.0%
	Good	38	25.3%
	Needs Improvement	7	4.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	19	18.3%
	Worse	1	1.0%
	Stayed the Same	84	80.8%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Dontae L. Bugg: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	91.7% 11	8.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.7% 11	8.3% 1	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% 10	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	100.0% 12	0.0% 0	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	90.9% 10	9.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	91.7% 11	8.3% 1	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Dontaé L Bugg
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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	27	7	0
2021	15	5	0
2022	16	6	0
2023	32	14	0
2024	25	5	0
2025	20	7	0
2026	31	8	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable James P. Fisher

Judge of the Circuit Court
20th 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 168 completed surveys for Judge James P. Fisher for groups other than jurors, and a total of 15 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge James P. Fisher: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.31

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	43.5% 73	30.4% 51	18.5% 31	7.1% 12	0.6% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	50.9% 85	27.5% 46	16.8% 28	4.2% 7	0.6% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	52.8% 86	20.9% 34	17.2% 28	7.4% 12	1.8% 3
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	54.7% 88	21.1% 34	14.3% 23	8.1% 13	1.9% 3
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	51.5% 85	21.2% 35	18.2% 30	7.9% 13	1.2% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	65.2% 101	21.3% 33	8.4% 13	3.2% 5	1.9% 3
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	60.7% 102	23.8% 40	10.1% 17	5.4% 9	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	52.8% 86	18.4% 30	19.0% 31	8.6% 14	1.2% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	55.5% 91	15.2% 25	18.9% 31	8.5% 14	1.8% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	80.0% 68	11.8% 10	7.1% 6	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	76.7% 125	17.8% 29	4.3% 7	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	76.9% 123	15.6% 25	6.3% 10	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	43.9% 61	27.3% 38	18.7% 26	8.6% 12	1.4% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	41.0% 57	30.9% 43	17.3% 24	10.1% 14	0.7% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	46.0% 63	22.6% 31	16.8% 23	13.1% 18	1.5% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	53.4% 87	27.0% 44	12.3% 20	6.8% 11	0.6% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	59.5% 94	31.7% 50	5.7% 9	1.9% 3	1.3% 2

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge James P. Fisher: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	53.7% 87	24.1% 39	17.9% 29	3.7% 6	0.6% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	56.3% 85	17.2% 26	10.6% 16	13.9% 21	2.0% 3
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	53.1% 86	34.6% 56	7.4% 12	3.7% 6	1.2% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	55.4% 92	32.5% 54	9.6% 16	2.4% 4	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	80	48.8%
	Good	35	21.3%
	Needs Improvement	26	15.9%
	Unsatisfactory	23	14.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	23	19.5%
	Worse	11	9.3%
	Stayed the Same	84	71.2%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge James P. Fisher: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 15	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% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
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% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	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	85.7% 12	14.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.0% 12	20.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	15	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable James P. Fisher
20th 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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	66	18	0
2021	18	4	0
2022	36	8	0
2023	22	3	0
2024	36	13	0
2025	58	15	0
2026	31	14	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable James E. Plowman, Jr.

Judge of the Circuit Court
20th 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 166 completed surveys for Judge James E. Plowman, Jr. for groups other than jurors, and a total of 6 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge James E. Plowman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.09

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	60.2% 100	24.7% 41	12.1% 20	2.4% 4	0.6% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	65.2% 107	20.7% 34	11.0% 18	2.4% 4	0.6% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	68.9% 113	17.7% 29	9.8% 16	3.7% 6	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	66.3% 108	21.5% 35	8.0% 13	4.3% 7	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	64.9% 107	17.6% 29	12.1% 20	4.9% 8	0.6% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	70.7% 111	19.8% 31	7.6% 12	1.9% 3	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	70.3% 116	19.4% 32	6.1% 10	4.2% 7	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	65.5% 108	15.2% 25	10.3% 17	7.9% 13	1.2% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	66.7% 110	14.6% 24	10.9% 18	6.1% 10	1.8% 3
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	79.6% 78	14.3% 14	2.0% 2	3.1% 3	1.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.9% 131	16.1% 26	1.9% 3	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.9% 131	13.1% 21	3.8% 6	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	57.7% 79	25.6% 35	11.0% 15	5.1% 7	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	55.2% 74	22.4% 30	16.4% 22	5.2% 7	0.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	57.0% 77	20.7% 28	13.3% 18	6.7% 9	2.2% 3
16. The judge communicates effectively	64.0% 105	23.8% 39	8.5% 14	3.7% 6	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	67.7% 109	24.8% 40	5.6% 9	1.9% 3	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge James E. Plowman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	63.2% 103	23.3% 38	9.8% 16	3.1% 5	0.6% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	67.3% 111	13.9% 23	10.9% 18	5.5% 9	2.4% 4
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	65.4% 106	28.4% 46	4.9% 8	1.2% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	65.5% 108	27.3% 45	6.1% 10	1.2% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	101	62.4%
	Good	36	22.2%
	Needs Improvement	14	8.6%
	Unsatisfactory	11	6.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	31	22.5%
	Worse	10	7.3%
	Stayed the Same	97	70.3%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge James E. Plowman, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

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

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	6	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable James E. Plowman
20th 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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	15	4	0
2021	55	8	0
2022	52	12	0
2023	53	18	0
2024	61	21	0
2025	66	21	0
2026	33	4	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Marcus A. Brinks

Judge of the Circuit Court
21st 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 65 completed surveys for Judge Marcus A. Brinks for groups other than jurors, and a total of 18 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Marcus A. Brinks: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.90

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	78.5% 51	21.5% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	87.7% 57	12.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	81.3% 52	18.8% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.0% 52	20.0% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.4% 54	15.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.6% 51	13.1% 8	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	92.3% 60	6.2% 4	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.8% 53	17.2% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.8% 53	17.2% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	94.0% 47	6.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.2% 56	10.8% 7	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	88.1% 52	6.8% 4	5.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	87.0% 47	13.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	69.1% 38	27.3% 15	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	81.5% 44	16.7% 9	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	70.8% 46	26.2% 17	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.7% 47	17.0% 10	3.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Marcus A. Brinks: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.0% 46	23.8% 15	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	84.4% 54	15.6% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	89.1% 57	9.4% 6	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.4% 50	17.5% 11	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	78.1%
	Good	12	18.8%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	13.5%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	45	86.5%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Marcus A. Brinks: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	94.4% 17	5.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.4% 17	5.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.4% 17	5.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	94.4% 17	5.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.4% 17	5.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	94.4% 17	5.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	100.0% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	100.0% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	100.0% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	88.9% 16	11.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.3% 15	16.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	16	88.9%
	Good	2	11.1%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Marcus A. Brinks, Jr.
21th 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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	74	5	0
2021	117	25	0
2022	93	17	0
2023	67	5	0
2024	48	6	0
2025	45	3	0
2026	63	4	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable James F. Watson

Judge of the Circuit Court
24th 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 James F. Watson for groups other than jurors, and a total of 35 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge James F. Watson: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.35

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	84.1% 95	14.2% 16	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.9% 100	8.2% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.3% 102	8.0% 9	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.3% 100	8.0% 9	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.6% 99	10.6% 12	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	87.0% 94	11.1% 12	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	91.1% 102	8.0% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.8% 95	8.9% 10	3.6% 4	2.7% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.7% 94	9.0% 10	3.6% 4	2.7% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	94.1% 80	4.7% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.2% 101	8.9% 10	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.8% 99	9.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.0% 75	16.8% 16	4.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	76.6% 72	18.1% 17	4.3% 4	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	76.3% 71	16.1% 15	6.5% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.7% 94	14.4% 16	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.7% 85	17.6% 19	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge James F. Watson: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	83.8% 93	14.4% 16	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.4% 95	7.3% 8	4.6% 5	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	81.1% 90	18.0% 20	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	83.2% 94	14.2% 16	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	97	86.6%
	Good	11	9.8%
	Needs Improvement	4	3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	20.4%
	Worse	4	4.1%
	Stayed the Same	74	75.5%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge James F. Watson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.6% 31	11.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.3% 33	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.3% 33	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	91.2% 31	8.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.3% 33	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	94.3% 33	5.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	91.4% 32	8.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	97.1% 33	2.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	88.6% 31	11.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	93.6% 29	6.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	91.2% 31	5.9% 2	2.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	85.3% 29	11.8% 4	2.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	34	97.1%
	Good	1	2.9%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable James F. Watson
24th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	126	27	0
2021	177	13	0
2022	236	35	0
2023	181	8	0
2024	227	14	0
2025	221	27	0
2026	237	33	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Frank Patrick Yeatts

Judge of the Circuit Court
24th 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 109 completed surveys for Judge Frank Patrick Yeatts for groups other than jurors, and a total of 32 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Frank Patrick Yeatts: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.08

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	63.3% 69	25.7% 28	9.2% 10	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	70.4% 76	21.3% 23	6.5% 7	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.3% 81	16.5% 18	8.3% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	70.4% 76	22.2% 24	6.5% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	72.5% 79	9.2% 10	15.6% 17	2.8% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	77.6% 83	16.8% 18	4.7% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	76.9% 83	16.7% 18	5.6% 6	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	74.3% 81	11.0% 12	8.3% 9	6.4% 7	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	74.3% 81	8.3% 9	11.0% 12	6.4% 7	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	78.2% 68	17.2% 15	3.5% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.3% 93	12.8% 14	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.3% 91	14.8% 16	0.0% 0	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	71.9% 69	16.7% 16	11.5% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.5% 67	16.8% 16	10.5% 10	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	74.7% 71	11.6% 11	11.6% 11	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.9% 83	17.6% 19	4.6% 5	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.2% 74	22.4% 24	8.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Frank Patrick Yeatts: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.1% 75	20.2% 21	7.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.4% 82	7.6% 8	10.4% 11	4.7% 5	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	59.3% 64	19.4% 21	12.0% 13	8.3% 9	0.9% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.4% 80	21.1% 23	3.7% 4	1.8% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	82	76.6%
	Good	14	13.1%
	Needs Improvement	8	7.5%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.8%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	10.6%
	Worse	7	7.5%
	Stayed the Same	77	81.9%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Frank Patrick Yeatts: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	87.5% 28	9.4% 3	3.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.6% 29	9.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.5% 28	12.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	90.0% 27	10.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.5% 28	9.4% 3	3.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.5% 28	12.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.5% 28	12.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.6% 29	6.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	93.8% 30	6.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	90.6% 29	6.3% 2	3.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	81.3% 26	15.6% 5	3.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	84.4% 27	12.5% 4	3.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	31	96.9%
	Good	1	3.1%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable F. Patrick Yeatts
24th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	133	24	0
2021	131	19	0
2022	112	19	0
2023	71	12	0
2024	108	18	0
2025	133	20	0
2026	101	10	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Paul A. Dryer

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 Paul A. Dryer for groups other than jurors, and a total of 15 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Dryer: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.47

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	77.8% 77	18.2% 18	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	86.7% 85	12.2% 12	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	90.9% 90	8.1% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	91.8% 90	6.1% 6	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.9% 86	12.1% 12	0.0% 0	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.7% 78	14.3% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	92.9% 92	7.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	84.7% 83	12.2% 12	3.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.7% 83	12.2% 12	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	95.7% 67	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	92.6% 88	7.4% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.3% 84	9.7% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.9% 67	19.8% 17	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.1% 74	12.6% 11	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	88.6% 78	8.0% 7	3.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.7% 85	12.2% 12	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	86.3% 82	12.6% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Dryer: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.7% 83	15.3% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.2% 81	9.6% 9	3.2% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	92.9% 91	6.1% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	88.7% 86	11.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	83	85.6%
	Good	12	12.4%
	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	11	14.9%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	63	85.1%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Paul A. Dryer: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	73.3% 11	26.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	100.0% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.7% 12	14.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
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% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	93.3% 14	6.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.7% 13	13.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	80.0% 12	20.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	100.0% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	80.0% 12	13.3% 2	6.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	71.4% 10	14.3% 2	14.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	15	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Paul A. Dryer
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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	240	43	0
2021	185	29	0
2022	231	30	0
2023	188	26	0
2024	163	22	0
2025	103	17	0
2026	114	12	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Edward K. Stein

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 91 completed surveys for Judge Edward K. Stein for groups other than jurors, and a total of 0 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Edward K. Stein: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.17

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	50.6% 46	28.6% 26	16.5% 15	4.4% 4	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	64.4% 58	18.9% 17	13.3% 12	3.3% 3	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	64.8% 59	23.1% 21	8.8% 8	2.2% 2	1.1% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	66.3% 59	20.2% 18	10.1% 9	2.3% 2	1.1% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	63.3% 57	18.9% 17	11.1% 10	4.4% 4	2.2% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	68.7% 57	24.1% 20	7.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	67.0% 61	25.3% 23	4.4% 4	2.2% 2	1.1% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	60.7% 54	27.0% 24	6.7% 6	4.5% 4	1.1% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	61.8% 55	22.5% 20	11.2% 10	3.4% 3	1.1% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	76.1% 51	14.9% 10	3.0% 2	4.5% 3	1.5% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.2% 68	20.7% 18	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	73.9% 65	20.5% 18	5.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	55.8% 43	27.3% 21	9.1% 7	5.2% 4	2.6% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	61.0% 47	32.5% 25	3.9% 3	0.0% 0	2.6% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	62.3% 48	27.3% 21	6.5% 5	1.3% 1	2.6% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	57.1% 52	26.4% 24	15.4% 14	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	70.8% 63	25.8% 23	3.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Edward K. Stein: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	63.3% 57	28.9% 26	6.7% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	65.6% 59	20.0% 18	10.0% 9	2.2% 2	2.2% 2
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	77.5% 69	19.1% 17	3.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	73.3% 66	23.3% 21	1.1% 1	2.2% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	56	62.2%
	Good	20	22.2%
	Needs Improvement	9	10.0%
	Unsatisfactory	5	5.6%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	15.7%
	Worse	5	7.1%
	Stayed the Same	54	77.1%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Edward K. Stein: Evaluation Summary

[No Juror Evaluations were received for Judge Edward K. Stein]

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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Edward K. Stein
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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	274	39	0
2021	225	44	0
2022	167	35	0
2023	164	52	0
2024	146	41	0
2025	162	55	0
2026	111	37	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Brett L. Geisler

Judge of the Circuit Court
27th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 94 completed surveys for Judge Brett L. Geisler for groups other than jurors, and a total of 22 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Brett L. Geisler: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 26.74

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	73.4% 69	26.6% 25	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.4% 85	9.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.2% 82	10.8% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.1% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.0% 78	16.0% 15	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.4% 85	9.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.3% 75	13.5% 12	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	87.0% 80	13.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	79.8% 75	19.2% 18	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	84.0% 79	13.8% 13	2.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	89.6% 69	9.1% 7	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.3% 84	8.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	85.7% 78	14.3% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.0% 68	15.0% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.3% 64	21.2% 18	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	82.4% 70	16.5% 14	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.2% 71	21.7% 20	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	70.2% 66	23.4% 22	6.4% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Brett L. Geisler: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	77.7% 73	21.3% 20	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	85.0% 79	14.0% 13	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	74.5% 70	24.5% 23	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	80.9% 76	18.1% 17	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	79	85.9%
	Good	12	13.0%
	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	9	11.0%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	73	89.0%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Brett L. Geisler: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.0% 17	10.0% 2	5.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	86.4% 19	13.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	95.2% 20	4.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge convenes court without undue delay	86.4% 19	13.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	90.9% 20	9.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	20	95.2%
	Good	1	4.8%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Brett L. Geisler
27th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	218	19	0
2021	190	19	0
2022	161	14	0
2023	194	17	0
2024	195	8	0
2025	159	9	0
2026	166	12	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable John C. Kilgore

Judge of the Circuit Court
30th Judicial Circuit

Submitted to:

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 85 completed surveys for Judge John C. Kilgore for groups other than jurors, and a total of 0 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge John C. Kilgore: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.93

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	91.8% 78	3.5% 3	4.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.9% 78	4.8% 4	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.5% 71	7.2% 6	6.0% 5	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.5% 71	8.2% 7	8.2% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.1% 79	3.6% 3	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.7% 67	18.1% 15	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	84.7% 72	8.2% 7	7.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.0% 73	8.4% 7	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.1% 74	9.4% 8	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	88.9% 56	4.8% 3	4.8% 3	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.1% 74	8.3% 7	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.7% 72	12.9% 11	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	85.9% 61	9.9% 7	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.9% 61	9.9% 7	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	84.7% 61	11.1% 8	4.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	89.3% 75	8.3% 7	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.1% 69	11.9% 10	4.8% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge John C. Kilgore: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	88.2% 75	9.4% 8	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.9% 73	9.5% 8	3.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	60.7% 51	21.4% 18	15.5% 13	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.3% 64	18.8% 16	5.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	67	81.7%
	Good	13	15.9%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	8.8%
	Worse	2	2.5%
	Stayed the Same	71	88.8%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge John C. Kilgore: Evaluation Summary

[No Juror Evaluations were received for Judge John C. Kilgore]

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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable John C. Kilgore
30th Circuit

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

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	173	36	0
2021	155	38	0
2022	146	38	0
2023	130	30	0
2024	145	21	0
2025	180	30	0
2026	145	15	0

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Angela Lemmon Horan

Judge of the Circuit Court
31st 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 September 12, 2025, and March 12, 2026, 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 148 completed surveys for Judge Angela Lemmon Horan for groups other than jurors, and a total of 16 completed juror surveys.

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk Evaluation of Judge Angela Lemmon Horan: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.48

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	77.7% 115	18.2% 27	3.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.9% 124	12.3% 18	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.4% 124	10.2% 15	4.1% 6	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.0% 122	10.2% 15	4.1% 6	2.7% 4	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.0% 127	10.3% 15	2.1% 3	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.3% 120	11.1% 16	3.5% 5	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceeding	89.9% 133	7.4% 11	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.7% 109	13.9% 20	6.3% 9	4.2% 6	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.3% 112	9.1% 13	8.4% 12	4.2% 6	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	92.3% 84	7.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.1% 120	12.2% 18	5.4% 8	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.6% 122	13.0% 19	2.1% 3	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	76.7% 92	17.5% 21	4.2% 5	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	69.4% 84	18.2% 22	9.1% 11	3.3% 4	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law	72.1% 88	17.2% 21	6.6% 8	4.1% 5	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	77.0% 114	15.5% 23	5.4% 8	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.5% 98	14.9% 21	11.4% 16	3.6% 5	0.7% 1

PART A: Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter,
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter and Courtroom Clerk
Evaluation of Judge Angela Lemmon Horan: Evaluation Summary

18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.3% 102	18.2% 26	7.7% 11	2.8% 4	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.6% 110	10.7% 15	6.4% 9	4.3% 6	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	75.2% 109	18.6% 27	5.5% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	66.0% 97	15.7% 23	12.9% 19	4.1% 6	1.4% 2

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	111	76.0%
	Good	19	13.0%
	Needs Improvement	14	9.6%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.4%
In general, over the last three years, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15	13.2%
	Worse	4	3.5%
	Stayed the Same	95	83.3%

PART B: Juror Evaluation of Judge Angela Lemmon Horan: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	87.5% 14	12.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	93.3% 14	6.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.5% 14	12.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge communicates effectively	87.5% 14	12.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	93.3% 14	6.7% 1	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	93.8% 15	6.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	15	93.8%
	Good	1	6.3%
	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 2020 – FY 2026

The Honorable Angela L. Horan
31th 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".

Guidelines Received

Fiscal Year	Total Guidelines Received	Departure Reason Required	Missing Departure Reason
2020	49	7	0
2021	36	8	0
2022	44	11	0
2023	25	9	0
2024	37	4	0
2025	62	13	0
2026	40	8	0

* FY 2026 may not be complete for courts submitting handwritten Guidelines or not using the automated Guidelines application (SWIFT).

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Tanya L. Lomax

Judge of the General District Court
1st Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 139 completed surveys for Judge Tanya L. Lomax.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Tanya L. Lomax: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 19.44

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	19.0% 26	23.4% 32	32.1% 44	18.3% 25	7.3% 10
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	18.8% 26	18.8% 26	32.6% 45	18.8% 26	10.9% 15
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	25.4% 34	22.4% 30	29.1% 39	16.4% 22	6.7% 9
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	27.8% 37	25.6% 34	29.3% 39	11.3% 15	6.0% 8
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	26.5% 36	19.9% 27	22.1% 30	19.9% 27	11.8% 16
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	39.7% 52	33.6% 44	19.1% 25	3.8% 5	3.8% 5
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	41.0% 57	29.5% 41	19.4% 27	6.5% 9	3.6% 5
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	25.4% 35	18.1% 25	29.0% 40	18.8% 26	8.7% 12
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	27.2% 37	18.4% 25	29.4% 40	16.2% 22	8.8% 12
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	69.1% 58	21.4% 18	7.1% 6	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	51.1% 68	33.8% 45	12.0% 16	1.5% 2	1.5% 2
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	56.5% 74	29.0% 38	13.7% 18	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	25.4% 33	19.2% 25	30.0% 39	20.8% 27	4.6% 6
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	20.6% 27	18.3% 24	32.8% 43	17.6% 23	10.7% 14
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	25.2% 33	13.0% 17	32.1% 42	20.6% 27	9.2% 12
16. The judge communicates effectively	23.0% 32	20.1% 28	27.3% 38	18.7% 26	10.8% 15
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	45.9% 62	31.1% 42	18.5% 25	3.7% 5	0.7% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Tanya L. Lomax: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	31.6% 43	27.9% 38	25.0% 34	11.0% 15	4.4% 6
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	31.0% 39	19.1% 24	20.6% 26	21.4% 27	7.9% 10
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	53.3% 72	31.9% 43	12.6% 17	2.2% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	33.1% 45	31.6% 43	21.3% 29	10.3% 14	3.7% 5

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	23	16.7%
	Good	30	21.7%
	Needs Improvement	35	25.4%
	Unsatisfactory	50	36.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	4.0%
	Worse	26	21.0%
	Stayed the Same	93	75.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Vivian F. Henderson

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Vivian F. Henderson.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Vivian F. Henderson: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.17

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	50.7% 37	32.9% 24	16.4% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	62.2% 46	23.0% 17	13.5% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	54.9% 39	16.9% 12	19.7% 14	8.5% 6	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	56.3% 40	15.5% 11	18.3% 13	9.9% 7	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	62.2% 46	16.2% 12	18.9% 14	2.7% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	69.0% 49	19.7% 14	9.9% 7	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	64.8% 46	14.1% 10	19.7% 14	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	49.3% 36	20.6% 15	17.8% 13	11.0% 8	1.4% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	53.5% 38	14.1% 10	19.7% 14	11.3% 8	1.4% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	69.8% 37	22.6% 12	5.7% 3	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	69.4% 50	20.8% 15	8.3% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	75.3% 55	17.8% 13	5.5% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	48.5% 32	19.7% 13	25.8% 17	6.1% 4	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	35.3% 24	22.1% 15	22.1% 15	17.7% 12	2.9% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	37.3% 25	22.4% 15	22.4% 15	16.4% 11	1.5% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	50.7% 37	16.4% 12	21.9% 16	9.6% 7	1.4% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	67.1% 49	16.4% 12	12.3% 9	4.1% 3	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Vivian F. Henderson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	48.7% 36	25.7% 19	18.9% 14	6.8% 5	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	51.4% 37	15.3% 11	23.6% 17	6.9% 5	2.8% 2
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	56.9% 41	19.4% 14	15.3% 11	6.9% 5	1.4% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	47.2% 34	19.4% 14	19.4% 14	8.3% 6	5.6% 4

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	28	37.8%
	Good	17	23.0%
	Needs Improvement	19	25.7%
	Unsatisfactory	10	13.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	8.6%
	Worse	6	10.3%
	Stayed the Same	47	81.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Tameeka M. Williams

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 82 completed surveys for Judge Tameeka M. Williams.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Tameeka M. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 19.35

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	52.4% 43	30.5% 25	14.6% 12	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	58.0% 47	29.6% 24	11.1% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	59.8% 49	29.3% 24	9.8% 8	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	62.2% 51	23.2% 19	12.2% 10	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	63.4% 52	25.6% 21	7.3% 6	3.7% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.8% 59	22.5% 18	2.5% 2	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	72.5% 58	16.3% 13	10.0% 8	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	56.8% 46	29.6% 24	7.4% 6	4.9% 4	1.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	57.3% 47	29.3% 24	8.5% 7	3.7% 3	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	87.9% 58	10.6% 7	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	76.5% 62	19.8% 16	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.5% 62	17.5% 14	3.8% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	55.8% 43	26.0% 20	15.6% 12	2.6% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	51.3% 40	30.8% 24	6.4% 5	10.3% 8	1.3% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	57.7% 45	23.1% 18	10.3% 8	7.7% 6	1.3% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	62.2% 51	28.1% 23	7.3% 6	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.5% 62	20.3% 16	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Tameeka M. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	69.5% 57	22.0% 18	6.1% 5	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	61.0% 50	24.4% 20	9.8% 8	3.7% 3	1.2% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	71.6% 58	24.7% 20	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	65.9% 54	28.1% 23	3.7% 3	1.2% 1	1.2% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	44	54.3%
	Good	23	28.4%
	Needs Improvement	8	9.9%
	Unsatisfactory	6	7.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	14.1%
	Worse	4	5.1%
	Stayed the Same	63	80.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Charisse M. Mullen

Judge of the General District Court
7th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 101 completed surveys for Judge Charisse M. Mullen.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Charisse M. Mullen: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.06

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	45.5% 46	39.6% 40	11.9% 12	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	52.5% 53	30.7% 31	13.9% 14	1.0% 1	2.0% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	49.0% 49	32.0% 32	17.0% 17	0.0% 0	2.0% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	47.0% 47	30.0% 30	19.0% 19	1.0% 1	3.0% 3
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	57.6% 57	22.2% 22	18.2% 18	0.0% 0	2.0% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	64.7% 64	28.3% 28	5.1% 5	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	59.0% 59	26.0% 26	13.0% 13	0.0% 0	2.0% 2
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	49.5% 50	24.8% 25	18.8% 19	5.0% 5	2.0% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	53.5% 54	22.8% 23	18.8% 19	3.0% 3	2.0% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	74.0% 57	23.4% 18	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	64.7% 64	27.3% 27	6.1% 6	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	69.0% 69	26.0% 26	4.0% 4	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	45.1% 41	26.4% 24	23.1% 21	3.3% 3	2.2% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	34.1% 31	25.3% 23	30.8% 28	7.7% 7	2.2% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	42.9% 39	22.0% 20	28.6% 26	4.4% 4	2.2% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	51.5% 52	24.8% 25	19.8% 20	2.0% 2	2.0% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	62.6% 62	24.2% 24	9.1% 9	2.0% 2	2.0% 2

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Charisse M. Mullen: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	53.5% 53	21.2% 21	22.2% 22	1.0% 1	2.0% 2
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	56.1% 55	21.4% 21	17.4% 17	2.0% 2	3.1% 3
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	62.6% 62	25.3% 25	9.1% 9	1.0% 1	2.0% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	49.0% 49	26.0% 26	16.0% 16	5.0% 5	4.0% 4

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	38	38.4%
	Good	27	27.3%
	Needs Improvement	28	28.3%
	Unsatisfactory	6	6.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	12.6%
	Worse	4	4.6%
	Stayed the Same	72	82.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael S. Stein

Judge of the General District Court
7th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 83 completed surveys for Judge Michael S. Stein.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Michael S. Stein: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 27.25

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	78.3% 65	15.7% 13	2.4% 2	2.4% 2	1.2% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	82.9% 68	14.6% 12	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.7% 71	9.9% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	89.9% 71	7.6% 6	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	86.6% 71	9.8% 8	1.2% 1	1.2% 1	1.2% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	89.2% 74	8.4% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	95.1% 78	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	90.4% 75	6.0% 5	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	89.0% 73	8.5% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	93.0% 66	4.2% 3	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.5% 75	6.1% 5	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.7% 76	4.9% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.6% 62	13.2% 10	2.6% 2	1.3% 1	1.3% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	80.5% 62	16.9% 13	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	89.6% 69	6.5% 5	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	91.4% 74	6.2% 5	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	93.8% 76	3.7% 3	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Michael S. Stein: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.5% 71	10.8% 9	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	91.5% 75	4.9% 4	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	87.7% 71	9.9% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.8% 72	9.8% 8	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	1.2% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	71	87.7%
	Good	7	8.6%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.5%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	12.0%
	Worse	1	1.3%
	Stayed the Same	65	86.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable David M. Hicks

Judge of the General District Court
13th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 115 completed surveys for Judge David M. Hicks.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge David M. Hicks: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.87

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	74.8% 86	15.7% 18	7.8% 9	0.0% 0	1.7% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	76.5% 88	11.3% 13	7.8% 9	2.6% 3	1.7% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	74.8% 86	12.2% 14	6.1% 7	4.4% 5	2.6% 3
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	71.3% 82	14.8% 17	9.6% 11	0.9% 1	3.5% 4
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	75.4% 86	9.7% 11	9.7% 11	4.4% 5	0.9% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.4% 87	12.6% 14	6.3% 7	1.8% 2	0.9% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	80.0% 92	13.0% 15	6.1% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	71.9% 82	8.8% 10	8.8% 10	7.0% 8	3.5% 4
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	72.2% 83	8.7% 10	8.7% 10	7.0% 8	3.5% 4
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	80.4% 74	9.8% 9	6.5% 6	3.3% 3	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.3% 90	17.4% 20	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	1.7% 2
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.7% 92	11.4% 13	5.3% 6	0.9% 1	1.8% 2
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	74.3% 81	12.8% 14	5.5% 6	5.5% 6	1.8% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.6% 77	15.6% 17	8.3% 9	3.7% 4	1.8% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	71.6% 78	9.2% 10	8.3% 9	5.5% 6	5.5% 6
16. The judge communicates effectively	75.7% 87	13.0% 15	8.7% 10	0.9% 1	1.7% 2
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	75.4% 86	21.1% 24	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.9% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of David M. Hicks: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	72.2% 83	15.7% 18	8.7% 10	1.7% 2	1.7% 2
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.2% 80	11.4% 13	8.8% 10	4.4% 5	5.3% 6
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	73.0% 84	24.4% 28	0.9% 1	1.7% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	70.4% 81	16.5% 19	9.6% 11	1.7% 2	1.7% 2

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	83	73.5%
	Good	9	8.0%
	Needs Improvement	13	11.5%
	Unsatisfactory	8	7.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	9.3%
	Worse	11	10.2%
	Stayed the Same	87	80.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Mansi J. Shah

Judge of the General District Court
13th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 148 completed surveys for Judge Mansi J. Shah.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Mansi J. Shah: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.34

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	62.2% 92	25.7% 38	9.5% 14	2.0% 3	0.7% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	74.8% 110	16.3% 24	7.5% 11	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	71.7% 104	14.5% 21	10.3% 15	2.1% 3	1.4% 2
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	68.8% 99	17.4% 25	11.1% 16	1.4% 2	1.4% 2
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	71.6% 106	18.9% 28	5.4% 8	3.4% 5	0.7% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	69.9% 100	23.8% 34	4.2% 6	1.4% 2	0.7% 1
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	77.7% 115	16.2% 24	5.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.7% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	66.7% 98	18.4% 27	10.2% 15	3.4% 5	1.4% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	66.7% 98	17.7% 26	8.8% 13	5.4% 8	1.4% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	83.3% 90	10.2% 11	4.6% 5	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	70.3% 104	23.0% 34	5.4% 8	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	74.8% 107	19.6% 28	4.2% 6	0.7% 1	0.7% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	67.4% 95	20.6% 29	8.5% 12	2.8% 4	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	57.8% 82	20.4% 29	14.8% 21	5.6% 8	1.4% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	61.4% 86	17.9% 25	12.9% 18	5.7% 8	2.1% 3
16. The judge communicates effectively	65.3% 96	20.4% 30	9.5% 14	2.7% 4	2.0% 3
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	66.7% 98	15.0% 22	14.3% 21	2.0% 3	2.0% 3

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Mansi J. Shah: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	65.5% 97	18.9% 28	12.2% 18	2.7% 4	0.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	69.7% 99	15.5% 22	9.2% 13	3.5% 5	2.1% 3
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	60.6% 86	26.8% 38	8.5% 12	2.8% 4	1.4% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	58.2% 85	21.9% 32	11.6% 17	5.5% 8	2.7% 4

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	93	64.1%
	Good	28	19.3%
	Needs Improvement	17	11.7%
	Unsatisfactory	7	4.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	17	13.7%
	Worse	4	3.2%
	Stayed the Same	103	83.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Bryan Craig Dunkum

Judge of the General District Court
14th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 61 completed surveys for Judge Bryan Craig Dunkum.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Bryan Craig Dunkum: 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	30.0% 18	36.7% 22	21.7% 13	11.7% 7	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	41.0% 25	34.4% 21	18.0% 11	6.6% 4	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	65.6% 40	26.2% 16	8.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	72.4% 42	20.7% 12	6.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	45.9% 28	27.9% 17	19.7% 12	6.6% 4	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	74.6% 44	20.3% 12	3.4% 2	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	76.7% 46	18.3% 11	5.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	57.4% 35	32.8% 20	8.2% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	60.0% 36	28.3% 17	10.0% 6	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	80.0% 36	17.8% 8	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.6% 51	13.1% 8	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.3% 49	14.8% 9	4.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	54.4% 31	28.1% 16	14.0% 8	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	75.9% 44	15.5% 9	6.9% 4	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	67.2% 39	24.1% 14	5.2% 3	3.5% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	59.3% 35	25.4% 15	11.9% 7	3.4% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.7% 48	18.0% 11	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Bryan Craig Dunkum: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.8% 45	23.0% 14	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	66.1% 39	22.0% 13	10.2% 6	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	78.3% 47	15.0% 9	5.0% 3	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.3% 41	23.3% 14	5.0% 3	3.3% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29	49.2%
	Good	21	35.6%
	Needs Improvement	8	13.6%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	2	4.3%
	Worse	4	8.5%
	Stayed the Same	41	87.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable John K. Honey, Jr.

Judge of the General District Court
14th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 82 completed surveys for Judge John K. Honey, Jr.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge John K. Honey, Jr.: 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	65.9% 54	30.5% 25	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	71.3% 57	26.3% 21	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.3% 61	22.2% 18	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	73.8% 59	23.8% 19	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	73.2% 60	20.7% 17	6.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	77.8% 63	21.0% 17	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	73.2% 60	25.6% 21	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	68.3% 56	28.1% 23	3.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	68.8% 55	23.8% 19	7.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	83.6% 46	16.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.7% 67	15.9% 13	2.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	80.3% 65	18.5% 15	1.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.3% 52	26.7% 20	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.5% 47	28.4% 21	8.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	67.6% 50	25.7% 19	6.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	64.6% 53	28.1% 23	7.3% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	77.5% 62	21.3% 17	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of John K. Honey, Jr.: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.6% 58	22.2% 18	6.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	70.5% 55	24.4% 19	5.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	69.6% 55	26.6% 21	3.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.8% 55	25.0% 20	5.0% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	56	70.0%
	Good	24	30.0%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	4.2%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	69	95.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Gary H. Moliken

Judge of the General District Court
19th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 147 completed surveys for Judge Gary H. Moliken.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Gary H. Moliken: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.14

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	51.7% 76	23.1% 34	21.1% 31	4.1% 6	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	56.6% 82	26.2% 38	12.4% 18	2.8% 4	2.1% 3
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	64.6% 93	20.8% 30	9.7% 14	4.9% 7	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	65.3% 94	19.4% 28	11.1% 16	3.5% 5	0.7% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	58.5% 86	21.1% 31	14.3% 21	4.8% 7	1.4% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	63.6% 84	23.5% 31	12.1% 16	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	69.7% 101	18.6% 27	11.0% 16	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	59.4% 85	18.9% 27	12.6% 18	8.4% 12	0.7% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	62.5% 90	16.0% 23	13.2% 19	8.3% 12	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	76.0% 73	14.6% 14	8.3% 8	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	75.3% 110	20.6% 30	4.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	76.1% 108	16.9% 24	7.0% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	56.1% 78	21.6% 30	13.7% 19	7.9% 11	0.7% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	57.8% 82	19.0% 27	14.8% 21	7.0% 10	1.4% 2
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	57.6% 80	17.3% 24	14.4% 20	10.1% 14	0.7% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	57.2% 83	26.2% 38	12.4% 18	3.5% 5	0.7% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	71.3% 102	25.2% 36	3.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Gary H. Moliken: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	70.3% 102	19.3% 28	9.0% 13	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	61.3% 84	20.4% 28	11.7% 16	5.8% 8	0.7% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	66.4% 93	25.7% 36	7.1% 10	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	66.7% 98	18.4% 27	11.6% 17	2.7% 4	0.7% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	75	51.7%
	Good	39	26.9%
	Needs Improvement	23	15.9%
	Unsatisfactory	8	5.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15	11.5%
	Worse	8	6.2%
	Stayed the Same	107	82.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jessica H. Foster

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 106 completed surveys for Judge Jessica H. Foster.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Jessica H. Foster: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.30

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	78.3% 83	19.8% 21	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.6% 96	7.6% 8	0.9% 1	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.7% 94	10.4% 11	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	87.6% 92	11.4% 12	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	93.3% 98	4.8% 5	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	88.1% 89	9.9% 10	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.3% 99	4.8% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	82.9% 87	13.3% 14	1.9% 2	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	83.0% 88	13.2% 14	2.8% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	93.2% 68	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	93.4% 99	6.6% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.2% 95	7.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.7% 82	14.3% 14	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	73.5% 72	22.5% 22	4.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	79.2% 76	14.6% 14	5.2% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	90.6% 96	7.6% 8	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	98.1% 104	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Jessica H. Foster: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	92.4% 97	6.7% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	86.4% 89	8.7% 9	2.9% 3	1.9% 2	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	90.3% 93	9.7% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	87.6% 92	10.5% 11	1.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	87	82.1%
	Good	15	14.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	2.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	24	25.8%
	Worse	1	1.1%
	Stayed the Same	68	73.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi

Judge of the General 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 93 completed surveys for Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.23

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	96.8% 90	3.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	97.9% 91	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	95.7% 88	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.5% 86	7.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	97.9% 91	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	93.3% 84	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	94.6% 87	5.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.0% 81	10.9% 10	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	90.2% 83	8.7% 8	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	98.5% 66	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	91.2% 83	8.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	94.4% 85	5.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	88.3% 68	9.1% 7	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.6% 66	11.5% 9	3.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	87.0% 67	11.7% 9	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	85.9% 79	13.0% 12	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	84.3% 75	14.6% 13	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Jacqueline F. Ward Talevi: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.7% 78	12.1% 11	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	91.3% 84	8.7% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	84.6% 77	14.3% 13	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.3% 74	15.4% 14	3.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	86	93.5%
	Good	4	4.4%
	Needs Improvement	2	2.2%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	6.0%
	Worse	1	1.2%
	Stayed the Same	78	92.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stephanie S. Maddox

Judge of the General District Court
24th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 102 completed surveys for Judge Stephanie S. Maddox.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Stephanie S. Maddox: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.48

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	41.6% 42	40.6% 41	10.9% 11	5.9% 6	1.0% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	51.0% 52	30.4% 31	11.8% 12	3.9% 4	2.9% 3
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	72.0% 72	21.0% 21	5.0% 5	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	71.3% 72	21.8% 22	5.0% 5	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	59.6% 59	25.3% 25	9.1% 9	3.0% 3	3.0% 3
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.7% 73	20.2% 20	2.0% 2	2.0% 2	2.0% 2
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	72.3% 73	23.8% 24	2.0% 2	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	65.0% 65	22.0% 22	7.0% 7	5.0% 5	1.0% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	69.3% 70	14.9% 15	8.9% 9	5.0% 5	2.0% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	83.5% 71	15.3% 13	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.2% 83	15.8% 16	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.2% 82	15.8% 16	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	53.8% 50	34.4% 32	5.4% 5	5.4% 5	1.1% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.8% 60	24.5% 23	8.5% 8	2.1% 2	1.1% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	69.9% 65	15.1% 14	9.7% 9	4.3% 4	1.1% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	66.7% 68	25.5% 26	6.9% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.5% 78	20.6% 21	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Stephanie S. Maddox: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.6% 73	24.5% 25	2.9% 3	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	69.0% 69	17.0% 17	9.0% 9	3.0% 3	2.0% 2
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	74.0% 74	24.0% 24	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.2% 79	19.8% 20	1.0% 1	1.0% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	67	66.3%
	Good	21	20.8%
	Needs Improvement	8	7.9%
	Unsatisfactory	5	5.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	6.5%
	Worse	5	5.4%
	Stayed the Same	81	88.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Amy B. Tisinger

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 113 completed surveys for Judge Amy B. Tisinger.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Amy B. Tisinger: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.10

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	38.4% 43	36.6% 41	15.2% 17	9.8% 11	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	57.5% 65	27.4% 31	13.3% 15	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	73.5% 83	18.6% 21	7.1% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	76.8% 86	14.3% 16	8.0% 9	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	58.6% 65	23.4% 26	16.2% 18	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	73.2% 79	19.4% 21	6.5% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.7% 96	12.5% 14	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	67.0% 75	19.6% 22	11.6% 13	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	68.8% 77	17.9% 20	9.8% 11	3.6% 4	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	77.9% 67	17.4% 15	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.9% 92	14.4% 16	2.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.0% 91	16.2% 18	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.9% 1
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	54.6% 54	25.3% 25	14.1% 14	4.0% 4	2.0% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.6% 72	22.6% 23	5.9% 6	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	70.3% 71	16.8% 17	10.9% 11	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.1% 80	18.9% 21	7.2% 8	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	67.6% 73	19.4% 21	10.2% 11	2.8% 3	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Amy B. Tisinger: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	78.9% 86	15.6% 17	5.5% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	73.4% 80	13.8% 15	10.1% 11	2.8% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	78.4% 87	12.6% 14	7.2% 8	0.9% 1	0.9% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	47.8% 53	19.8% 22	18.0% 20	10.8% 12	3.6% 4

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	63	56.8%
	Good	26	23.4%
	Needs Improvement	16	14.4%
	Unsatisfactory	6	5.4%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	5.0%
	Worse	4	4.0%
	Stayed the Same	92	91.1%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Erin J. DeHart

Judge of the General 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 75 completed surveys for Judge Erin J. DeHart.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Erin J. DeHart: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.87

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	88.0% 66	12.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.9% 68	8.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	91.9% 68	5.4% 4	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	93.2% 69	4.1% 3	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.9% 68	6.8% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	90.3% 65	9.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	93.2% 69	6.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	93.3% 70	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	91.9% 68	6.8% 5	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	98.2% 55	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	94.6% 70	5.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	92.0% 69	8.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	90.5% 57	7.9% 5	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	84.4% 54	14.1% 9	0.0% 0	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	89.2% 58	7.7% 5	1.5% 1	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	93.3% 70	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	93.1% 67	6.9% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Erin J. DeHart: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	89.2% 66	10.8% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	93.2% 68	5.5% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	82.4% 61	14.9% 11	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.4% 61	14.9% 11	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	90.7%
	Good	6	8.0%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	17.7%
	Worse	1	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	55	80.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Robert L. Hobbs

Judge of the General District Court
28th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 81 completed surveys for Judge Robert L. Hobbs.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Robert L. Hobbs: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.43

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	88.8% 71	8.8% 7	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	93.8% 76	6.2% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	87.2% 68	10.3% 8	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.5% 66	13.9% 11	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.5% 70	7.5% 6	5.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	77.9% 60	19.5% 15	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	86.4% 70	12.4% 10	0.0% 0	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	81.0% 64	12.7% 10	5.1% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	79.2% 61	15.6% 12	3.9% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	87.5% 49	7.1% 4	3.6% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.5% 62	18.2% 14	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.3% 65	14.1% 11	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	72.7% 48	18.2% 12	7.6% 5	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	70.6% 48	22.1% 15	5.9% 4	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	77.6% 52	14.9% 10	6.0% 4	0.0% 0	1.5% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	80.0% 64	18.8% 15	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.2% 61	20.5% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.3% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Robert L. Hobbs: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.8% 63	17.7% 14	1.3% 1	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.8% 63	16.5% 13	2.5% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	79.5% 62	18.0% 14	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	78.2% 61	18.0% 14	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	61	76.3%
	Good	15	18.8%
	Needs Improvement	4	5.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	15	23.8%
	Worse	1	1.6%
	Stayed the Same	47	74.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Che Christopher Rogers

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 116 completed surveys for Judge Che Christopher Rogers.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Che Christopher Rogers: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 19.95

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	82.8% 96	15.5% 18	1.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.3% 99	14.7% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	76.1% 86	17.7% 20	5.3% 6	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	74.3% 81	18.4% 20	6.4% 7	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	85.2% 98	12.2% 14	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.0% 88	11.3% 12	5.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	79.8% 91	18.4% 21	1.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	68.4% 78	21.1% 24	7.9% 9	2.6% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	73.5% 83	18.6% 21	6.2% 7	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	83.6% 61	13.7% 10	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	72.4% 84	25.0% 29	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	77.2% 88	20.2% 23	2.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.3% 71	17.8% 18	8.9% 9	3.0% 3	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	62.3% 66	18.9% 20	14.2% 15	3.8% 4	0.9% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	65.1% 69	20.8% 22	10.4% 11	2.8% 3	0.9% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.2% 83	24.4% 28	2.6% 3	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	72.5% 79	20.2% 22	3.7% 4	3.7% 4	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Che Christopher Rogers: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	68.8% 75	20.2% 22	10.1% 11	0.9% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.7% 80	18.2% 20	5.5% 6	2.7% 3	0.9% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	64.3% 72	26.8% 30	7.1% 8	1.8% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	57.4% 66	26.1% 30	11.3% 13	4.4% 5	0.9% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	75	67.0%
	Good	24	21.4%
	Needs Improvement	11	9.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2	1.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	25	26.6%
	Worse	1	1.1%
	Stayed the Same	68	72.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Lyn M. Simmons

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Lyn M. Simmons.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Lyn M. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 17.65

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	46.1% 35	32.9% 25	21.1% 16	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	61.8% 47	25.0% 19	13.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	70.3% 52	23.0% 17	5.4% 4	0.0% 0	1.4% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	71.2% 52	26.0% 19	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	60.5% 46	27.6% 21	11.8% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	78.4% 58	20.3% 15	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	81.6% 62	17.1% 13	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	59.2% 45	26.3% 20	14.5% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	61.3% 46	22.7% 17	14.7% 11	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	85.0% 51	13.3% 8	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.3% 64	14.7% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.2% 64	15.8% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	56.3% 40	31.0% 22	12.7% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	65.2% 45	26.1% 18	5.8% 4	1.5% 1	1.5% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	62.9% 44	22.9% 16	11.4% 8	1.4% 1	1.4% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	71.1% 54	21.1% 16	6.6% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.4% 58	18.9% 14	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Lyn M. Simmons: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	74.7% 56	17.3% 13	8.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	64.0% 48	22.7% 17	12.0% 9	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	60.3% 44	32.9% 24	5.5% 4	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	69.7% 53	25.0% 19	5.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	48	64.0%
	Good	18	24.0%
	Needs Improvement	8	10.7%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.3%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	17.7%
	Worse	1	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	55	80.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Jacqueline R. Waymack

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Jacqueline R. Waymack.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 23.56

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	61.1% 33	33.3% 18	3.7% 2	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	81.1% 43	15.1% 8	3.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	66.7% 36	22.2% 12	11.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	64.8% 35	20.4% 11	13.0% 7	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	85.2% 46	9.3% 5	3.7% 2	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	74.1% 40	22.2% 12	3.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.0% 44	13.2% 7	3.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	67.9% 36	24.5% 13	5.7% 3	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	67.9% 36	24.5% 13	5.7% 3	1.9% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	75.0% 30	22.5% 9	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	67.9% 36	28.3% 15	3.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	64.8% 35	33.3% 18	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	64.6% 31	29.2% 14	4.2% 2	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	56.3% 27	31.3% 15	10.4% 5	2.1% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	62.5% 30	25.0% 12	8.3% 4	4.2% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	63.0% 34	27.8% 15	9.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	68.5% 37	25.9% 14	5.6% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Jacqueline R. Waymack: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	64.2% 34	24.5% 13	9.4% 5	0.0% 0	1.9% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	67.9% 36	26.4% 14	5.7% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	51.9% 28	33.3% 18	11.1% 6	3.7% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	59.3% 32	27.8% 15	11.1% 6	1.9% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29	55.8%
	Good	17	32.7%
	Needs Improvement	6	11.5%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	3	6.3%
	Worse	1	2.1%
	Stayed the Same	44	91.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Kimberly Anne Kurkjian

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 89 completed surveys for Judge Kimberly Anne Kurkjian.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Kimberly Anne Kurkjian: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.44

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	76.4% 68	16.9% 15	5.6% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	84.1% 74	10.2% 9	5.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.5% 71	12.9% 11	2.4% 2	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.7% 72	12.8% 11	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	80.9% 72	12.4% 11	3.4% 3	3.4% 3	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.9% 73	13.8% 12	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.6% 78	10.1% 9	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.6% 65	15.1% 13	9.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.7% 70	13.5% 12	6.7% 6	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	84.3% 59	12.9% 9	1.4% 1	1.4% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.9% 73	13.8% 12	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	84.9% 73	11.6% 10	3.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	78.8% 63	13.8% 11	6.3% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	71.3% 57	22.5% 18	6.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	75.0% 60	18.8% 15	5.0% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	79.8% 71	15.7% 14	4.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	82.8% 72	14.9% 13	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Kimberly Anne Kurkjian: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	79.6% 70	15.9% 14	4.6% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	78.8% 67	15.3% 13	4.7% 4	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	77.0% 67	20.7% 18	2.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.9% 66	14.9% 13	8.1% 7	1.2% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	68	77.3%
	Good	13	14.8%
	Needs Improvement	6	6.8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.1%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	10.3%
	Worse	2	2.6%
	Stayed the Same	68	87.2%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Shawn W. Overbey

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Shawn W. Overbey.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Shawn W. Overbey: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 22.34

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	35.7% 30	19.1% 16	28.6% 24	14.3% 12	2.4% 2
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	37.8% 31	23.2% 19	23.2% 19	13.4% 11	2.4% 2
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	46.8% 37	24.1% 19	22.8% 18	5.1% 4	1.3% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	50.0% 40	26.3% 21	18.8% 15	3.8% 3	1.3% 1
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	38.6% 32	15.7% 13	24.1% 20	19.3% 16	2.4% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	55.0% 44	27.5% 22	16.3% 13	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	65.9% 54	17.1% 14	15.9% 13	0.0% 0	1.2% 1
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	38.6% 32	20.5% 17	21.7% 18	18.1% 15	1.2% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	42.0% 34	18.5% 15	21.0% 17	16.1% 13	2.5% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	69.4% 43	19.4% 12	8.1% 5	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	72.3% 60	22.9% 19	4.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	65.9% 54	19.5% 16	14.6% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	37.0% 27	23.3% 17	21.9% 16	15.1% 11	2.7% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	42.7% 32	32.0% 24	21.3% 16	2.7% 2	1.3% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	42.7% 32	20.0% 15	26.7% 20	9.3% 7	1.3% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	45.8% 38	21.7% 18	20.5% 17	10.8% 9	1.2% 1
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	61.0% 50	23.2% 19	9.8% 8	4.9% 4	1.2% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Shawn W. Overbey: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	54.2% 45	24.1% 20	18.1% 15	3.6% 3	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	43.8% 35	18.8% 15	21.3% 17	15.0% 12	1.3% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	62.0% 49	26.6% 21	8.9% 7	2.5% 2	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	50.6% 41	13.6% 11	19.8% 16	12.4% 10	3.7% 3

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	26	31.3%
	Good	20	24.1%
	Needs Improvement	24	28.9%
	Unsatisfactory	13	15.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	29.4%
	Worse	9	13.2%
	Stayed the Same	39	57.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Mara M. Matthews

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Mara M. Matthews.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Mara M. Matthews: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.48

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	84.3% 59	14.3% 10	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	90.0% 63	7.1% 5	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	78.3% 54	18.8% 13	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.4% 54	16.2% 11	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	85.7% 60	10.0% 7	4.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.0% 56	17.1% 12	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.1% 61	11.4% 8	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	75.4% 52	23.2% 16	1.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	78.6% 55	20.0% 14	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	93.8% 45	6.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	78.6% 55	14.3% 10	7.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.3% 54	17.4% 12	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	77.1% 47	18.0% 11	4.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	77.1% 47	21.3% 13	1.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	86.9% 53	8.2% 5	4.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.8% 53	18.8% 13	4.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	76.8% 53	8.7% 6	13.0% 9	1.5% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Mara M. Matthews: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.5% 52	20.6% 14	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	81.4% 57	15.7% 11	2.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	66.7% 46	13.0% 9	14.5% 10	5.8% 4	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	52.9% 37	18.6% 13	15.7% 11	10.0% 7	2.9% 2

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	47	67.1%
	Good	17	24.3%
	Needs Improvement	6	8.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	14.1%
	Worse	2	3.1%
	Stayed the Same	53	82.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Brian J. Smalls

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 60 completed surveys for Judge Brian J. Smalls.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Brian J. Smalls: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.69

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	89.8% 53	10.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	98.3% 59	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	88.1% 52	8.5% 5	1.7% 1	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	84.8% 50	10.2% 6	3.4% 2	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.5% 54	8.5% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.0% 51	15.0% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	93.3% 56	5.0% 3	0.0% 0	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	88.3% 53	11.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	91.7% 55	8.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	95.7% 44	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	86.7% 52	13.3% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.3% 50	16.7% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	81.8% 45	18.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.2% 43	20.0% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	80.0% 44	18.2% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.8% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	86.7% 52	11.7% 7	0.0% 0	1.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.1% 52	10.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.7% 1

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Brian J. Smalls: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	86.7% 52	11.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.7% 1
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	92.9% 52	5.4% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	67.2% 39	20.7% 12	6.9% 4	1.7% 1	3.5% 2
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	63.3% 38	26.7% 16	6.7% 4	3.3% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	83.3%
	Good	7	11.7%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.7%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	6	11.5%
	Worse	1	1.9%
	Stayed the Same	45	86.5%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Travis R. Williams

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Travis R. Williams.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Travis R. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.95

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	81.9% 86	13.3% 14	3.8% 4	0.0% 0	1.0% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	89.5% 94	6.7% 7	3.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	84.6% 88	12.5% 13	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.3% 85	14.7% 15	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.6% 92	5.7% 6	1.9% 2	4.8% 5	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	84.6% 88	12.5% 13	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	87.5% 91	9.6% 10	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	79.8% 83	14.4% 15	2.9% 3	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	77.5% 79	13.7% 14	5.9% 6	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	92.1% 70	6.6% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.4% 88	14.6% 15	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	87.6% 92	12.4% 13	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.1% 72	16.5% 15	4.4% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.0% 71	14.3% 13	7.7% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	84.3% 75	11.2% 10	4.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	81.9% 86	15.2% 16	2.9% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.9% 86	17.1% 18	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Travis R. Williams: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.7% 85	14.4% 15	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.2% 80	14.9% 15	2.0% 2	4.0% 4	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	69.2% 72	25.0% 26	2.9% 3	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	75.0% 78	20.2% 21	4.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	82	80.4%
	Good	14	13.7%
	Needs Improvement	5	4.9%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	7	7.4%
	Worse	1	1.1%
	Stayed the Same	87	91.6%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Stacy E. Lee

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Stacy E. Lee.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Stacy E. Lee: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 25.17

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	73.0% 46	23.8% 15	1.6% 1	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	85.5% 53	9.7% 6	3.2% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.5% 53	9.7% 6	1.6% 1	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	80.7% 50	14.5% 9	1.6% 1	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	83.9% 52	11.3% 7	3.2% 2	1.6% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.7% 50	16.1% 10	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	85.5% 53	11.3% 7	3.2% 2	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	74.2% 46	16.1% 10	6.5% 4	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	80.9% 38	14.9% 7	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	2.1% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	82.3% 51	12.9% 8	4.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	78.7% 48	18.0% 11	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	72.7% 40	23.6% 13	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	1.8% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	67.9% 38	19.6% 11	8.9% 5	1.8% 1	1.8% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	75.5% 40	11.3% 6	9.4% 5	0.0% 0	3.8% 2
16. The judge communicates effectively	74.6% 47	22.2% 14	0.0% 0	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.0% 49	17.7% 11	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Stacy E. Lee: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	75.8% 47	21.0% 13	3.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	83.1% 49	6.8% 4	6.8% 4	1.7% 1	1.7% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	53.2% 33	27.4% 17	16.1% 10	1.6% 1	1.6% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	57.1% 36	27.0% 17	14.3% 9	1.6% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	42	67.7%
	Good	15	24.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	4.8%
	Unsatisfactory	2	3.2%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	20.0%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	44	80.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable John E. Franklin

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 93 completed surveys for Judge John E. Franklin.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge John E. Franklin: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.10

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	64.5% 60	28.0% 26	5.4% 5	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	76.3% 71	19.4% 18	2.2% 2	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	73.9% 68	21.7% 20	3.3% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.3% 72	16.3% 15	5.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	76.1% 70	18.5% 17	3.3% 3	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	80.2% 73	15.4% 14	3.3% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	81.7% 76	12.9% 12	3.2% 3	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	64.1% 59	29.4% 27	4.4% 4	2.2% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	69.6% 64	22.8% 21	4.4% 4	3.3% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	90.3% 65	8.3% 6	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	80.7% 75	19.4% 18	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	86.8% 79	11.0% 10	1.1% 1	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.1% 58	22.6% 19	6.0% 5	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	63.1% 53	25.0% 21	10.7% 9	1.2% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	67.9% 57	21.4% 18	8.3% 7	2.4% 2	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	74.7% 68	18.7% 17	5.5% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.4% 73	18.5% 17	2.2% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of John E. Franklin: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	71.7% 66	23.9% 22	3.3% 3	1.1% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	72.2% 65	17.8% 16	5.6% 5	3.3% 3	1.1% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	73.9% 68	19.6% 18	4.4% 4	1.1% 1	1.1% 1
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	72.5% 66	20.9% 19	5.5% 5	1.1% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	63	69.2%
	Good	21	23.1%
	Needs Improvement	7	7.7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	13	15.9%
	Worse	4	4.9%
	Stayed the Same	65	79.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Andrea M. Stewart

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 57 completed surveys for Judge Andrea M. Stewart.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Andrea M. Stewart: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.46

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	35.1% 20	33.3% 19	21.1% 12	8.8% 5	1.8% 1
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	47.4% 27	28.1% 16	19.3% 11	3.5% 2	1.8% 1
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	64.9% 37	10.5% 6	17.5% 10	5.3% 3	1.8% 1
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	67.9% 38	10.7% 6	12.5% 7	8.9% 5	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	50.9% 29	15.8% 9	14.0% 8	15.8% 9	3.5% 2
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	70.4% 38	18.5% 10	11.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	75.0% 42	12.5% 7	12.5% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	47.4% 27	15.8% 9	24.6% 14	8.8% 5	3.5% 2
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	45.6% 26	21.1% 12	19.3% 11	10.5% 6	3.5% 2
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	69.1% 29	9.5% 4	7.1% 3	14.3% 6	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	85.5% 47	7.3% 4	7.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	76.8% 43	17.9% 10	3.6% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	52.9% 27	15.7% 8	15.7% 8	13.7% 7	2.0% 1
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	54.9% 28	19.6% 10	17.7% 9	5.9% 3	2.0% 1
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	54.9% 28	13.7% 7	19.6% 10	9.8% 5	2.0% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	58.9% 33	16.1% 9	23.2% 13	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	69.6% 39	23.2% 13	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Andrea M. Stewart: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	64.3% 36	23.2% 13	10.7% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	54.4% 31	12.3% 7	19.3% 11	8.8% 5	5.3% 3
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	60.0% 33	23.6% 13	10.9% 6	5.5% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	66.1% 37	17.9% 10	12.5% 7	3.6% 2	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29	50.9%
	Good	12	21.1%
	Needs Improvement	7	12.3%
	Unsatisfactory	9	15.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	16.4%
	Worse	6	10.9%
	Stayed the Same	40	72.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Frank G. Uvanni

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 135 completed surveys for Judge Frank G. Uvanni.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Frank G. Uvanni: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.11

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	87.4% 118	11.9% 16	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	92.6% 125	6.7% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	82.2% 111	11.9% 16	5.9% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	79.3% 107	14.1% 19	5.9% 8	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	89.6% 121	7.4% 10	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.1% 114	11.2% 15	3.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	83.7% 113	14.1% 19	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.5% 101	16.7% 22	5.3% 7	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	75.4% 101	19.4% 26	3.7% 5	0.8% 1	0.8% 1
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	81.7% 94	12.2% 14	6.1% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	81.5% 110	16.3% 22	2.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	82.8% 111	14.2% 19	3.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	79.5% 101	17.3% 22	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	69.5% 89	20.3% 26	9.4% 12	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	74.8% 95	15.8% 20	8.7% 11	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
16. The judge communicates effectively	74.8% 101	20.7% 28	3.7% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	78.2% 104	19.6% 26	1.5% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Frank G. Uvanni: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	76.7% 102	15.8% 21	7.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	79.7% 106	12.0% 16	7.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.8% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	74.4% 99	22.6% 30	2.3% 3	0.8% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.4% 91	23.3% 31	6.8% 9	0.8% 1	0.8% 1

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	101	77.1%
	Good	18	13.7%
	Needs Improvement	11	8.4%
	Unsatisfactory	1	0.8%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	10	8.3%
	Worse	2	1.7%
	Stayed the Same	108	90.0%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Melissa S. Cardoce

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Melissa S. Cardoce.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Melissa S. Cardoce: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 18.38

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	57.7% 60	30.8% 32	6.7% 7	4.8% 5	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	66.7% 70	23.8% 25	3.8% 4	5.7% 6	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	75.8% 75	18.2% 18	6.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	74.3% 75	17.8% 18	6.9% 7	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	67.7% 69	23.5% 24	5.9% 6	2.0% 2	1.0% 1
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	72.2% 70	23.7% 23	2.1% 2	2.1% 2	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	76.7% 79	18.5% 19	3.9% 4	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	64.7% 66	20.6% 21	10.8% 11	3.9% 4	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	66.7% 68	18.6% 19	11.8% 12	2.9% 3	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	88.0% 66	9.3% 7	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.3% 85	15.7% 16	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.8% 81	17.2% 17	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	62.4% 58	26.9% 25	8.6% 8	0.0% 0	2.2% 2
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	66.7% 64	17.7% 17	12.5% 12	3.1% 3	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	65.6% 63	17.7% 17	12.5% 12	4.2% 4	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	72.1% 75	22.1% 23	4.8% 5	1.0% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.2% 80	19.8% 20	1.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Melissa S. Cardoce: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	73.5% 75	20.6% 21	3.9% 4	2.0% 2	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	71.4% 70	13.3% 13	13.3% 13	1.0% 1	1.0% 1
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	65.4% 66	32.7% 33	2.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	68.9% 71	27.2% 28	3.9% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	69	66.4%
	Good	22	21.2%
	Needs Improvement	10	9.6%
	Unsatisfactory	3	2.9%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	12	13.8%
	Worse	3	3.5%
	Stayed the Same	72	82.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Thomas P. Sotelo

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 153 completed surveys for Judge Thomas P. Sotelo.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Thomas P. Sotelo: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.23

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% 76	34.2% 52	12.5% 19	3.3% 5	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	68.6% 105	21.6% 33	8.5% 13	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	86.6% 129	11.4% 17	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	86.4% 127	10.9% 16	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	72.2% 109	16.6% 25	9.9% 15	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.6% 125	11.6% 17	2.7% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	90.9% 139	8.5% 13	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	77.6% 118	17.1% 26	4.0% 6	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	82.0% 123	11.3% 17	5.3% 8	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	92.0% 103	7.1% 8	0.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	90.1% 137	9.2% 14	0.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.9% 133	8.1% 12	2.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	69.5% 98	20.6% 29	8.5% 12	1.4% 2	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	85.1% 120	13.5% 19	1.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	84.5% 120	12.7% 18	2.8% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	76.7% 115	19.3% 29	2.0% 3	2.0% 3	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	79.1% 117	14.2% 21	6.1% 9	0.7% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Thomas P. Sotelo: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	81.3% 122	14.7% 22	3.3% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	82.9% 121	13.7% 20	1.4% 2	2.1% 3	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	74.3% 110	20.3% 30	5.4% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	79.6% 121	16.5% 25	2.0% 3	2.0% 3	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	117	77.5%
	Good	24	15.9%
	Needs Improvement	10	6.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	11	7.9%
	Worse	6	4.3%
	Stayed the Same	122	87.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Melinda L. VanLowe

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

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026



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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 162 completed surveys for Judge Melinda L. VanLowe.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Melinda L. VanLowe: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.45

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	26.7% 43	31.1% 50	26.7% 43	11.8% 19	3.7% 6
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	35.0% 56	26.3% 42	23.1% 37	12.5% 20	3.1% 5
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	39.4% 63	24.4% 39	23.1% 37	8.8% 14	4.4% 7
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	39.4% 63	26.3% 42	22.5% 36	6.3% 10	5.6% 9
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	33.5% 54	24.2% 39	23.0% 37	15.5% 25	3.7% 6
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	41.1% 62	37.1% 56	11.9% 18	6.6% 10	3.3% 5
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	50.6% 82	28.4% 46	13.0% 21	5.6% 9	2.5% 4
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	32.3% 52	19.9% 32	23.0% 37	16.8% 27	8.1% 13
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	36.7% 59	14.3% 23	24.8% 40	15.5% 25	8.7% 14
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	58.7% 61	22.1% 23	10.6% 11	7.7% 8	1.0% 1
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	53.7% 87	26.5% 43	13.6% 22	4.9% 8	1.2% 2
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	54.7% 87	29.6% 47	11.3% 18	1.3% 2	3.1% 5
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	27.1% 42	21.3% 33	25.2% 39	18.7% 29	7.7% 12
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	30.1% 47	21.2% 33	25.6% 40	16.0% 25	7.1% 11
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	29.5% 46	18.0% 28	27.6% 43	14.7% 23	10.3% 16
16. The judge communicates effectively	36.0% 58	20.5% 33	25.5% 41	13.7% 22	4.4% 7
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	46.5% 74	35.9% 57	13.8% 22	1.9% 3	1.9% 3

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Melinda L. VanLowe: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	37.5% 60	26.9% 43	23.8% 38	9.4% 15	2.5% 4
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	34.0% 51	20.0% 30	20.0% 30	16.7% 25	9.3% 14
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	39.9% 63	32.9% 52	16.5% 26	7.0% 11	3.8% 6
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	35.9% 57	25.2% 40	25.8% 41	7.6% 12	5.7% 9

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	45	28.0%
	Good	33	20.5%
	Needs Improvement	45	28.0%
	Unsatisfactory	38	23.6%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	20	14.5%
	Worse	25	18.1%
	Stayed the Same	93	67.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Deanna Perdue Stone

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
22nd 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 40 completed surveys for Judge Deanna Perdue Stone.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Deanna Perdue Stone: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 21.28

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	70.0% 28	27.5% 11	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	72.5% 29	25.0% 10	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	92.1% 35	5.3% 2	0.0% 0	2.6% 1	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.1% 35	5.3% 2	0.0% 0	2.6% 1	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	87.5% 35	10.0% 4	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	86.8% 33	7.9% 3	2.6% 1	2.6% 1	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	95.0% 38	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.5% 35	10.0% 4	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	87.5% 35	10.0% 4	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	96.8% 30	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.2% 1	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	95.0% 38	5.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	97.4% 38	0.0% 0	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	83.3% 30	11.1% 4	2.8% 1	2.8% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	83.3% 30	13.9% 5	2.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	91.7% 33	5.6% 2	2.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	87.5% 35	10.0% 4	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	97.5% 39	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Deanna Perdue Stone: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	92.5% 37	7.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.7% 35	7.7% 3	0.0% 0	2.6% 1	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	89.7% 35	7.7% 3	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	95.0% 38	2.5% 1	0.0% 0	2.5% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	29	72.5%
	Good	10	25.0%
	Needs Improvement	0	0.0%
	Unsatisfactory	1	2.5%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	5	15.2%
	Worse	1	3.0%
	Stayed the Same	27	81.8%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Heather P. Ferguson

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Heather P. Ferguson.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Heather P. Ferguson: 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	82.1% 46	16.1% 9	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.6% 53	5.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	94.6% 52	5.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	94.6% 53	5.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	91.1% 51	7.1% 4	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	96.3% 52	3.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	96.4% 53	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	87.3% 48	9.1% 5	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	85.5% 47	10.9% 6	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	95.7% 44	4.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	94.6% 53	5.4% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	98.2% 54	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	88.0% 44	12.0% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	94.1% 48	3.9% 2	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	92.3% 48	5.8% 3	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	96.4% 54	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	96.4% 54	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Heather P. Ferguson: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	96.4% 54	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.1% 49	7.3% 4	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	89.3% 50	10.7% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	92.9% 52	7.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	53	94.6%
	Good	2	3.6%
	Needs Improvement	1	1.8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	17.3%
	Worse	0	0.0%
	Stayed the Same	43	82.7%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Hilary D. Griffith

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 Hilary D. Griffith.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Hilary D. Griffith: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 24.77

Average Number of Appearances before Judge: 6 to 10

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
1. The judge displays patience in the courtroom	68.4% 52	25.0% 19	6.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	79.7% 59	16.2% 12	4.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	85.3% 64	10.7% 8	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	85.5% 65	11.8% 9	2.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	81.6% 62	11.8% 9	5.3% 4	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	85.1% 63	8.1% 6	6.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	82.9% 63	15.8% 12	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	78.7% 59	14.7% 11	6.7% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	80.0% 60	12.0% 9	6.7% 5	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	82.3% 51	11.3% 7	3.2% 2	3.2% 2	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	88.2% 67	11.8% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	89.5% 68	6.6% 5	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	84.9% 56	10.6% 7	3.0% 2	1.5% 1	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	89.4% 59	4.6% 3	6.1% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	90.6% 58	6.3% 4	3.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	84.2% 64	11.8% 9	4.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	88.2% 67	10.5% 8	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Hilary D. Griffith: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	85.1% 63	12.2% 9	2.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	80.0% 60	14.7% 11	5.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	77.6% 59	17.1% 13	4.0% 3	1.3% 1	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.9% 63	10.5% 8	6.6% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	63	82.9%
	Good	10	13.2%
	Needs Improvement	3	4.0%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	14	20.3%
	Worse	1	1.5%
	Stayed the Same	54	78.3%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Joseph B. Lyle

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
28th Judicial District

Submitted to:

The Chair of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice

The Chair of the House Committee for Courts of Justice

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

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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 60 completed surveys for Judge Joseph B. Lyle.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Joseph B. Lyle: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 26.30

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	78.3% 47	20.0% 12	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	91.7% 55	8.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	83.3% 50	16.7% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	83.3% 50	13.3% 8	3.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	84.8% 50	13.6% 8	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	79.0% 45	21.1% 12	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	84.8% 50	11.9% 7	3.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	76.7% 46	18.3% 11	5.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.3% 45	18.6% 11	5.1% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	86.4% 38	9.1% 4	4.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	83.3% 50	15.0% 9	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	81.7% 49	18.3% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	70.6% 36	19.6% 10	9.8% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	78.0% 39	18.0% 9	4.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	78.4% 40	17.7% 9	3.9% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	83.3% 50	16.7% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	81.4% 48	18.6% 11	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Joseph B. Lyle: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	84.8% 50	13.6% 8	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.6% 45	17.2% 10	5.2% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	75.9% 44	24.1% 14	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	81.7% 49	16.7% 10	1.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	51	86.4%
	Good	6	10.2%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.4%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	8	14.3%
	Worse	1	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	47	83.9%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Michael J. Bush

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters 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 50 completed surveys for Judge Michael J. Bush.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Michael J. Bush: Evaluation Summary

Statistics on Attorney Survey Respondents

Average Years in Practice: 20.09

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	42.0% 21	44.0% 22	14.0% 7	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	66.0% 33	28.0% 14	6.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	81.6% 40	14.3% 7	4.1% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	78.0% 39	18.0% 9	4.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	70.0% 35	24.0% 12	6.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	63.3% 31	24.5% 12	12.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	76.0% 38	22.0% 11	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	72.0% 36	20.0% 10	8.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	76.0% 38	16.0% 8	6.0% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	86.8% 33	10.5% 4	2.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	68.0% 34	24.0% 12	6.0% 3	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	70.0% 35	18.0% 9	8.0% 4	4.0% 2	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	56.8% 25	31.8% 14	11.4% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	68.2% 30	25.0% 11	6.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	72.7% 32	20.5% 9	6.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	60.0% 30	24.0% 12	16.0% 8	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	56.0% 28	22.0% 11	20.0% 10	2.0% 1	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Michael J. Bush: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	54.0% 27	36.0% 18	8.0% 4	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	77.1% 37	14.6% 7	8.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	68.1% 32	23.4% 11	2.1% 1	6.4% 3	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	55.1% 27	22.5% 11	14.3% 7	8.2% 4	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	28	57.1%
	Good	14	28.6%
	Needs Improvement	7	14.3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	4	9.1%
	Worse	2	4.6%
	Stayed the Same	38	86.4%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Evaluation of:

The Honorable Martha P. Ketron

Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations 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

2026

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, court reporters, and staff and contract certified foreign language interpreters were surveyed for judges at all levels of the trial courts. In-court clerk's office staff were surveyed for circuit court judges only. The surveys for these groups contain 19 of the 23 factors. The surveys were distributed and completed electronically.

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

III. Report Content

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

This report reflects a total of 57 completed surveys for Judge Martha P. Ketron.

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter Evaluation of Judge Martha P. Ketron: 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	91.2% 52	7.0% 4	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
2. The judge is courteous in the courtroom	94.7% 54	3.5% 2	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
3. The judge is conscientious in the performance of judicial duties	92.9% 52	5.4% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
4. The judge is diligent in the performance of judicial duties	92.9% 52	5.4% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
5. The judge shows respect for all court participants	94.7% 54	5.3% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
6. The judge requires court participants to display respect toward one another	83.3% 45	14.8% 8	1.9% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
7. The judge is attentive to the proceedings	93.0% 53	7.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
8. The judge exhibits fairness to all parties	91.1% 51	5.4% 3	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
9. The judge treats all parties in an impartial manner	91.1% 51	5.4% 3	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
10. The judge avoids inappropriate *ex parte* communications	93.2% 41	4.6% 2	2.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
11. The judge maintains order in the courtroom	87.3% 48	9.1% 5	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
12. The judge expects professional behavior of court participants	83.6% 46	12.7% 7	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
13. The judge allows lawyers appropriate latitude in presentation of their case	88.0% 44	10.0% 5	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
14. The judge displays knowledge of the law	87.5% 42	10.4% 5	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
15. The judge exhibits a good faith consideration of applicable law.	91.7% 44	6.3% 3	2.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
16. The judge communicates effectively	94.6% 53	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	1.8% 1	0.0% 0
17. The judge is prompt in rendering decisions	92.9% 52	5.4% 3	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Attorney, Bailiff, Court Reporter, and
Staff and Certified Contract Foreign Language Interpreter
Evaluation of Martha P. Ketron: Evaluation Summary

Performance Factor	Every Time	Frequently	Some of the Time	Rarely	Never
18. The judge's decisions are clear	87.5% 49	10.7% 6	1.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
19. The judge performs judicial duties without bias or prejudice	89.3% 50	7.1% 4	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
20. The judge convenes court without undue delay	80.4% 45	16.1% 9	3.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
21. The judge uses courtroom time efficiently	82.1% 46	14.3% 8	1.8% 1	1.8% 1	0.0% 0

Performance Factor		Survey Responses	
		Number	Percent
Judge's overall performance	Excellent	50	89.3%
	Good	4	7.1%
	Needs Improvement	2	3.6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
In general, over the last twelve months, has the judge's overall court-related performance become...	Better	9	16.4%
	Worse	1	1.8%
	Stayed the Same	45	81.8%