

NORTH CAROLINA
BAR ASSOCIATION
SEEKING LIBERTY & JUSTICE

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY

SURVEY RESULTS

NORTH CAROLINA BAR ASSOCIATION
JANUARY 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4 | PREFACE

6 | SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

7 | DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

17 | INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS

- 17 | ALMA L. HINTON (6A)
- 17 | CY A. GRANT (6B)
- 17 | ABRAHAM P. JONES (10A)
- 18 | MICHAEL R. MORGAN (10A)
- 18 | DONALD W. STEPHENS (10D)
- 18 | ORLANDO F. HUDSON JR. (14A)
- 19 | JAMES G. BELL (16B)
- 19 | ROBERT F. FLOYD JR. (16B)
- 19 | JOSEPH E. TURNER (18E)
- 20 | LOGAN T. BURKE (21D)
- 20 | YVONNE M. EVANS (26A)
- 20 | LINWOOD O. FOUST (26A)
- 21 | ROBERT T. SUMNER (27A)

22 | INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS

DISTRICT 1

- 22 | EDGAR L. BARNES
- 22 | AMBER DAVIS-MALARNEY

DISTRICT 2

- 23 | CHRISTOPHER B. McLENDON
- 23 | MICHAEL A. PAUL

DISTRICT 3A

- 24 | GEORGE GALEN BRADY
- 24 | DAVID A. LEECH
- 24 | CHARLES M. VINCENT

DISTRICT 3B

- 25 | KAREN A. ALEXANDER
- 25 | PETER MACK JR.
- 25 | L. WALTER MILLS
- 26 | PAUL M. QUINN
- 26 | CHERYL LYNN SPENCER

DISTRICT 4

- 27 | WILLIAM M. CAMERON III
- 27 | LOUIS FOWLER FOY JR.
- 27 | CAROL A. JONES (WILSON)
- 28 | JAMES L. MOORE JR.
- 28 | HENRY L. STEVENS IV
- 28 | LEONARD W. THAGARD

DISTRICT 5

- 29 | JULIUS H. CORPENING II
- 29 | SANDRA RAY CRINER
- 29 | RICHARD RUSSELL DAVIS
- 30 | JEFF NOECKER

DISTRICT 6A

- 31 | BRENDA G. BRANCH
- 31 | TERESA R. ROBINSON FREEMAN
- 31 | W. TURNER STEPHENSON III

DISTRICT 6B

- 32 | THOMAS R. NEWBERN

DISTRICT 7

- 33 | JOHN M. BRITT
- 33 | ANTHONY (TONY) W. BROWN
- 33 | JOHN J. COVOLO
- 34 | WILLIAM CHARLES FARRIS
- 34 | WILLIAM G. STEWART

DISTRICT 8

- 35 | DAVID B. BRANTLEY
- 35 | LONNIE W. CARRAWAY
- 35 | TIMOTHY I. FINAN
- 36 | CHARLES P. GAYLOR III
- 36 | ROBERT LESLIE TURNER

DISTRICT 9

- 37 | S. QUON BRIDGES
- 37 | JOHN W. DAVIS
- 37 | DANIEL F. FINCH
- 38 | CAROLYN J. YANCEY

DISTRICT 9A

- 39 | LLOYD MICHAEL GENTRY

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

DISTRICT 9B

40 | RANDOLPH BASKERVILLE

DISTRICT 10

- 41 | MONICA M. BOUSMAN
- 41 | JACQUELINE L. BREWER
- 41 | ERIC CRAIG CHASSE
- 42 | LORI GRUNDY CHRISTIAN
- 42 | JENNIFER MILLER GREEN
- 42 | JENNIFER J. KNOX
- 43 | ROBERT B. RADER
- 43 | DEBRA ANN SASSER
- 43 | CHRISTINE M. WALCZYK
- 44 | ANNA ELEANA WORLEY

DISTRICT 11

- 45 | ROBERT W. BRYANT JR.
- 45 | CHARLES PATRICK BULLOCK
- 45 | RESSON O. FAIRCLOTH II
- 46 | PAUL A. HOLCOMBE
- 46 | JACQUELYN L. LEE
- 46 | JIMMY L. LOVE JR.
- 47 | R. DALE STUBBS
- 47 | OWEN (HENRY) WILLIS JR.

DISTRICT 12

- 48 | LAURA A. DEVAN
- 48 | JOHN W. DICKSON
- 48 | EDWARD A. PONE

DISTRICT 13

- 49 | NAPOLEON B. BAREFOOT JR.
- 49 | JERRY ARNOLD JOLLY
- 49 | SCOTT L. USSERY
- 50 | MARION R. WARREN

DISTRICT 14

- 51 | WILLIAM ANDREW MARSH III

DISTRICT 15A

- 52 | DAVID THOMAS LAMBETH JR.
- 52 | KATHRYN WHITAKER OVERBY
- 52 | JAMES K. ROBERSON

DISTRICT 15B

- 53 | CHARLES T. L. ANDERSON
- 53 | LUNSFORD LONG
- 53 | BEVERLY A. SCARLETT

DISTRICT 16A

- 54 | JOHN H. HORNE

DISTRICT 16B

- 55 | JUDITH MILSAP DANIELS
- 55 | WILLIAM JEFFREY MOORE

DISTRICT 17A

- 56 | JAMES A. GROGAN

DISTRICT 17B

- 57 | WILLIAM F. SOUTHERN III

DISTRICT 18

- 58 | SHERRY FOWLER ALLOWAY
- 58 | SUSAN E. BRAY
- 58 | BETTY J. BROWN
- 59 | SUSAN R. BURCH
- 59 | AVERY MICHELLE CRUMP
- 59 | KIMBERLY MICHELLE FLETCHER
- 60 | ANGELA C. FOSTER
- 60 | WILLIAM K. (PETE) HUNTER
- 60 | JAN H. SAMET
- 61 | POLLY D. SIZEMORE
- 61 | TERESA H. VINCENT

DISTRICT 19B

- 62 | DONALD W. (SKIPPER) CREED JR.
- 62 | JAMES P. (JIMMY) HILL
- 62 | ROBERT M. WILKINS

DISTRICT 19C

- 63 | R. MARSHALL BICKETT JR.

DISTRICT 20A

- 64 | LISA D. THACKER
- 64 | AMANDA L. WILSON

DISTRICT 20B

- 65 | HUNT GWYN

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

DISTRICT 20C

- 66 | STEPHEN HIGDON
- 66 | JOSEPH J. WILLIAMS

DISTRICT 20D

- 67 | WILLIAM F. (TRIPP) HELMS

DISTRICT 21

- 68 | CAMILLE D. BANKS-PAYNE
- 68 | CHESTER C. DAVIS
- 68 | LAWRENCE J. (LARRY) FINE
- 69 | WILLIAM T. GRAHAM JR.
- 69 | LAURIE L. HUTCHINS
- 69 | WILLIAM B. REINGOLD
- 70 | VICTORIA L. ROEMER

DISTRICT 22A

- 71 | DEBORAH BROWN
- 71 | LAWRENCE DALE GRAHAM
- 71 | EDWARD L. HEDRICK IV
- 72 | CHRISTINE UNDERWOOD

DISTRICT 23

- 73 | JEANIE REAVIS HOUSTON

DISTRICT 24

- 74 | R. GREGORY HORNE
- 74 | ROY ALEXANDER LYERLY
- 74 | TED McENTIRE

DISTRICT 25

- 75 | BURFORD A. CHERRY
- 75 | J. GARY DELLINGER

DISTRICT 26

- 76 | KIMBERLY Y. BEST
- 76 | CHARLOTTE BROWN-WILLIAMS
- 76 | RONALD L. CHAPMAN
- 77 | JENA P. CULLER
- 77 | KAREN EADY-WILLIAMS
- 77 | TYYAWDI M. HANDS

DISTRICT 26, CONTINUED

- 78 | DONNIE HOOVER
- 78 | CHRISTY TOWNLEY MANN
- 78 | THOMAS F. MOORE JR.
- 79 | JOHN TOTTEN
- 79 | ELIZABETH THORNTON TROSCH
- 79 | LOUIS A. TROSCH JR.

DISTRICT 27A

- 80 | RICHARD B. ABERNETHY
- 80 | JOHN K. GREENLEE
- 80 | ANGELA G. HOYLE
- 81 | JAMES A. JACKSON
- 81 | THOMAS G. TAYLOR

DISTRICT 27B

- 82 | KELVIN DEAN BLACK
- 82 | ANNA F. FOSTER
- 82 | MEREDITH A. SHUFORD
- 83 | LARRY JAMES WILSON

DISTRICT 28

- 84 | ANDREA DRAY
- 84 | J. CALVIN HILL

DISTRICT 29B

- 85 | THOMAS McAVOY BRITTAIN JR.
- 85 | ATHENA F. BROOKS
- 85 | DAVID KENNEDY FOX
- 86 | PETER KNIGHT

DISTRICT 30

- 87 | RICHLYN D. HOLT
- 87 | MONICA HAYES LESLIE
- 87 | RICHARD K. WALKER

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Bar Association's (NCBA) Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Committee is pleased to provide this report summarizing the results of its 2011 survey. The report contains evaluations of trial court judges who are eligible for election in 2012. Overall, the report confirms that North Carolina has a large number of highly regarded judges in both Superior Court and District Court. The purpose of this report is to provide citizens with useful information to help them make informed decisions when voting in judicial elections.

BACKGROUND

For more than a century, North Carolina has elected its judges, previously in partisan but now in non-partisan elections.

In 2006, the NCBA's Administration of Justice (AOJ) Committee produced a report noting the lack of information available to members of the public to enable them to cast an informed vote based on a judge's performance. The report recommends the creation of the JPE Committee. The NCBA's Board of Governors followed that recommendation, and the JPE Committee was formed in 2008. The committee was charged with creating and administering a survey by which lawyers could evaluate a judge's performance. Results of the survey could be utilized to provide information for the voting public. The JPE Committee is led by former Chief Justice Rhoda B. Billings, chair, and former District Court Judge Nancy Black Norelli, vice-chair. The JPE Committee is comprised of seven retired judges, seven retired attorneys and seven laypersons.

The NCBA contracted with BDO USA, LLP, a national accounting firm with local offices in Raleigh, to conduct the survey. BDO USA served as gatekeeper throughout the survey process, ensuring that only persons meeting the survey requirements were allowed to participate and that those who did participate remained anonymous.

The NCBA also employed statistician Larry Nelson, a well-respected member of the faculty at North Carolina State University, to evaluate the methodology to ensure that the survey would encourage the most participation possible and generate statistically valid results.

Utilizing the services and advice of BDO USA and Professor Nelson, the JPE Committee crafted a survey that it administered in May 2011.

SURVEY DETAILS

Drawing upon experience from two pilot surveys of attorneys, the JPE Committee fine-tuned the survey, implementing suggestions from judges, attorneys and the general public. The number of questions was reduced, the process for responding was simplified and survey marketing was increased. The end result was a survey that produced a remarkable rate of return.

The 2011 survey asked attorneys with an active North Carolina law license to rate each judge with whom the attorney had had sufficient professional contact to be able to evaluate the judge's performance in six categories:

1. **Integrity and Impartiality** | Judge is fair to all persons, bases decisions on facts and law and refrains from inappropriate ex parte communications;
2. **Legal Ability** | Judge demonstrates knowledge of law and rules of procedure and evidence;
3. **Professionalism** | Judge exercises patience, is courteous to all and attentive to proceedings, fulfills out-of-court duties and responsibilities, and upholds the dignity of the office;
4. **Communication** | Judge speaks clearly and understandably, prepares coherent decisions and carefully reviews orders before entry;
5. **Administrative Skills** | Judge is punctual and prepared, controls the courtroom appropriately, uses courtroom time efficiently, enforces deadlines appropriately and makes decisions promptly; and
6. **Overall Performance** | Rate the judge's performance overall.

Each attorney was asked to rate the judge's performance in each category, using a scale of 5 (Excellent), 4 (Good), 3 (Average), 2 (Below Average) and 1 (Poor). If the attorney felt that he/she had insufficient information to rate the qualities within a category for a particular judge, the attorney could indicate "do not know" for that category but rate the others. As a result, the number of responses for a single judge may vary somewhat among the six categories.

To identify the members of the bench who would be eligible to seek election in 2012, the JPE Committee collected information from the North Carolina Board of Elections. A total of 168 judges – 17 in Superior Court and 151 in District Court – were included in the survey.

A list was compiled of the more than 20,000 attorneys having an active North Carolina law license, and email addresses for approximately 95% of those attorneys were obtained. Attorneys with email addresses were able to participate in the survey online via an electronic invitation from BDO USA.

The JPE Committee recognized that some attorneys did not have email addresses and some would not want to take the survey online. Accordingly, the JPE Committee identified the following groups and mailed each of them a paper version of the survey: (a) attorneys working for the government, including judges, clerks of court, district attorneys and public defenders, (b) attorneys without email addresses, and (c) members of the North Carolina Bar Association's Senior Lawyers Division. Paper surveys were also available upon request. Overall, more than 3,000 paper surveys were distributed during the survey period.

In the first week of May 2011, BDO USA distributed the survey electronically to each attorney with a known email address. Paper surveys were mailed with an enclosed business reply envelope addressed to and returned directly to BDO USA, who had exclusive access to manage the survey. All the survey responses were directed to BDO USA, which ensured that each respondent was an eligible attorney and safeguarded against the possibility of multiple responses from one individual.

The survey was open for participation during May. BDO USA compiled the survey results for Professor Nelson who conducted a statistical analysis. Professor Nelson received anonymous raw data from the survey, which did not identify the judges. Upon review of the data, Professor Nelson reported that the results were statistically valid for each judge included in the survey and that he did not consider an adjustment for non-response necessary in this case due to the high response rate.

PREFACE, CONTINUED

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Four thousand two hundred and seventy-eight unique attorney respondents provided more than 27,700 individual evaluations of judges. The response is substantial, especially when one takes into account the large number of attorneys, particularly those who practice in metropolitan areas, who do not engage in litigation and, therefore, do not have any professional contact with judges.

The total number of responses per judge varied, reflecting variation in the length of past service of the judge as well as, especially for District Court judges, the total number of attorneys who practice in the particular county or judicial district in which the judge presides. For example, a resident judge in a judicial district with a low number of attorneys may have received what seems to be a low overall number of responses, but the total number of responses constitutes a significant percentage of the total number of attorneys practicing in that judicial district.

JUDGES NOT INCLUDED IN REPORT

The number of judges included in this report is lower than the number of judges in the May survey. Results for judges are not included if a judge is deceased or made a public announcement by December 27, 2011, that he or she will not seek election to any judicial office in 2012. If an omitted judge later decides to file for election, the JPE Committee will include the survey result for that judge on the NCBA web page and in any subsequent publication reporting the survey results and accessible to the public.

The reasons for decisions by those judges to retire from the bench vary and do not reflect the rating any judge may have received in the May survey.

Since the survey was conducted, a few vacancies have occurred on the bench, which have been filled by appointment of the Governor. Other vacancies will occur before the election in November 2012 and likewise will be filled by appointment. Those new judges will stand for election in 2012 but, obviously, were not included in the May survey and are not included in this report. No effort will be made to provide evaluations of those judges or of their challengers before the election in 2012.

NAVIGATING THIS REPORT

The information in this report is set out in two distinct sections.

The first section sets forth the summary results for each Superior Court and District Court judge evaluated in the survey who is included in the report. The information in this first section reports the average numerical rating given by attorneys for each of the six categories for which the judge was evaluated.

The second section provides individual results for each Superior Court and District Court judge included in the report. The information in this section reports the total number of responses provided by attorneys for the judge and a breakdown of the number of responses under each rating from 5 (Excellent) to 1 (Poor).

In both sections, the Superior Court judges are listed first and then the District Court judges, in order by the number of his or her judicial district and in alphabetical order within the district for those districts with two or more judges.

SURVEY OF NON-INCUMBENT CHALLENGERS

A separate survey evaluating the qualifications of each challenger who files for election against an incumbent judge included in this report will be conducted in March 2012 by the AOJ Committee and released in April 2012. Those results, combined with the results in this report, will be compiled in an online voter's guide that will be posted on the NCBA website.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES						
JUDGE NAME (DISTRICT)	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
ALMA L. HINTON (6A)	4.41	4.14	4.49	4.42	4.38	4.32
CY A. GRANT (6B)	4.46	4.43	4.47	4.40	4.40	4.41
ABRAHAM P. JONES (10A)	3.83	3.24	3.81	3.56	2.97	3.30
MICHAEL R. MORGAN (10A)	4.47	4.10	4.64	4.39	4.15	4.27
DONALD W. STEPHENS (10D)	4.44	4.68	4.47	4.48	4.64	4.51
ORLANDO F. HUDSON JR. (14A)	4.05	4.03	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.03
JAMES G. BELL (16B)	4.06	3.78	4.19	3.90	3.94	3.93
ROBERT F. FLOYD JR. (16B)	4.36	4.24	4.48	4.40	4.35	4.31
JOSEPH E. TURNER* (18E)	4.49	4.57	4.59	4.51	4.47	4.50
LOGAN T. BURKE (21D)	3.20	3.09	3.00	3.36	3.20	3.01
YVONNE M. EVANS (26A)	4.34	4.16	4.48	4.29	4.27	4.26
LINWOOD O. FOUST (26A)	3.51	2.73	3.44	3.05	2.92	2.92
ROBERT T. SUMNER (27A)	4.49	4.35	4.58	4.46	4.34	4.41

* Judge Turner served on the District Court until March 2011 when he was appointed to the Superior Court. He received evaluations as both a District and Superior Court judge. All results are combined into this single listing.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 1						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
EDGAR L. BARNES	3.43	3.25	3.68	3.62	3.63	3.38
AMBER DAVIS-MALARNEY	4.02	4.18	4.13	4.31	4.21	4.13

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 2						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
CHRISTOPHER B. McLENDON	4.54	4.43	4.67	4.60	4.50	4.54
MICHAEL A. PAUL	4.06	4.16	4.08	4.02	4.10	4.01

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
GEORGE GALEN BRADDY	4.36	4.16	4.42	4.40	4.25	4.29
DAVID A. LEECH	4.68	4.70	4.74	4.54	4.58	4.66
CHARLES M. VINCENT	4.18	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.15	4.24

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
KAREN A. ALEXANDER	3.97	3.83	3.97	4.03	4.12	3.88
PETER MACK JR.	3.92	3.86	3.78	4.02	3.84	3.83
L. WALTER MILLS	4.73	4.52	4.74	4.60	4.61	4.61
PAUL M. QUINN	4.13	4.08	4.21	4.37	4.34	4.15
CHERYL LYNN SPENCER	4.25	3.75	4.09	3.53	3.53	3.69

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
WILLIAM M. CAMERON III	4.79	4.71	4.79	4.76	4.68	4.76
LOUIS FOWLER FOY JR.	4.47	4.29	4.49	4.46	4.41	4.46
CAROL A. JONES (WILSON)	3.60	3.33	3.57	3.45	3.37	3.46
JAMES L. MOORE JR.	4.51	4.64	4.42	4.55	4.48	4.53
HENRY L. STEVENS IV	4.56	4.51	4.68	4.64	4.64	4.64
LEONARD W. THAGARD	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.26	4.47	4.38

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 5						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
JULIUS H. CORPENING II	4.63	4.71	4.62	4.57	4.59	4.63
SANDRA RAY CRINER	3.64	3.71	3.48	3.80	3.79	3.54
RICHARD RUSSELL DAVIS	4.46	4.23	4.46	4.37	4.32	4.33
JEFF NOECKER	4.22	4.13	4.26	4.00	4.14	4.07

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
BRENDA G. BRANCH	3.88	3.57	3.77	3.79	3.95	3.70
TERESA ROBINSON FREEMAN	4.26	4.55	4.10	4.52	4.04	4.29
W. TURNER STEPHENSON III	4.57	4.46	4.61	4.54	4.16	4.57

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
THOMAS R. NEWBERN	4.62	4.51	4.60	4.60	4.55	4.51

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 7						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
JOHN M. BRITT	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.11	4.28
ANTHONY (TONY) W. BROWN	4.37	4.23	4.48	4.29	4.18	4.31
JOHN J. COVOLO	4.49	4.34	4.36	4.39	4.05	4.37
WILLIAM CHARLES FARRIS	4.78	4.80	4.83	4.84	4.79	4.80
WILLIAM G. STEWART	4.62	4.50	4.72	4.58	4.54	4.62

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
DAVID B. BRANTLEY	4.45	4.56	4.53	4.47	4.57	4.49
LONNIE W. CARRAWAY	4.25	3.89	3.91	4.00	3.61	3.87
TIMOTHY I. FINAN	4.55	4.60	4.52	4.50	4.38	4.49
CHARLES P. GAYLOR III	4.34	3.75	4.45	4.23	4.24	3.99
ROBERT LESLIE TURNER	3.96	3.99	3.96	4.00	3.97	3.90

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
S. QUON BRIDGES	3.93	3.60	3.83	3.91	3.73	3.74
JOHN W. DAVIS	4.76	4.78	4.79	4.74	4.66	4.75
DANIEL F. FINCH	4.03	4.20	4.11	4.14	4.11	4.14
CAROLYN J. YANCEY	3.46	3.27	3.48	3.63	3.47	3.31

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
LLOYD MICHAEL GENTRY	3.53	3.58	3.45	3.62	3.76	3.49

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
RANDOLPH BASKERVILLE	3.99	3.91	4.13	4.16	3.95	4.03

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
MONICA M. BOUSMAN	3.93	3.96	3.86	3.96	4.08	3.85
JACQUELINE L. BREWER	3.87	3.72	4.11	3.97	3.86	3.82
ERIC CRAIG CHASSE	4.50	4.33	4.71	4.57	4.49	4.47
LORI GRUNDY CHRISTIAN	4.48	4.22	4.53	4.50	4.36	4.39
JENNIFER MILLER GREEN	3.77	4.09	3.63	3.82	4.03	3.77
JENNIFER J. KNOX	3.95	4.13	4.02	4.06	4.12	4.03
ROBERT B. RADER	4.84	4.76	4.88	4.81	4.81	4.83
DEBRA ANN SASSER	4.11	4.22	4.06	4.16	4.25	4.07
CHRISTINE M. WALCZYK	4.33	4.14	4.43	4.23	4.19	4.18
ANNA ELEANA WORLEY	3.71	3.20	3.43	3.29	2.84	3.16

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
ROBERT W. BRYANT JR.	4.75	4.79	4.80	4.74	4.74	4.78
CHARLES PATRICK BULLOCK	3.95	3.81	3.76	3.95	3.94	3.83
RESSON O. FAIRCLOTH II	4.21	4.00	4.17	4.17	4.16	4.13
PAUL A. HOLCOMBE	4.32	4.11	4.28	4.14	4.12	4.15
JACQUELYN L. LEE	4.09	3.97	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.09
JIMMY L. LOVE JR.	4.59	4.48	4.72	4.63	4.59	4.61
R. DALE STUBBS	4.48	4.23	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.35
OWEN (HENRY) WILLIS JR.	4.27	4.32	4.17	4.18	4.12	4.21

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 12						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
LAURA A. DEVAN	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.24	4.13	4.14
JOHN W. DICKSON	3.96	4.18	4.00	4.04	4.00	3.98
EDWARD A. PONE	4.59	4.53	4.62	4.58	4.46	4.53

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 13						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
NAPOLEON B. BAREFOOT JR.	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.19	4.34	4.17
JERRY ARNOLD JOLLY	4.01	4.25	4.02	3.79	4.19	4.04
SCOTT L. USSERY	4.19	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.32	4.20
MARION R. WARREN	3.90	4.09	3.76	4.15	3.94	3.98

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 14						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
WILLIAM ANDREW MARSH III	3.49	3.43	3.48	3.57	3.67	3.35

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
DAVID THOMAS LAMBETH JR.	4.48	4.37	4.55	4.47	4.24	4.43
KATHRYN WHITAKER OVERBY	4.42	4.02	4.50	4.36	4.11	4.16
JAMES K. ROBERSON	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.50	4.06	4.41

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
CHARLES T. L. ANDERSON	4.54	4.60	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.44
LUNSFORD LONG	4.10	4.25	4.13	4.20	4.07	4.05
BEVERLY A. SCARLETT	3.99	3.88	4.03	4.07	3.95	3.91

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
JOHN H. HORNE	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.51	4.28	4.30

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
JUDITH MILSAP DANIELS	4.13	3.97	4.25	4.03	3.93	4.03
WILLIAM JEFFREY MOORE	3.38	3.44	3.52	3.39	3.39	3.34

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 17A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
JAMES A. GROGAN	4.55	4.53	4.76	4.64	4.63	4.59

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 17B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
WILLIAM F. SOUTHERN III	4.30	4.05	4.50	4.32	4.40	4.22

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
SHERRY FOWLER ALLOWAY	4.09	3.79	3.88	3.82	3.87	3.81
SUSAN E. BRAY	4.17	4.41	4.04	4.16	4.29	4.20
BETTY J. BROWN	4.30	3.64	4.42	4.21	3.89	4.02
SUSAN R. BURCH	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.43	4.20	4.33
AVERY MICHELLE CRUMP	3.27	3.21	3.11	3.12	3.44	3.03
KIMBERLY MICHELLE FLETCHER	4.38	4.21	4.48	4.46	4.13	4.33
ANGELA C. FOSTER	3.47	3.08	3.34	3.55	3.28	3.29
WILLIAM K. (PETE) HUNTER	4.30	4.06	4.43	4.27	4.07	4.24
JAN H. SAMET	4.54	4.34	4.69	4.55	4.31	4.43
POLLY D. SIZEMORE	3.85	3.91	3.31	3.28	3.39	3.42
TERESA H. VINCENT	4.63	4.53	4.70	4.55	4.54	4.58

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
DONALD (SKIPPER) CREED JR.	3.46	3.19	3.31	3.45	3.46	3.25
JAMES P. (JIMMY) HILL	4.54	4.30	4.46	4.35	3.83	4.40
ROBERT M. WILKINS	3.09	2.80	2.99	3.16	3.12	2.88

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19C						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
R. MARSHALL BICKETT JR.	3.76	3.86	3.64	3.71	3.35	3.65

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
LISA D. THACKER	4.55	4.57	4.59	4.58	4.60	4.56
AMANDA L. WILSON	4.42	3.69	4.37	4.32	4.14	4.09

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
HUNT GWYN	4.52	4.28	4.58	4.43	4.44	4.46

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20C						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
STEPHEN HIGDON	4.68	4.50	4.62	4.63	4.49	4.57
JOSEPH J. WILLIAMS	4.10	4.12	3.66	3.63	4.06	3.85

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20D						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
WILLIAM F. (TRIPP) HELMS	3.67	3.69	3.64	3.60	3.35	3.61

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
CAMILLE D. BANKS-PAYNE	4.21	4.10	4.21	4.24	4.21	4.13
CHESTER C. DAVIS	3.98	4.22	3.77	3.85	4.10	3.93
LAWRENCE J. (LARRY) FINE	4.58	4.52	4.65	4.53	4.40	4.54
WILLIAM T. GRAHAM JR.	4.04	3.85	4.14	4.24	4.05	4.07
LAURIE L. HUTCHINS	3.75	3.67	3.84	3.95	3.83	3.72
WILLIAM B. REINGOLD	4.23	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.23	4.28
VICTORIA L. ROEMER	3.48	2.99	3.49	3.44	3.45	3.26

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 22A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
DEBORAH BROWN	3.28	3.52	3.25	3.58	3.58	3.32
LAWRENCE DALE GRAHAM	4.73	4.58	4.78	4.71	4.72	4.68
EDWARD L. HEDRICK IV	4.45	4.39	4.49	4.32	4.32	4.37
CHRISTINE UNDERWOOD	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.42	4.35	4.23

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 23						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
JEANIE REAVIS HOUSTON	4.00	3.67	3.77	3.95	3.65	3.72

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 24						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
R. GREGORY HORNE	4.69	4.59	4.81	4.78	4.69	4.68
ROY ALEXANDER LYERLY	4.49	4.45	4.58	4.37	4.41	4.45
TED McENTIRE	4.39	4.53	4.36	4.33	4.49	4.35

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 25						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
BURFORD A. CHERRY	4.54	4.40	4.47	4.43	4.36	4.45
J. GARY DELLINGER	4.31	4.14	4.26	4.25	4.18	4.24

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
KIMBERLY Y. BEST	3.63	3.51	3.61	3.74	3.78	3.54
CHARLOTTE BROWN-WILLIAMS	3.64	2.85	3.53	3.47	3.27	3.15
RONALD L. CHAPMAN	4.51	4.52	4.56	4.44	4.19	4.46
JENA P. CULLER	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.28	4.24	4.26
KAREN EADY-WILLIAMS	4.35	4.25	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.30
TYYAWDI M. HANDS	4.49	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.33	4.37
DONNIE HOOVER	4.35	3.75	4.31	3.86	3.25	3.85
CHRISTY TOWNLEY MANN	4.21	4.45	4.12	4.37	4.34	4.27
THOMAS F. MOORE JR.	3.27	3.72	3.39	3.23	3.73	3.33
JOHN TOTTEN	1.98	2.27	2.00	2.49	2.29	2.03
ELIZABETH THORNTON TROSCH	4.29	4.14	4.37	4.10	4.03	4.19
LOUIS A. TROSCH JR.	4.24	4.36	4.12	4.14	4.16	4.24

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
RICHARD B. ABERNETHY	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.43	4.20	4.26
JOHN K. GREENLEE	4.15	4.23	3.94	4.15	4.10	4.06
ANGELA G. HOYLE	3.35	3.53	3.21	3.60	3.17	3.30
JAMES A. JACKSON	4.33	4.24	4.36	4.26	4.19	4.24
THOMAS G. TAYLOR	3.81	3.74	3.91	4.18	4.00	3.89

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
KELVIN DEAN BLACK	4.29	4.11	4.29	3.93	3.63	3.97
ANNA F. FOSTER	4.51	4.57	4.43	4.60	4.47	4.55
MEREDITH A. SHUFORD	3.81	3.75	4.02	4.06	3.88	3.81
LARRY JAMES WILSON	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.29	4.27	4.41

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 28						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
ANDREA DRAY	4.76	4.52	4.84	4.73	4.51	4.65
J. CALVIN HILL	4.42	4.29	4.50	4.21	4.18	4.31

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 29B						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
THOMAS McAVOY BRITAIN JR.	4.46	4.27	4.47	4.32	4.42	4.36
ATHENA F. BROOKS	4.35	4.45	4.43	4.44	4.40	4.43
DAVID KENNEDY FOX	4.36	4.37	4.35	4.37	4.25	4.28
PETER KNIGHT	4.27	3.79	4.39	4.03	3.92	3.99

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 30						
JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
RICHLYN D. HOLT	4.84	4.78	4.78	4.74	4.73	4.78
MONICA HAYES LESLIE	4.50	4.33	4.43	4.52	4.16	4.42
RICHARD K. WALKER	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.60	4.60	4.57

INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS

JUDGE ALMA L. HINTON • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	296	193 (65.2%)	62 (20.9%)	21 (7.1%)	8 (2.7%)	12 (4.1%)	4.41
Legal Ability	292	142 (48.6%)	91 (31.2%)	30 (10.3%)	15 (5.1%)	14 (4.8%)	4.14
Professionalism	298	203 (68.1%)	61 (20.5%)	18 (6.0%)	8 (2.7%)	8 (2.7%)	4.49
Communication	295	182 (61.7%)	75 (25.4%)	24 (8.1%)	8 (2.7%)	6 (2.0%)	4.42
Administrative Skills	235	139 (59.1%)	64 (27.2%)	18 (7.7%)	11 (4.7%)	3 (1.3%)	4.38
Overall Performance	292	176 (60.3%)	69 (23.6%)	22 (7.5%)	15 (5.1%)	10 (3.4%)	4.32

JUDGE CY A. GRANT • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	300	193 (64.3%)	69 (23.0%)	26 (8.7%)	7 (2.3%)	5 (1.7%)	4.46
Legal Ability	297	179 (60.3%)	78 (26.3%)	30 (10.1%)	8 (2.7%)	2 (0.7%)	4.43
Professionalism	299	195 (65.2%)	66 (22.1%)	25 (8.4%)	9 (3.0%)	4 (1.3%)	4.47
Communication	298	174 (58.4%)	84 (28.2%)	29 (9.7%)	8 (2.7%)	3 (1.0%)	4.40
Administrative Skills	231	133 (57.6%)	64 (27.7%)	29 (12.6%)	4 (1.7%)	1 (0.4%)	4.40
Overall Performance	299	176 (58.9%)	83 (27.8%)	31 (10.4%)	6 (2.0%)	3 (1.0%)	4.41

JUDGE ABRAHAM P. JONES • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	688	267 (38.8%)	173 (25.1%)	146 (21.2%)	70 (10.2%)	32 (4.7%)	3.83
Legal Ability	690	169 (24.5%)	142 (20.6%)	153 (22.2%)	135 (19.6%)	91 (13.2%)	3.24
Professionalism	687	256 (37.3%)	191 (27.8%)	131 (19.1%)	71 (10.3%)	38 (5.5%)	3.81
Communication	683	188 (27.5%)	187 (27.4%)	176 (25.8%)	84 (12.3%)	48 (7.0%)	3.56
Administrative Skills	552	107 (19.4%)	94 (17.0%)	141 (25.5%)	96 (17.4%)	114 (20.7%)	2.97
Overall Performance	683	170 (24.9%)	150 (22.0%)	159 (23.3%)	124 (18.2%)	80 (11.7%)	3.30

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, CONTINUED

JUDGE MICHAEL R. MORGAN • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	502	314 (62.5%)	132 (26.3%)	40 (8.0%)	10 (2.0%)	6 (1.2%)	4.47
Legal Ability	498	220 (44.2%)	153 (30.7%)	88 (17.7%)	27 (5.4%)	10 (2.0%)	4.10
Professionalism	503	367 (73.0%)	103 (20.5%)	26 (5.2%)	2 (0.4%)	5 (1.0%)	4.64
Communication	500	270 (54.0%)	170 (34.0%)	48 (9.6%)	7 (1.4%)	5 (1.0%)	4.39
Administrative Skills	394	183 (46.4%)	123 (31.2%)	63 (16.0%)	15 (3.8%)	10 (2.5%)	4.15
Overall Performance	496	246 (49.6%)	166 (33.5%)	63 (12.7%)	16 (3.2%)	5 (1.0%)	4.27

JUDGE DONALD W. STEPHENS • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10D							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	924	614 (66.5%)	189 (20.5%)	64 (6.9%)	30 (3.2%)	27 (2.9%)	4.44
Legal Ability	922	699 (75.8%)	166 (18.0%)	44 (4.8%)	7 (0.8%)	6 (0.7%)	4.68
Professionalism	921	618 (67.1%)	194 (21.2%)	54 (5.9%)	33 (3.6%)	22 (2.4%)	4.47
Communication	912	573 (62.8%)	252 (27.6%)	55 (6.0%)	20 (2.2%)	12 (1.3%)	4.48
Administrative Skills	803	580 (72.2%)	169 (21.0%)	44 (5.5%)	6 (0.7%)	4 (0.5%)	4.64
Overall Performance	908	620 (68.3%)	194 (21.4%)	54 (5.9%)	21 (2.3%)	19 (2.1%)	4.51

JUDGE ORLANDO F. HUDSON JR. • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 14A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	647	325 (50.2%)	154 (23.8%)	89 (13.8%)	36 (5.6%)	43 (6.6%)	4.05
Legal Ability	652	289 (44.3%)	190 (29.1%)	104 (16.0%)	40 (6.1%)	29 (4.4%)	4.03
Professionalism	649	338 (52.1%)	159 (24.5%)	81 (12.5%)	42 (6.5%)	29 (4.5%)	4.13
Communication	643	297 (46.2%)	183 (28.5%)	101 (15.7%)	38 (5.9%)	24 (3.7%)	4.07
Administrative Skills	516	232 (45.0%)	150 (29.1%)	88 (17.1%)	24 (4.7%)	22 (4.3%)	4.06
Overall Performance	638	289 (45.3%)	187 (29.3%)	86 (13.5%)	41 (6.4%)	35 (5.5%)	4.03

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, CONTINUED

JUDGE JAMES G. BELL • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	143	71 (49.7%)	34 (23.8%)	21 (14.7%)	9 (6.3%)	8 (5.6%)	4.06
Legal Ability	140	43 (30.7%)	47 (33.6%)	31 (22.1%)	14 (10.0%)	5 (3.6%)	3.78
Professionalism	139	72 (51.8%)	37 (26.6%)	21 (15.1%)	3 (2.2%)	6 (4.3%)	4.19
Communication	140	51 (36.4%)	48 (34.3%)	24 (17.1%)	10 (7.1%)	7 (5.0%)	3.90
Administrative Skills	115	41 (35.7%)	42 (36.5%)	22 (19.1%)	4 (3.5%)	6 (5.2%)	3.94
Overall Performance	140	54 (38.6%)	45 (32.1%)	24 (17.1%)	11 (7.9%)	6 (4.3%)	3.93

JUDGE ROBERT F. FLOYD JR. • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	201	124 (61.7%)	47 (23.4%)	16 (8.0%)	7 (3.5%)	7 (3.5%)	4.36
Legal Ability	197	101 (51.3%)	65 (33.0%)	16 (8.1%)	8 (4.1%)	7 (3.6%)	4.24
Professionalism	200	131 (65.5%)	46 (23.0%)	15 (7.5%)	4 (2.0%)	4 (2.0%)	4.48
Communication	198	114 (57.6%)	58 (29.3%)	21 (10.6%)	2 (1.0%)	3 (1.5%)	4.40
Administrative Skills	168	92 (54.8%)	50 (29.8%)	21 (12.5%)	3 (1.8%)	2 (1.2%)	4.35
Overall Performance	196	108 (55.1%)	56 (28.6%)	21 (10.7%)	7 (3.6%)	4 (2.0%)	4.31

JUDGE JOSEPH E. TURNER* • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18E							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	269	198 (73.6%)	34 (12.6%)	20 (7.4%)	5 (1.9%)	12 (4.5%)	4.49
Legal Ability	267	198 (74.2%)	44 (16.5%)	12 (4.5%)	5 (1.9%)	8 (3.0%)	4.57
Professionalism	270	210 (77.8%)	34 (12.6%)	13 (4.8%)	2 (0.7%)	11 (4.1%)	4.59
Communication	269	188 (69.9%)	49 (18.2%)	20 (7.4%)	5 (1.9%)	7 (2.6%)	4.51
Administrative Skills	251	170 (67.7%)	49 (19.5%)	19 (7.6%)	6 (2.4%)	7 (2.8%)	4.47
Overall Performance	266	189 (71.1%)	45 (16.9%)	17 (6.4%)	7 (2.6%)	8 (3.0%)	4.50

*Judge Turner served on the District Court until March 2011 when he was appointed to the Superior Court. He received evaluations as both a District and Superior Court judge. All results are combined into this single listing.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, CONTINUED

JUDGE LOGAN T. BURKE • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21D							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	294	69 (23.5%)	62 (21.1%)	67 (22.8%)	50 (17.0%)	46 (15.6%)	3.20
Legal Ability	293	53 (18.1%)	64 (21.8%)	82 (28.0%)	44 (15.0%)	50 (17.1%)	3.09
Professionalism	295	59 (20.0%)	53 (18.0%)	67 (22.7%)	60 (20.3%)	56 (19.0%)	3.00
Communication	289	69 (23.9%)	64 (22.1%)	86 (29.8%)	42 (14.5%)	28 (9.7%)	3.36
Administrative Skills	230	44 (19.1%)	55 (23.9%)	66 (28.7%)	34 (14.8%)	31 (13.5%)	3.20
Overall Performance	293	57 (19.5%)	56 (19.1%)	69 (23.5%)	56 (19.1%)	55 (18.8%)	3.01

JUDGE YVONNE M. EVANS • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	480	302 (62.9%)	89 (18.5%)	55 (11.5%)	18 (3.8%)	16 (3.3%)	4.34
Legal Ability	478	237 (49.6%)	137 (28.7%)	64 (13.4%)	22 (4.6%)	18 (3.8%)	4.16
Professionalism	480	331 (69.0%)	82 (17.1%)	43 (9.0%)	12 (2.5%)	12 (2.5%)	4.48
Communication	476	261 (54.8%)	131 (27.5%)	58 (12.2%)	15 (3.2%)	11 (2.3%)	4.29
Administrative Skills	381	204 (53.5%)	110 (28.9%)	46 (12.1%)	9 (2.4%)	12 (3.1%)	4.27
Overall Performance	476	258 (54.2%)	132 (27.7%)	53 (11.1%)	20 (4.2%)	13 (2.7%)	4.26

JUDGE LINWOOD O. FOUST • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	386	106 (27.5%)	101 (26.2%)	98 (25.4%)	45 (11.7%)	36 (9.3%)	3.51
Legal Ability	383	60 (15.7%)	55 (14.4%)	93 (24.3%)	70 (18.3%)	105 (27.4%)	2.73
Professionalism	388	104 (26.8%)	99 (25.5%)	99 (25.5%)	35 (9.0%)	51 (13.1%)	3.44
Communication	384	69 (18.0%)	77 (20.1%)	111 (28.9%)	59 (15.4%)	68 (17.7%)	3.05
Administrative Skills	279	48 (17.2%)	50 (17.9%)	70 (25.1%)	53 (19.0%)	58 (20.8%)	2.92
Overall Performance	379	63 (16.6%)	75 (19.8%)	89 (23.5%)	74 (19.5%)	78 (20.6%)	2.92

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, CONTINUED

JUDGE ROBERT T. SUMNER • SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	201	130 (64.7%)	52 (25.9%)	11 (5.5%)	3 (1.5%)	5 (2.5%)	4.49
Legal Ability	197	107 (54.3%)	63 (32.0%)	19 (9.6%)	4 (2.0%)	4 (2.0%)	4.35
Professionalism	197	140 (71.1%)	41 (20.8%)	10 (5.1%)	2 (1.0%)	4 (2.0%)	4.58
Communication	195	121 (62.1%)	52 (26.7%)	16 (8.2%)	2 (1.0%)	4 (2.1%)	4.46
Administrative Skills	160	86 (53.8%)	53 (33.1%)	15 (9.4%)	2 (1.3%)	4 (2.5%)	4.34
Overall Performance	199	116 (58.3%)	60 (30.2%)	16 (8.0%)	3 (1.5%)	4 (2.0%)	4.41

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS
DISTRICT 1**

JUDGE EDGAR L. BARNES • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 1							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	114	31 (27.2%)	29 (25.4%)	24 (21.2%)	18 (15.8%)	12 (10.5%)	3.43
Legal Ability	114	22 (19.3%)	29 (25.4%)	33 (28.9%)	16 (14.0%)	14 (12.3%)	3.25
Professionalism	114	34 (29.8%)	33 (28.9%)	31 (27.2%)	8 (7.0%)	8 (7.0%)	3.68
Communication	114	28 (24.6%)	35 (30.7%)	37 (32.5%)	8 (7.0%)	6 (5.3%)	3.62
Administrative Skills	91	23 (25.3%)	26 (28.6%)	31 (34.1%)	7 (7.7%)	4 (4.4%)	3.63
Overall Performance	112	27 (24.1%)	25 (22.3%)	33 (29.5%)	18 (16.1%)	9 (8.0%)	3.38

JUDGE AMBER DAVIS-MALARNEY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 1							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	105	49 (46.7%)	28 (26.7%)	13 (12.4%)	11 (10.5%)	4 (3.8%)	4.02
Legal Ability	102	46 (45.1%)	37 (36.3%)	14 (13.7%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (3.9%)	4.18
Professionalism	102	54 (52.9%)	23 (22.5%)	13 (12.7%)	8 (7.8%)	4 (3.9%)	4.13
Communication	102	56 (54.9%)	30 (29.4%)	10 (9.8%)	4 (3.9%)	2 (2.0%)	4.31
Administrative Skills	85	43 (50.6%)	25 (29.4%)	11 (12.9%)	4 (4.7%)	2 (2.4%)	4.21
Overall Performance	103	49 (47.6%)	33 (32.0%)	11 (10.7%)	5 (4.9%)	5 (4.9%)	4.13

DISTRICT 2

JUDGE CHRISTOPHER B. McLENDON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 2							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	96	62 (64.6%)	27 (28.1%)	5 (5.2%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.54
Legal Ability	97	55 (56.7%)	31 (32.0%)	9 (9.3%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.43
Professionalism	97	72 (74.2%)	20 (20.6%)	3 (3.1%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.67
Communication	97	67 (69.1%)	22 (22.7%)	7 (7.2%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Administrative Skills	76	47 (61.8%)	21 (27.6%)	7 (9.2%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	4.50
Overall Performance	96	61 (63.5%)	28 (29.2%)	5 (5.2%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.54

JUDGE MICHAEL A. PAUL • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 2							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	87	45 (51.7%)	18 (20.7%)	12 (13.8%)	8 (9.2%)	4 (4.6%)	4.06
Legal Ability	89	42 (47.2%)	29 (32.6%)	10 (11.2%)	6 (6.7%)	2 (2.2%)	4.16
Professionalism	89	45 (50.6%)	23 (25.8%)	11 (12.4%)	3 (3.4%)	7 (7.9%)	4.08
Communication	89	41 (46.1%)	25 (28.1%)	12 (13.5%)	6 (6.7%)	5 (5.6%)	4.02
Administrative Skills	79	39 (49.4%)	20 (25.3%)	13 (16.5%)	3 (3.8%)	4 (5.1%)	4.10
Overall Performance	89	41 (46.1%)	24 (27.0%)	15 (16.9%)	2 (2.2%)	7 (7.9%)	4.01

DISTRICT 3A

JUDGE GEORGE GALEN BRADY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	149	98 (65.8%)	25 (16.8%)	13 (8.7%)	7 (4.7%)	6 (4.0%)	4.36
Legal Ability	149	79 (53.0%)	33 (22.1%)	23 (15.4%)	10 (6.7%)	4 (2.7%)	4.16
Professionalism	149	98 (65.8%)	27 (18.1%)	16 (10.7%)	5 (3.4%)	3 (2.0%)	4.42
Communication	149	91 (61.1%)	36 (24.2%)	16 (10.7%)	3 (2.0%)	3 (2.0%)	4.40
Administrative Skills	122	73 (59.8%)	26 (21.3%)	10 (8.2%)	7 (5.7%)	6 (4.9%)	4.25
Overall Performance	149	89 (59.7%)	32 (21.5%)	17 (11.4%)	4 (2.7%)	7 (4.7%)	4.29

JUDGE DAVID A. LEECH • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	152	124 (81.6%)	17 (11.2%)	4 (2.6%)	5 (3.3%)	2 (1.3%)	4.68
Legal Ability	151	116 (76.8%)	25 (16.6%)	9 (6.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	4.70
Professionalism	150	125 (83.3%)	15 (10.0%)	6 (4.0%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.74
Communication	149	97 (65.1%)	40 (26.8%)	8 (5.4%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (0.7%)	4.54
Administrative Skills	142	101 (71.1%)	29 (20.4%)	7 (4.9%)	3 (2.1%)	2 (1.4%)	4.58
Overall Performance	152	114 (75.0%)	27 (17.8%)	8 (5.3%)	3 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	4.66

JUDGE CHARLES M. VINCENT • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	148	91 (61.5%)	25 (16.9%)	14 (9.5%)	4 (2.7%)	14 (9.5%)	4.18
Legal Ability	147	86 (58.5%)	36 (24.5%)	14 (9.5%)	8 (5.4%)	3 (2.0%)	4.32
Professionalism	147	96 (65.3%)	22 (15.0%)	13 (8.8%)	9 (6.1%)	7 (4.8%)	4.30
Communication	145	86 (59.3%)	38 (26.2%)	11 (7.6%)	6 (4.1%)	4 (2.8%)	4.35
Administrative Skills	118	67 (56.8%)	21 (17.8%)	18 (15.3%)	5 (4.2%)	7 (5.9%)	4.15
Overall Performance	145	88 (60.7%)	27 (18.6%)	13 (9.0%)	11 (7.6%)	6 (4.1%)	4.24

DISTRICT 3B

JUDGE KAREN A. ALEXANDER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	115	53 (46.1%)	23 (20.0%)	26 (22.6%)	8 (7.0%)	5 (4.3%)	3.97
Legal Ability	114	42 (36.8%)	29 (25.4%)	29 (25.4%)	9 (7.9%)	5 (4.4%)	3.83
Professionalism	116	52 (44.8%)	24 (20.7%)	26 (22.4%)	12 (10.3%)	2 (1.7%)	3.97
Communication	116	50 (43.1%)	30 (25.9%)	27 (23.3%)	7 (6.0%)	2 (1.7%)	4.03
Administrative Skills	91	43 (47.3%)	24 (26.4%)	18 (19.8%)	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.2%)	4.12
Overall Performance	116	47 (40.5%)	26 (22.4%)	29 (25.0%)	10 (8.6%)	4 (3.4%)	3.88

JUDGE PETER MACK JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	104	47 (45.2%)	22 (21.2%)	22 (21.2%)	6 (5.8%)	7 (6.7%)	3.92
Legal Ability	101	38 (37.6%)	28 (27.7%)	24 (23.8%)	5 (5.0%)	6 (5.9%)	3.86
Professionalism	101	41 (40.6%)	18 (17.8%)	27 (26.7%)	9 (8.9%)	6 (5.9%)	3.78
Communication	101	48 (47.5%)	21 (20.8%)	23 (22.8%)	4 (4.0%)	5 (5.0%)	4.02
Administrative Skills	85	34 (40.0%)	18 (21.2%)	21 (24.7%)	9 (10.6%)	3 (3.5%)	3.84
Overall Performance	102	43 (42.2%)	16 (15.7%)	31 (30.4%)	7 (6.9%)	5 (4.9%)	3.83

JUDGE L. WALTER MILLS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	100	80 (80.0%)	15 (15.0%)	4 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.73
Legal Ability	99	63 (63.6%)	26 (26.3%)	9 (9.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.52
Professionalism	99	79 (79.8%)	15 (15.2%)	4 (4.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.74
Communication	99	73 (73.7%)	15 (15.2%)	8 (8.1%)	3 (3.0%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Administrative Skills	84	57 (67.9%)	21 (25.0%)	6 (7.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.61
Overall Performance	99	70 (70.7%)	23 (23.2%)	4 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.0%)	4.61

DISTRICT 3B, CONTINUED

JUDGE PAUL M. QUINN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	125	75 (60.0%)	13 (10.4%)	21 (16.8%)	10 (8.0%)	6 (4.8%)	4.13
Legal Ability	123	64 (52.0%)	28 (22.8%)	14 (11.4%)	11 (8.9%)	6 (4.9%)	4.08
Professionalism	122	69 (56.6%)	21 (17.2%)	22 (18.0%)	8 (6.6%)	2 (1.6%)	4.21
Communication	122	77 (63.1%)	21 (17.2%)	18 (14.8%)	4 (3.3%)	2 (1.6%)	4.37
Administrative Skills	104	65 (62.5%)	16 (15.4%)	17 (16.3%)	5 (4.8%)	1 (1.0%)	4.34
Overall Performance	122	70 (57.4%)	20 (16.4%)	16 (13.1%)	12 (9.8%)	4 (3.3%)	4.15

JUDGE CHERYL LYNN SPENCER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	109	61 (56.0%)	22 (20.2%)	21 (19.3%)	2 (1.8%)	3 (2.8%)	4.25
Legal Ability	108	42 (38.9%)	22 (20.4%)	29 (26.9%)	5 (4.6%)	10 (9.3%)	3.75
Professionalism	107	53 (49.5%)	22 (20.6%)	25 (23.4%)	3 (2.8%)	4 (3.7%)	4.09
Communication	107	34 (31.8%)	23 (21.5%)	26 (24.3%)	14 (13.1%)	10 (9.3%)	3.53
Administrative Skills	90	25 (27.8%)	23 (25.6%)	24 (26.7%)	11 (12.2%)	7 (7.8%)	3.53
Overall Performance	107	34 (31.8%)	30 (28.0%)	27 (25.2%)	8 (7.5%)	8 (7.5%)	3.69

DISTRICT 4

JUDGE WILLIAM M. CAMERON III • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	150	127 (84.7%)	15 (10.0%)	7 (4.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	4.79
Legal Ability	150	115 (76.7%)	27 (18.0%)	7 (4.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	4.71
Professionalism	148	126 (85.1%)	14 (9.5%)	7 (4.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	4.79
Communication	148	120 (81.1%)	21 (14.2%)	7 (4.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.76
Administrative Skills	133	100 (75.2%)	24 (18.0%)	8 (6.0%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	4.68
Overall Performance	147	118 (80.3%)	24 (16.3%)	4 (2.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	4.76

JUDGE LOUIS FOWLER FOY JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	157	110 (70.1%)	27 (17.2%)	8 (5.1%)	8 (5.1%)	4 (2.5%)	4.47
Legal Ability	158	95 (60.1%)	29 (18.4%)	22 (13.9%)	9 (5.7%)	3 (1.9%)	4.29
Professionalism	158	105 (66.5%)	33 (20.9%)	14 (8.9%)	4 (2.5%)	2 (1.3%)	4.49
Communication	156	103 (66.0%)	28 (17.9%)	20 (12.8%)	4 (2.6%)	1 (0.6%)	4.46
Administrative Skills	139	90 (64.7%)	24 (17.3%)	18 (12.9%)	6 (4.3%)	1 (0.7%)	4.41
Overall Performance	156	100 (64.1%)	38 (24.4%)	9 (5.8%)	8 (5.1%)	1 (0.6%)	4.46

JUDGE CAROL A. JONES (WILSON) • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	119	42 (35.3%)	29 (24.4%)	17 (14.3%)	20 (16.8%)	11 (9.2%)	3.60
Legal Ability	120	33 (27.5%)	28 (23.3%)	20 (16.7%)	23 (19.2%)	16 (13.3%)	3.33
Professionalism	119	44 (37.0%)	25 (21.0%)	20 (16.8%)	15 (12.6%)	15 (12.6%)	3.57
Communication	119	39 (32.8%)	23 (19.3%)	22 (18.5%)	23 (19.3%)	12 (10.1%)	3.45
Administrative Skills	102	34 (33.3%)	17 (16.7%)	19 (18.6%)	17 (16.7%)	15 (14.7%)	3.37
Overall Performance	119	37 (31.1%)	24 (20.2%)	25 (21.0%)	23 (19.3%)	10 (8.4%)	3.46

DISTRICT 4, CONTINUED

JUDGE JAMES L. MOORE JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	124	86 (69.4%)	21 (16.9%)	13 (10.5%)	2 (1.6%)	2 (1.6%)	4.51
Legal Ability	125	90 (72.0%)	25 (20.0%)	10 (8.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.64
Professionalism	125	83 (66.4%)	21 (16.8%)	12 (9.6%)	8 (6.4%)	1 (0.8%)	4.42
Communication	124	87 (70.2%)	23 (18.5%)	10 (8.1%)	3 (2.4%)	1 (0.8%)	4.55
Administrative Skills	112	76 (67.9%)	20 (17.9%)	12 (10.7%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (1.8%)	4.48
Overall Performance	123	85 (69.1%)	22 (17.9%)	13 (10.6%)	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	4.53

JUDGE HENRY L. STEVENS IV • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	159	121 (76.1%)	19 (11.9%)	12 (7.5%)	1 (0.6%)	6 (3.8%)	4.56
Legal Ability	158	110 (69.6%)	26 (16.5%)	17 (10.8%)	3 (1.9%)	2 (1.3%)	4.51
Professionalism	158	125 (79.1%)	18 (11.4%)	13 (8.2%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	4.68
Communication	158	119 (75.3%)	23 (14.6%)	15 (9.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)	4.64
Administrative Skills	139	107 (77.0%)	16 (11.5%)	15 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	4.64
Overall Performance	157	120 (76.4%)	21 (13.4%)	13 (8.3%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)	4.64

JUDGE LEONARD W. THAGARD • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 4							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	130	85 (65.4%)	21 (16.2%)	16 (12.3%)	4 (3.1%)	4 (3.1%)	4.38
Legal Ability	131	84 (64.1%)	28 (21.4%)	11 (8.4%)	5 (3.8%)	3 (2.3%)	4.41
Professionalism	131	86 (65.6%)	24 (18.3%)	11 (8.4%)	8 (6.1%)	2 (1.5%)	4.41
Communication	130	78 (60.0%)	20 (15.4%)	21 (16.2%)	10 (7.7%)	1 (0.8%)	4.26
Administrative Skills	125	83 (66.4%)	23 (18.4%)	14 (11.2%)	5 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	4.47
Overall Performance	128	77 (60.2%)	30 (23.4%)	15 (11.7%)	4 (3.1%)	2 (1.6%)	4.38

DISTRICT 5

JUDGE JULIUS H. CORPENING II • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 5							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	167	125 (74.9%)	30 (18.0%)	6 (3.6%)	4 (2.4%)	2 (1.2%)	4.63
Legal Ability	167	130 (77.8%)	28 (16.8%)	7 (4.2%)	2 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	4.71
Professionalism	169	122 (72.2%)	36 (21.3%)	6 (3.6%)	3 (1.8%)	2 (1.2%)	4.62
Communication	169	116 (68.6%)	38 (22.5%)	11 (6.5%)	3 (1.8%)	1 (0.6%)	4.57
Administrative Skills	156	113 (72.4%)	29 (18.6%)	9 (5.8%)	3 (1.9%)	2 (1.3%)	4.59
Overall Performance	167	123 (73.7%)	31 (18.6%)	9 (5.4%)	3 (1.8%)	1 (0.6%)	4.63

JUDGE SANDRA RAY CRINER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 5							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	170	71 (41.8%)	27 (15.9%)	33 (19.4%)	18 (10.6%)	21 (12.4%)	3.64
Legal Ability	169	60 (35.5%)	39 (23.1%)	40 (23.7%)	21 (12.4%)	9 (5.3%)	3.71
Professionalism	170	61 (35.9%)	35 (20.6%)	25 (14.7%)	22 (12.9%)	27 (15.9%)	3.48
Communication	168	65 (38.7%)	42 (25.0%)	36 (21.4%)	13 (7.7%)	12 (7.1%)	3.80
Administrative Skills	140	55 (39.3%)	35 (25.0%)	27 (19.3%)	12 (8.6%)	11 (7.9%)	3.79
Overall Performance	169	62 (36.7%)	31 (18.3%)	30 (17.8%)	28 (16.6%)	18 (10.7%)	3.54

JUDGE RICHARD RUSSELL DAVIS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 5							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	150	94 (62.7%)	38 (25.3%)	12 (8.0%)	5 (3.3%)	1 (0.7%)	4.46
Legal Ability	150	71 (47.3%)	49 (32.7%)	25 (16.7%)	3 (2.0%)	2 (1.3%)	4.23
Professionalism	151	92 (60.9%)	39 (25.8%)	18 (11.9%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	4.46
Communication	151	81 (53.6%)	49 (32.5%)	18 (11.9%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.7%)	4.37
Administrative Skills	128	67 (52.3%)	38 (29.7%)	20 (15.6%)	3 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	4.32
Overall Performance	149	78 (52.3%)	48 (32.2%)	18 (12.1%)	4 (2.7%)	1 (0.7%)	4.33

DISTRICT 5, CONTINUED

JUDGE JEFF NOECKER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 5							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	121	63 (52.1%)	35 (28.9%)	15 (12.4%)	3 (2.5%)	5 (4.1%)	4.22
Legal Ability	120	58 (48.3%)	35 (29.2%)	17 (14.2%)	5 (4.2%)	5 (4.2%)	4.13
Professionalism	122	64 (52.5%)	36 (29.5%)	15 (12.3%)	4 (3.3%)	3 (2.5%)	4.26
Communication	116	50 (43.1%)	35 (30.2%)	18 (15.5%)	7 (6.0%)	6 (5.2%)	4.00
Administrative Skills	95	39 (41.1%)	39 (41.1%)	11 (11.6%)	3 (3.2%)	3 (3.2%)	4.14
Overall Performance	121	49 (40.5%)	45 (37.2%)	17 (14.0%)	6 (5.0%)	4 (3.3%)	4.07

DISTRICT 6A

JUDGE BRENDA G. BRANCH • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	43	22 (51.2%)	3 (7.0%)	12 (27.9%)	3 (7.0%)	3 (7.0%)	3.88
Legal Ability	42	15 (35.7%)	8 (19.0%)	8 (19.0%)	8 (19.0%)	3 (7.1%)	3.57
Professionalism	43	17 (39.5%)	8 (18.6%)	11 (25.6%)	5 (11.6%)	2 (4.7%)	3.77
Communication	42	19 (45.2%)	5 (11.9%)	10 (23.8%)	6 (14.3%)	2 (4.8%)	3.79
Administrative Skills	39	18 (46.2%)	8 (20.5%)	6 (15.4%)	7 (17.9%)	0 (0%)	3.95
Overall Performance	43	16 (37.2%)	9 (20.9%)	10 (23.3%)	5 (11.6%)	3 (7.0%)	3.70

JUDGE TERESA R. ROBINSON FREEMAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	31	20 (64.5%)	4 (12.9%)	4 (12.9%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (6.5%)	4.26
Legal Ability	31	20 (64.5%)	8 (25.8%)	3 (9.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.55
Professionalism	31	18 (58.1%)	5 (16.1%)	4 (12.9%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)	4.10
Communication	31	19 (61.3%)	9 (29.0%)	3 (9.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.52
Administrative Skills	25	14 (56.0%)	3 (12.0%)	4 (16.0%)	3 (12.0%)	1 (4.0%)	4.04
Overall Performance	31	17 (54.8%)	8 (25.8%)	5 (16.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	4.29

JUDGE W. TURNER STEPHENSON III • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	44	31 (70.5%)	9 (20.5%)	3 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	4.57
Legal Ability	44	26 (59.1%)	14 (31.8%)	3 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	4.46
Professionalism	44	33 (75.0%)	7 (15.9%)	3 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	4.61
Communication	43	29 (67.4%)	10 (23.3%)	3 (7.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	4.54
Administrative Skills	37	20 (54.1%)	9 (24.3%)	4 (10.8%)	2 (5.4%)	2 (5.4%)	4.16
Overall Performance	44	30 (68.2%)	11 (25.0%)	2 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	4.57

DISTRICT 6B

JUDGE THOMAS R. NEWBERN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 6B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	53	36 (67.9%)	14 (26.4%)	3 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.62
Legal Ability	53	31 (58.5%)	18 (34.0%)	4 (7.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.51
Professionalism	53	36 (67.9%)	13 (24.5%)	4 (7.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Communication	52	35 (67.3%)	13 (25.0%)	4 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Administrative Skills	44	27 (61.4%)	14 (31.8%)	3 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.55
Overall Performance	53	30 (56.6%)	20 (37.7%)	3 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.51

DISTRICT 7

JUDGE JOHN M. BRITT • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 7							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	74	42 (56.8%)	18 (24.3%)	11 (14.9%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.7%)	4.31
Legal Ability	72	36 (50.0%)	23 (31.9%)	10 (13.9%)	2 (2.8%)	1 (1.4%)	4.26
Professionalism	73	36 (49.3%)	21 (28.8%)	13 (17.8%)	3 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	4.23
Communication	73	37 (50.7%)	25 (34.2%)	9 (12.3%)	2 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.33
Administrative Skills	63	30 (47.6%)	15 (23.8%)	13 (20.6%)	5 (7.9%)	0 (0%)	4.11
Overall Performance	72	37 (51.4%)	20 (27.8%)	13 (18.1%)	2 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	4.28

JUDGE ANTHONY (TONY) W. BROWN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 7							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	63	38 (60.3%)	14 (22.2%)	8 (12.7%)	2 (3.2%)	1 (1.6%)	4.37
Legal Ability	62	31 (50.0%)	20 (32.3%)	7 (11.3%)	2 (3.2%)	2 (3.2%)	4.23
Professionalism	63	42 (66.7%)	13 (20.6%)	5 (7.9%)	2 (3.2%)	1 (1.6%)	4.48
Communication	62	32 (51.6%)	19 (30.6%)	9 (14.5%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	4.29
Administrative Skills	56	28 (50.0%)	15 (26.8%)	9 (16.1%)	3 (5.4%)	1 (1.8%)	4.18
Overall Performance	62	34 (54.8%)	18 (29.0%)	6 (9.7%)	3 (4.8%)	1 (1.6%)	4.31

JUDGE JOHN J. COVOLO • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 7							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	75	47 (62.7%)	20 (26.7%)	6 (8.0%)	2 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.49
Legal Ability	74	37 (50.0%)	28 (37.8%)	6 (8.1%)	3 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	4.34
Professionalism	75	41 (54.7%)	23 (30.7%)	8 (10.7%)	3 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	4.36
Communication	74	42 (56.8%)	23 (31.1%)	5 (6.8%)	4 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	4.39
Administrative Skills	62	25 (40.3%)	21 (33.9%)	10 (16.1%)	6 (9.7%)	0 (0%)	4.05
Overall Performance	74	41 (55.4%)	23 (31.1%)	6 (8.1%)	4 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	4.37

DISTRICT 7, CONTINUED

JUDGE WILLIAM CHARLES FARRIS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 7							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	102	88 (86.3%)	8 (7.8%)	3 (2.9%)	3 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	4.78
Legal Ability	100	86 (86.0%)	9 (9.0%)	4 (4.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.80
Professionalism	100	90 (90.0%)	5 (5.0%)	3 (3.0%)	2 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	4.83
Communication	101	91 (90.1%)	6 (5.9%)	3 (3.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.84
Administrative Skills	96	81 (84.4%)	11 (11.5%)	3 (3.1%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.79
Overall Performance	100	87 (87.0%)	9 (9.0%)	2 (2.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.80

JUDGE WILLIAM G. STEWART • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 7							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	81	59 (72.8%)	15 (18.5%)	6 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	4.62
Legal Ability	80	49 (61.3%)	24 (30.0%)	6 (7.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	4.50
Professionalism	81	66 (81.5%)	9 (11.1%)	5 (6.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	4.72
Communication	79	54 (68.4%)	19 (24.1%)	5 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	4.58
Administrative Skills	67	45 (67.2%)	16 (23.9%)	4 (6.0%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.54
Overall Performance	81	57 (70.4%)	19 (23.5%)	4 (4.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	4.62

DISTRICT 8

JUDGE DAVID B. BRANTLEY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	89	58 (65.2%)	18 (20.2%)	9 (10.1%)	3 (3.4%)	1 (1.1%)	4.45
Legal Ability	88	62 (70.5%)	16 (18.2%)	7 (8.0%)	3 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	4.56
Professionalism	88	63 (71.6%)	15 (17.0%)	6 (6.8%)	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.3%)	4.53
Communication	87	58 (66.7%)	17 (19.5%)	8 (9.2%)	3 (3.4%)	1 (1.1%)	4.47
Administrative Skills	83	58 (69.9%)	16 (19.3%)	7 (8.4%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	4.57
Overall Performance	87	59 (67.8%)	17 (19.5%)	8 (9.2%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.3%)	4.49

JUDGE LONNIE W. CARRAWAY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	91	45 (49.5%)	28 (30.8%)	16 (17.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.2%)	4.25
Legal Ability	91	33 (36.3%)	26 (28.6%)	24 (26.4%)	5 (5.5%)	3 (3.3%)	3.89
Professionalism	90	34 (37.8%)	29 (32.2%)	17 (18.9%)	5 (5.6%)	5 (5.6%)	3.91
Communication	89	35 (39.3%)	28 (31.5%)	20 (22.5%)	3 (3.4%)	3 (3.4%)	4.00
Administrative Skills	76	26 (34.2%)	15 (19.7%)	21 (27.6%)	7 (9.2%)	7 (9.2%)	3.61
Overall Performance	90	29 (32.2%)	32 (35.6%)	20 (22.2%)	6 (6.7%)	3 (3.3%)	3.87

JUDGE TIMOTHY I. FINAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	83	56 (67.5%)	20 (24.1%)	5 (6.0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	4.55
Legal Ability	83	57 (68.7%)	20 (24.1%)	5 (6.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Professionalism	84	56 (66.7%)	21 (25.0%)	4 (4.8%)	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.4%)	4.52
Communication	84	53 (63.1%)	22 (26.2%)	7 (8.3%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	4.50
Administrative Skills	74	42 (56.8%)	22 (29.7%)	7 (9.5%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.4%)	4.38
Overall Performance	84	51 (60.7%)	26 (31.0%)	5 (6.0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	4.49

DISTRICT 8, CONTINUED

JUDGE CHARLES P. GAYLOR III • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	64	37 (57.8%)	17 (26.6%)	6 (9.4%)	3 (4.7%)	1 (1.6%)	4.34
Legal Ability	64	21 (32.8%)	17 (26.6%)	16 (25.0%)	9 (14.1%)	1 (1.6%)	3.75
Professionalism	65	37 (56.9%)	22 (33.8%)	5 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	4.45
Communication	64	30 (46.9%)	20 (31.3%)	13 (20.3%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	4.23
Administrative Skills	51	24 (47.1%)	17 (33.3%)	8 (15.7%)	2 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	4.24
Overall Performance	65	22 (33.8%)	25 (38.5%)	14 (21.5%)	3 (4.6%)	1 (1.5%)	3.99

JUDGE ROBERT LESLIE TURNER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	83	43 (51.8%)	15 (18.1%)	12 (14.5%)	5 (6.0%)	8 (9.6%)	3.96
Legal Ability	83	37 (44.6%)	24 (28.9%)	12 (14.5%)	4 (4.8%)	6 (7.2%)	3.99
Professionalism	83	39 (47.0%)	18 (21.7%)	17 (20.5%)	2 (2.4%)	7 (8.4%)	3.96
Communication	83	39 (47.0%)	23 (27.7%)	9 (10.8%)	6 (7.2%)	6 (7.2%)	4.00
Administrative Skills	66	32 (48.5%)	14 (21.2%)	11 (16.7%)	4 (6.1%)	5 (7.6%)	3.97
Overall Performance	83	34 (41.0%)	24 (28.9%)	15 (18.1%)	3 (3.6%)	7 (8.4%)	3.90

DISTRICT 9

JUDGE S. QUON BRIDGES • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	106	44 (41.5%)	33 (31.1%)	15 (14.2%)	6 (5.7%)	8 (7.5%)	3.93
Legal Ability	106	35 (33.0%)	26 (24.5%)	23 (21.7%)	12 (11.3%)	10 (9.4%)	3.60
Professionalism	106	43 (40.6%)	29 (27.4%)	18 (17.0%)	5 (4.7%)	11 (10.4%)	3.83
Communication	105	46 (43.8%)	26 (24.8%)	19 (18.1%)	6 (5.7%)	8 (7.6%)	3.91
Administrative Skills	96	38 (39.6%)	21 (21.9%)	21 (21.9%)	5 (5.2%)	11 (11.5%)	3.73
Overall Performance	106	40 (37.7%)	24 (22.6%)	25 (23.6%)	8 (7.5%)	9 (8.5%)	3.74

JUDGE JOHN W. DAVIS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	88	70 (79.5%)	15 (17.0%)	3 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.76
Legal Ability	89	75 (84.3%)	8 (9.0%)	6 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.78
Professionalism	89	76 (85.4%)	8 (9.0%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	4.79
Communication	89	72 (80.9%)	12 (13.5%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	4.74
Administrative Skills	88	66 (75.0%)	16 (18.2%)	5 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	4.66
Overall Performance	89	73 (82.0%)	11 (12.4%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	4.75

JUDGE DANIEL F. FINCH • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	98	40 (40.8%)	31 (31.6%)	21 (21.4%)	2 (2.0%)	4 (4.1%)	4.03
Legal Ability	98	44 (44.9%)	35 (35.7%)	15 (15.3%)	3 (3.1%)	1 (1.0%)	4.20
Professionalism	99	43 (43.4%)	32 (32.3%)	17 (17.2%)	6 (6.1%)	1 (1.0%)	4.11
Communication	99	42 (42.4%)	34 (34.3%)	19 (19.2%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.14
Administrative Skills	92	39 (42.4%)	29 (31.5%)	20 (21.7%)	3 (3.3%)	1 (1.1%)	4.11
Overall Performance	99	38 (38.4%)	43 (43.4%)	13 (13.1%)	4 (4.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.14

DISTRICT 9, CONTINUED

JUDGE CAROLYN J. YANCEY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	85	32 (37.6%)	14 (16.5%)	11 (12.9%)	17 (20.0%)	11 (12.9%)	3.46
Legal Ability	85	20 (23.5%)	17 (20.0%)	23 (27.1%)	16 (18.8%)	9 (10.6%)	3.27
Professionalism	84	24 (28.6%)	23 (27.4%)	14 (16.7%)	15 (17.9%)	8 (9.5%)	3.48
Communication	84	26 (31.0%)	22 (26.2%)	21 (25.0%)	9 (10.7%)	6 (7.1%)	3.63
Administrative Skills	78	23 (29.5%)	20 (25.6%)	15 (19.2%)	11 (14.1%)	9 (11.5%)	3.47
Overall Performance	83	22 (26.5%)	20 (24.1%)	13 (15.7%)	18 (21.7%)	10 (12.0%)	3.31

DISTRICT 9A

JUDGE LLOYD MICHAEL GENTRY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	53	23 (43.4%)	6 (11.3%)	9 (17.0%)	6 (11.3%)	9 (17.0%)	3.53
Legal Ability	52	21 (40.4%)	9 (17.3%)	7 (13.5%)	9 (17.3%)	6 (11.5%)	3.58
Professionalism	53	19 (35.8%)	9 (17.0%)	10 (18.9%)	7 (13.2%)	8 (15.1%)	3.45
Communication	53	22 (41.5%)	8 (15.1%)	11 (20.8%)	5 (9.4%)	7 (13.2%)	3.62
Administrative Skills	46	19 (41.3%)	7 (15.2%)	13 (28.3%)	4 (8.7%)	3 (6.5%)	3.76
Overall Performance	51	20 (39.2%)	6 (11.8%)	11 (21.6%)	7 (13.7%)	7 (13.7%)	3.49

DISTRICT 9B

JUDGE RANDOLPH BASKERVILLE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 9B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	91	38 (41.8%)	26 (28.6%)	18 (19.8%)	6 (6.6%)	3 (3.3%)	3.99
Legal Ability	91	36 (39.6%)	19 (20.9%)	29 (31.9%)	6 (6.6%)	1 (1.1%)	3.91
Professionalism	91	42 (46.2%)	26 (28.6%)	18 (19.8%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	4.13
Communication	89	43 (48.3%)	25 (28.1%)	15 (16.9%)	4 (4.5%)	2 (2.2%)	4.16
Administrative Skills	83	33 (39.8%)	22 (26.5%)	22 (26.5%)	3 (3.6%)	3 (3.6%)	3.95
Overall Performance	89	34 (38.2%)	31 (34.8%)	18 (20.2%)	5 (5.6%)	1 (1.1%)	4.03

DISTRICT 10

JUDGE MONICA M. BOUSMAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	274	108 (39.4%)	83 (30.3%)	52 (19.0%)	19 (6.9%)	12 (4.4%)	3.93
Legal Ability	272	106 (39.0%)	87 (32.0%)	54 (19.9%)	13 (4.8%)	12 (4.4%)	3.96
Professionalism	273	105 (38.5%)	74 (27.1%)	55 (20.1%)	28 (10.3%)	11 (4.0%)	3.86
Communication	271	106 (39.1%)	82 (30.3%)	57 (21.0%)	17 (6.3%)	9 (3.3%)	3.96
Administrative Skills	222	95 (42.8%)	72 (32.4%)	40 (18.0%)	8 (3.6%)	7 (3.2%)	4.08
Overall Performance	272	91 (33.5%)	96 (35.3%)	51 (18.8%)	21 (7.7%)	13 (4.8%)	3.85

JUDGE JACQUELINE L. BREWER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	228	87 (38.2%)	66 (28.9%)	47 (20.6%)	15 (6.6%)	13 (5.7%)	3.87
Legal Ability	225	71 (31.6%)	70 (31.1%)	48 (21.3%)	23 (10.2%)	13 (5.8%)	3.72
Professionalism	225	104 (46.2%)	65 (28.9%)	40 (17.8%)	9 (4.0%)	7 (3.1%)	4.11
Communication	225	89 (39.6%)	66 (29.3%)	53 (23.6%)	9 (4.0%)	8 (3.6%)	3.97
Administrative Skills	184	65 (35.3%)	59 (32.1%)	40 (21.7%)	9 (4.9%)	11 (6.0%)	3.86
Overall Performance	223	76 (34.1%)	67 (30.0%)	52 (23.3%)	20 (9.0%)	8 (3.6%)	3.82

JUDGE ERIC CRAIG CHASSE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	236	152 (64.4%)	60 (25.4%)	17 (7.2%)	4 (1.7%)	3 (1.3%)	4.50
Legal Ability	232	115 (49.6%)	88 (37.9%)	23 (9.9%)	2 (0.9%)	4 (1.7%)	4.33
Professionalism	235	178 (75.7%)	49 (20.9%)	6 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.9%)	4.71
Communication	236	156 (66.1%)	65 (27.5%)	11 (4.7%)	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.8%)	4.57
Administrative Skills	189	110 (58.2%)	66 (34.9%)	10 (5.3%)	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.1%)	4.49
Overall Performance	234	138 (59.0%)	77 (32.9%)	13 (5.6%)	3 (1.3%)	3 (1.3%)	4.47

DISTRICT 10, CONTINUED

JUDGE LORI GRUNDY CHRISTIAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	279	184 (65.9%)	61 (21.9%)	22 (7.9%)	9 (3.2%)	3 (1.1%)	4.48
Legal Ability	280	135 (48.2%)	92 (32.9%)	37 (13.2%)	11 (3.9%)	5 (1.8%)	4.22
Professionalism	280	189 (67.5%)	65 (23.2%)	16 (5.7%)	6 (2.1%)	4 (1.4%)	4.53
Communication	276	179 (64.9%)	70 (25.4%)	19 (6.9%)	2 (0.7%)	6 (2.2%)	4.50
Administrative Skills	231	134 (58.0%)	59 (25.5%)	30 (13.0%)	3 (1.3%)	5 (2.2%)	4.36
Overall Performance	280	163 (58.2%)	81 (28.9%)	21 (7.5%)	11 (3.9%)	4 (1.4%)	4.39

JUDGE JENNIFER MILLER GREEN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	279	105 (37.6%)	70 (25.1%)	62 (22.2%)	19 (6.8%)	23 (8.2%)	3.77
Legal Ability	276	123 (44.6%)	83 (30.1%)	52 (18.8%)	7 (2.5%)	11 (4.0%)	4.09
Professionalism	278	92 (33.1%)	68 (24.5%)	63 (22.7%)	34 (12.2%)	21 (7.6%)	3.63
Communication	277	102 (36.8%)	74 (26.7%)	64 (23.1%)	23 (8.3%)	14 (5.1%)	3.82
Administrative Skills	225	94 (41.8%)	66 (29.3%)	51 (22.7%)	5 (2.2%)	9 (4.0%)	4.03
Overall Performance	279	91 (32.6%)	88 (31.5%)	60 (21.5%)	25 (9.0%)	15 (5.4%)	3.77

JUDGE JENNIFER J. KNOX • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	253	110 (43.5%)	70 (27.7%)	39 (15.4%)	17 (6.7%)	17 (6.7%)	3.95
Legal Ability	253	110 (43.5%)	95 (37.5%)	30 (11.9%)	6 (2.4%)	12 (4.7%)	4.13
Professionalism	254	109 (42.9%)	80 (31.5%)	37 (14.6%)	16 (6.3%)	12 (4.7%)	4.02
Communication	251	110 (43.8%)	79 (31.5%)	42 (16.7%)	8 (3.2%)	12 (4.8%)	4.06
Administrative Skills	208	93 (44.7%)	73 (35.1%)	24 (11.5%)	10 (4.8%)	8 (3.8%)	4.12
Overall Performance	252	108 (42.9%)	81 (32.1%)	39 (15.5%)	11 (4.4%)	13 (5.2%)	4.03

DISTRICT 10, CONTINUED

JUDGE ROBERT B. RADER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	405	359 (88.6%)	35 (8.6%)	6 (1.5%)	2 (0.5%)	3 (0.7%)	4.84
Legal Ability	401	324 (80.8%)	62 (15.5%)	11 (2.7%)	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.5%)	4.76
Professionalism	406	369 (90.9%)	30 (7.4%)	4 (1.0%)	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.5%)	4.88
Communication	406	346 (85.2%)	50 (12.3%)	6 (1.5%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.7%)	4.81
Administrative Skills	373	317 (85.0%)	47 (12.6%)	5 (1.3%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.8%)	4.81
Overall Performance	403	349 (86.6%)	45 (11.2%)	6 (1.5%)	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.5%)	4.83

JUDGE DEBRA ANN SASSER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	309	171 (55.3%)	64 (20.7%)	33 (10.7%)	20 (6.5%)	21 (6.8%)	4.11
Legal Ability	308	173 (56.2%)	64 (20.8%)	50 (16.2%)	9 (2.9%)	12 (3.9%)	4.22
Professionalism	307	155 (50.5%)	75 (24.4%)	36 (11.7%)	21 (6.8%)	20 (6.5%)	4.06
Communication	305	152 (49.8%)	86 (28.2%)	39 (12.8%)	19 (6.2%)	9 (3.0%)	4.16
Administrative Skills	262	141 (53.8%)	69 (26.3%)	35 (13.4%)	11 (4.2%)	6 (2.3%)	4.25
Overall Performance	310	148 (47.7%)	87 (28.1%)	39 (12.6%)	21 (6.8%)	15 (4.8%)	4.07

JUDGE CHRISTINE M. WALCZYK • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	308	174 (56.5%)	88 (28.6%)	27 (8.8%)	10 (3.2%)	9 (2.9%)	4.33
Legal Ability	303	132 (43.6%)	106 (35.0%)	46 (15.2%)	12 (4.0%)	7 (2.3%)	4.14
Professionalism	306	187 (61.1%)	80 (26.1%)	28 (9.2%)	6 (2.0%)	5 (1.6%)	4.43
Communication	302	149 (49.3%)	96 (31.8%)	40 (13.2%)	11 (3.6%)	6 (2.0%)	4.23
Administrative Skills	256	122 (47.7%)	80 (31.3%)	39 (15.2%)	10 (3.9%)	5 (2.0%)	4.19
Overall Performance	307	142 (46.3%)	109 (35.5%)	34 (11.1%)	13 (4.2%)	9 (2.9%)	4.18

DISTRICT 10, CONTINUED

JUDGE ANNA ELEANA WORLEY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	228	73 (32.0%)	66 (28.9%)	54 (23.7%)	20 (8.8%)	15 (6.6%)	3.71
Legal Ability	229	48 (21.0%)	42 (18.3%)	70 (30.6%)	45 (19.7%)	24 (10.5%)	3.20
Professionalism	227	61 (26.9%)	58 (25.6%)	50 (22.0%)	34 (15.0%)	24 (10.6%)	3.43
Communication	225	54 (24.0%)	47 (20.9%)	63 (28.0%)	32 (14.2%)	29 (12.9%)	3.29
Administrative Skills	194	37 (19.1%)	30 (15.5%)	43 (22.2%)	32 (16.5%)	52 (26.8%)	2.84
Overall Performance	229	45 (19.7%)	45 (19.7%)	70 (30.6%)	40 (17.5%)	29 (12.7%)	3.16

DISTRICT 11

JUDGE ROBERT W. BRYANT JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	115	92 (80.0%)	18 (15.7%)	4 (3.5%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	4.75
Legal Ability	114	96 (84.2%)	13 (11.4%)	4 (3.5%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	4.79
Professionalism	114	98 (86.0%)	11 (9.6%)	4 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)	4.80
Communication	112	91 (81.3%)	13 (11.6%)	8 (7.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.74
Administrative Skills	102	82 (80.4%)	14 (13.7%)	5 (4.9%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.74
Overall Performance	114	95 (83.3%)	14 (12.3%)	4 (3.5%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	4.78

JUDGE CHARLES PATRICK BULLOCK • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	102	51 (50.0%)	20 (19.6%)	13 (12.7%)	11 (10.8%)	7 (6.9%)	3.95
Legal Ability	101	38 (37.6%)	27 (26.7%)	22 (21.8%)	7 (6.9%)	7 (6.9%)	3.81
Professionalism	102	46 (45.1%)	17 (16.7%)	18 (17.6%)	10 (9.8%)	11 (10.8%)	3.76
Communication	101	45 (44.6%)	27 (26.7%)	15 (14.9%)	7 (6.9%)	7 (6.9%)	3.95
Administrative Skills	90	42 (46.7%)	22 (24.4%)	12 (13.3%)	7 (7.8%)	7 (7.8%)	3.94
Overall Performance	101	42 (41.6%)	25 (24.8%)	16 (15.8%)	11 (10.9%)	7 (6.9%)	3.83

JUDGE RESSON O. FAIRCLOTH II • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	101	54 (53.5%)	25 (24.8%)	14 (13.9%)	5 (5.0%)	3 (3.0%)	4.21
Legal Ability	100	44 (44.0%)	27 (27.0%)	18 (18.0%)	7 (7.0%)	4 (4.0%)	4.00
Professionalism	101	50 (49.5%)	29 (28.7%)	13 (12.9%)	7 (6.9%)	2 (2.0%)	4.17
Communication	100	51 (51.0%)	29 (29.0%)	9 (9.0%)	8 (8.0%)	3 (3.0%)	4.17
Administrative Skills	93	44 (47.3%)	28 (30.1%)	15 (16.1%)	4 (4.3%)	2 (2.2%)	4.16
Overall Performance	101	49 (48.5%)	30 (29.7%)	11 (10.9%)	8 (7.9%)	3 (3.0%)	4.13

DISTRICT 11, CONTINUED

JUDGE PAUL A. HOLCOMBE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	91	53 (58.2%)	21 (23.1%)	11 (12.1%)	5 (5.5%)	1 (1.1%)	4.32
Legal Ability	89	39 (43.8%)	28 (31.5%)	16 (18.0%)	5 (5.6%)	1 (1.1%)	4.11
Professionalism	91	53 (58.2%)	20 (22.0%)	10 (11.0%)	6 (6.6%)	2 (2.2%)	4.28
Communication	89	42 (47.2%)	26 (29.2%)	13 (14.6%)	7 (7.9%)	1 (1.1%)	4.14
Administrative Skills	83	39 (47.0%)	24 (28.9%)	14 (16.9%)	3 (3.6%)	3 (3.6%)	4.12
Overall Performance	91	42 (46.2%)	29 (31.9%)	13 (14.3%)	6 (6.6%)	1 (1.1%)	4.15

JUDGE JACQUELYN L. LEE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	120	67 (55.8%)	22 (18.3%)	15 (12.5%)	7 (5.8%)	9 (7.5%)	4.09
Legal Ability	119	55 (46.2%)	26 (21.8%)	24 (20.2%)	7 (5.9%)	7 (5.9%)	3.97
Professionalism	120	72 (60.0%)	23 (19.2%)	12 (10.0%)	7 (5.8%)	6 (5.0%)	4.23
Communication	117	65 (55.6%)	25 (21.4%)	17 (14.5%)	8 (6.8%)	2 (1.7%)	4.22
Administrative Skills	104	61 (58.7%)	20 (19.2%)	15 (14.4%)	5 (4.8%)	3 (2.9%)	4.26
Overall Performance	120	59 (49.2%)	33 (27.5%)	15 (12.5%)	6 (5.0%)	7 (5.8%)	4.09

JUDGE JIMMY L. LOVE JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	123	88 (71.5%)	24 (19.5%)	7 (5.7%)	4 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	4.59
Legal Ability	122	78 (63.9%)	30 (24.6%)	9 (7.4%)	5 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	4.48
Professionalism	123	96 (78.0%)	20 (16.3%)	7 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.72
Communication	121	88 (72.7%)	22 (18.2%)	10 (8.3%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	4.63
Administrative Skills	108	79 (73.1%)	16 (14.8%)	11 (10.2%)	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	4.59
Overall Performance	123	87 (70.7%)	26 (21.1%)	8 (6.5%)	2 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	4.61

DISTRICT 11, CONTINUED

JUDGE R. DALE STUBBS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	109	72 (66.1%)	24 (22.0%)	9 (8.3%)	1 (0.9%)	3 (2.8%)	4.48
Legal Ability	107	55 (51.4%)	30 (28.0%)	15 (14.0%)	6 (5.6%)	1 (0.9%)	4.23
Professionalism	109	73 (67.0%)	23 (21.1%)	11 (10.1%)	1 (0.9%)	1 (0.9%)	4.52
Communication	107	56 (52.3%)	26 (24.3%)	19 (17.8%)	4 (3.7%)	2 (1.9%)	4.22
Administrative Skills	96	52 (54.2%)	25 (26.0%)	13 (13.5%)	4 (4.2%)	2 (2.1%)	4.26
Overall Performance	108	61 (56.5%)	29 (26.9%)	14 (13.0%)	3 (2.8%)	1 (0.9%)	4.35

JUDGE OWEN (HENRY) WILLIS JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 11							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	127	76 (59.8%)	24 (18.9%)	16 (12.6%)	7 (5.5%)	4 (3.1%)	4.27
Legal Ability	127	72 (56.7%)	32 (25.2%)	16 (12.6%)	5 (3.9%)	2 (1.6%)	4.32
Professionalism	127	68 (53.5%)	25 (19.7%)	25 (19.7%)	5 (3.9%)	4 (3.1%)	4.17
Communication	126	63 (50.0%)	35 (27.8%)	19 (15.1%)	5 (4.0%)	4 (3.2%)	4.18
Administrative Skills	113	58 (51.3%)	28 (24.8%)	15 (13.3%)	6 (5.3%)	6 (5.3%)	4.12
Overall Performance	127	69 (54.3%)	30 (23.6%)	19 (15.0%)	4 (3.1%)	5 (3.9%)	4.21

DISTRICT 12

JUDGE LAURA A. DEVAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 12							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	92	57 (62.0%)	15 (16.3%)	11 (12.0%)	7 (7.6%)	2 (2.2%)	4.28
Legal Ability	92	45 (48.9%)	26 (28.3%)	16 (17.4%)	4 (4.3%)	1 (1.1%)	4.20
Professionalism	92	47 (51.1%)	24 (26.1%)	10 (10.9%)	8 (8.7%)	3 (3.3%)	4.13
Communication	91	48 (52.7%)	25 (27.5%)	12 (13.2%)	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.2%)	4.24
Administrative Skills	80	39 (48.8%)	21 (26.3%)	14 (17.5%)	3 (3.8%)	3 (3.8%)	4.13
Overall Performance	92	44 (47.8%)	27 (29.3%)	13 (14.1%)	6 (6.5%)	2 (2.2%)	4.14

JUDGE JOHN W. DICKSON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 12							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	100	42 (42.0%)	29 (29.0%)	16 (16.0%)	9 (9.0%)	4 (4.0%)	3.96
Legal Ability	100	47 (47.0%)	32 (32.0%)	15 (15.0%)	4 (4.0%)	2 (2.0%)	4.18
Professionalism	100	43 (43.0%)	27 (27.0%)	22 (22.0%)	3 (3.0%)	5 (5.0%)	4.00
Communication	100	38 (38.0%)	36 (36.0%)	21 (21.0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (3.0%)	4.04
Administrative Skills	82	28 (34.1%)	33 (40.2%)	16 (19.5%)	3 (3.7%)	2 (2.4%)	4.00
Overall Performance	98	37 (37.8%)	33 (33.7%)	21 (21.4%)	3 (3.1%)	4 (4.1%)	3.98

JUDGE EDWARD A. PONE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 12							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	101	74 (73.3%)	18 (17.8%)	5 (5.0%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.59
Legal Ability	100	68 (68.0%)	20 (20.0%)	9 (9.0%)	3 (3.0%)	0 (0%)	4.53
Professionalism	100	74 (74.0%)	18 (18.0%)	4 (4.0%)	4 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	4.62
Communication	100	69 (69.0%)	22 (22.0%)	7 (7.0%)	2 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	4.58
Administrative Skills	90	57 (63.3%)	21 (23.3%)	8 (8.9%)	4 (4.4%)	0 (0%)	4.46
Overall Performance	101	68 (67.3%)	22 (21.8%)	7 (6.9%)	4 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	4.53

DISTRICT 13

JUDGE NAPOLEON B. BAREFOOT JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 13							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	161	93 (57.8%)	37 (23.0%)	15 (9.3%)	7 (4.3%)	9 (5.6%)	4.23
Legal Ability	161	92 (57.1%)	41 (25.5%)	18 (11.2%)	3 (1.9%)	7 (4.3%)	4.29
Professionalism	161	91 (56.5%)	33 (20.5%)	17 (10.6%)	9 (5.6%)	11 (6.8%)	4.14
Communication	160	88 (55.0%)	36 (22.5%)	22 (13.8%)	7 (4.4%)	7 (4.4%)	4.19
Administrative Skills	141	85 (60.3%)	31 (22.0%)	19 (13.5%)	0 (0%)	6 (4.3%)	4.34
Overall Performance	159	89 (56.0%)	35 (22.0%)	17 (10.7%)	9 (5.7%)	9 (5.7%)	4.17

JUDGE JERRY ARNOLD JOLLY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 13							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	140	80 (57.1%)	24 (17.1%)	11 (7.9%)	7 (5.0%)	18 (12.9%)	4.01
Legal Ability	139	83 (59.7%)	31 (22.3%)	12 (8.6%)	3 (2.2%)	10 (7.2%)	4.25
Professionalism	140	81 (57.9%)	22 (15.7%)	12 (8.6%)	9 (6.4%)	16 (11.4%)	4.02
Communication	139	64 (46.0%)	25 (18.0%)	20 (14.4%)	17 (12.2%)	13 (9.4%)	3.79
Administrative Skills	130	79 (60.8%)	22 (16.9%)	15 (11.5%)	3 (2.3%)	11 (8.5%)	4.19
Overall Performance	139	79 (56.8%)	22 (15.8%)	17 (12.2%)	6 (4.3%)	15 (10.8%)	4.04

JUDGE SCOTT L. USSERY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 13							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	84	44 (52.4%)	21 (25.0%)	12 (14.3%)	5 (6.0%)	2 (2.4%)	4.19
Legal Ability	85	38 (44.7%)	25 (29.4%)	18 (21.2%)	3 (3.5%)	1 (1.2%)	4.13
Professionalism	84	47 (56.0%)	22 (26.2%)	9 (10.7%)	4 (4.8%)	2 (2.4%)	4.29
Communication	84	45 (53.6%)	27 (32.1%)	6 (7.1%)	4 (4.8%)	2 (2.4%)	4.30
Administrative Skills	71	37 (52.1%)	24 (33.8%)	7 (9.9%)	2 (2.8%)	1 (1.4%)	4.32
Overall Performance	84	41 (48.8%)	27 (32.1%)	10 (11.9%)	4 (4.8%)	2 (2.4%)	4.20

DISTRICT 13, CONTINUED

JUDGE MARION R. WARREN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 13							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	125	66 (52.8%)	19 (15.2%)	14 (11.2%)	14 (11.2%)	12 (9.6%)	3.90
Legal Ability	124	67 (54.0%)	27 (21.8%)	14 (11.3%)	6 (4.8%)	10 (8.1%)	4.09
Professionalism	125	61 (48.8%)	22 (17.6%)	13 (10.4%)	9 (7.2%)	20 (16.0%)	3.76
Communication	124	72 (58.1%)	22 (17.7%)	16 (12.9%)	5 (4.0%)	9 (7.3%)	4.15
Administrative Skills	113	59 (52.2%)	22 (19.5%)	12 (10.6%)	6 (5.3%)	14 (12.4%)	3.94
Overall Performance	123	64 (52.0%)	24 (19.5%)	16 (13.0%)	6 (4.9%)	13 (10.6%)	3.98

DISTRICT 14

JUDGE WILLIAM ANDREW MARSH III • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 14							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	154	48 (31.2%)	37 (24.0%)	32 (20.8%)	16 (10.4%)	21 (13.6%)	3.49
Legal Ability	152	33 (21.7%)	45 (29.6%)	42 (27.6%)	19 (12.5%)	13 (8.6%)	3.43
Professionalism	152	47 (30.9%)	39 (25.7%)	26 (17.1%)	20 (13.2%)	20 (13.2%)	3.48
Communication	150	47 (31.3%)	31 (20.7%)	43 (28.7%)	18 (12.0%)	11 (7.3%)	3.57
Administrative Skills	129	35 (27.1%)	42 (32.6%)	32 (24.8%)	14 (10.9%)	6 (4.7%)	3.67
Overall Performance	150	34 (22.7%)	41 (27.3%)	36 (24.0%)	22 (14.7%)	17 (11.3%)	3.35

DISTRICT 15A

JUDGE DAVID THOMAS LAMBETH JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	88	63 (71.6%)	13 (14.8%)	5 (5.7%)	5 (5.7%)	2 (2.3%)	4.48
Legal Ability	85	52 (61.2%)	20 (23.5%)	8 (9.4%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (3.5%)	4.37
Professionalism	86	63 (73.3%)	12 (14.0%)	8 (9.3%)	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.3%)	4.55
Communication	85	56 (65.9%)	16 (18.8%)	11 (12.9%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	4.47
Administrative Skills	68	38 (55.9%)	17 (25.0%)	7 (10.3%)	3 (4.4%)	3 (4.4%)	4.24
Overall Performance	84	53 (63.1%)	21 (25.0%)	5 (6.0%)	3 (3.6%)	2 (2.4%)	4.43

JUDGE KATHRYN WHITAKER OVERBY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	57	37 (64.9%)	12 (21.1%)	4 (7.0%)	3 (5.3%)	1 (1.8%)	4.42
Legal Ability	52	22 (42.3%)	17 (32.7%)	8 (15.4%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (5.8%)	4.02
Professionalism	56	33 (58.9%)	18 (32.1%)	5 (8.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.50
Communication	55	32 (58.2%)	14 (25.5%)	7 (12.7%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.8%)	4.36
Administrative Skills	45	19 (42.2%)	15 (33.3%)	8 (17.8%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	4.11
Overall Performance	55	30 (54.5%)	12 (21.8%)	7 (12.7%)	4 (7.3%)	2 (3.6%)	4.16

JUDGE JAMES K. ROBERSON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	76	52 (68.4%)	10 (13.2%)	11 (14.5%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.6%)	4.43
Legal Ability	75	48 (64.0%)	17 (22.7%)	7 (9.3%)	3 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	4.47
Professionalism	75	49 (65.3%)	14 (18.7%)	10 (13.3%)	2 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.47
Communication	74	48 (64.9%)	16 (21.6%)	9 (12.2%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	4.50
Administrative Skills	70	39 (55.7%)	11 (15.7%)	10 (14.3%)	5 (7.1%)	5 (7.1%)	4.06
Overall Performance	74	45 (60.8%)	17 (23.0%)	10 (13.5%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)	4.41

DISTRICT 15B

JUDGE CHARLES T. L. ANDERSON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	157	106 (67.5%)	37 (23.6%)	9 (5.7%)	3 (1.9%)	2 (1.3%)	4.54
Legal Ability	157	109 (69.4%)	35 (22.3%)	11 (7.0%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Professionalism	157	100 (63.7%)	33 (21.0%)	17 (10.8%)	3 (1.9%)	4 (2.5%)	4.41
Communication	156	95 (60.9%)	38 (24.4%)	14 (9.0%)	5 (3.2%)	4 (2.6%)	4.38
Administrative Skills	128	71 (55.5%)	41 (32.0%)	12 (9.4%)	4 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	4.40
Overall Performance	153	91 (59.5%)	48 (31.4%)	8 (5.2%)	3 (2.0%)	3 (2.0%)	4.44

JUDGE LUNSFORD LONG • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	169	91 (53.8%)	37 (21.9%)	19 (11.2%)	10 (5.9%)	12 (7.1%)	4.10
Legal Ability	169	103 (60.9%)	27 (16.0%)	24 (14.2%)	9 (5.3%)	6 (3.6%)	4.25
Professionalism	170	96 (56.5%)	36 (21.2%)	14 (8.2%)	12 (7.1%)	12 (7.1%)	4.13
Communication	170	91 (53.5%)	40 (23.5%)	27 (15.9%)	6 (3.5%)	6 (3.5%)	4.20
Administrative Skills	133	65 (48.9%)	35 (26.3%)	18 (13.5%)	7 (5.3%)	8 (6.0%)	4.07
Overall Performance	168	81 (48.2%)	47 (28.0%)	18 (10.7%)	12 (7.1%)	10 (6.0%)	4.05

JUDGE BEVERLY A. SCARLETT • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 15B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	164	89 (54.3%)	30 (18.3%)	18 (11.0%)	9 (5.5%)	18 (11.0%)	3.99
Legal Ability	163	78 (47.9%)	33 (20.2%)	24 (14.7%)	11 (6.7%)	17 (10.4%)	3.88
Professionalism	163	93 (57.1%)	27 (16.6%)	16 (9.8%)	9 (5.5%)	18 (11.0%)	4.03
Communication	163	89 (54.6%)	28 (17.2%)	25 (15.3%)	10 (6.1%)	11 (6.7%)	4.07
Administrative Skills	131	62 (47.3%)	34 (26.0%)	15 (11.5%)	6 (4.6%)	14 (10.7%)	3.95
Overall Performance	161	81 (50.3%)	33 (20.5%)	18 (11.2%)	10 (6.2%)	19 (11.8%)	3.91

DISTRICT 16A

JUDGE JOHN H. HORNE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	47	32 (68.1%)	6 (12.8%)	6 (12.8%)	3 (6.4%)	0 (0%)	4.43
Legal Ability	47	28 (59.6%)	10 (21.3%)	6 (12.8%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.1%)	4.32
Professionalism	47	32 (68.1%)	6 (12.8%)	4 (8.5%)	5 (10.6%)	0 (0%)	4.38
Communication	47	31 (66.0%)	10 (21.3%)	5 (10.6%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.51
Administrative Skills	39	24 (61.5%)	6 (15.4%)	6 (15.4%)	2 (5.1%)	1 (2.6%)	4.28
Overall Performance	47	25 (53.2%)	15 (31.9%)	3 (6.4%)	4 (8.5%)	0 (0%)	4.30

DISTRICT 16B

JUDGE JUDITH MILSAP DANIELS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	32	14 (43.8%)	10 (31.3%)	6 (18.8%)	2 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	4.13
Legal Ability	32	11 (34.4%)	12 (37.5%)	6 (18.8%)	3 (9.4%)	0 (0%)	3.97
Professionalism	32	17 (53.1%)	8 (25.0%)	5 (15.6%)	2 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	4.25
Communication	32	11 (34.4%)	14 (43.8%)	4 (12.5%)	3 (9.4%)	0 (0%)	4.03
Administrative Skills	29	10 (34.5%)	10 (34.5%)	6 (20.7%)	3 (10.3%)	0 (0%)	3.93
Overall Performance	32	12 (37.5%)	12 (37.5%)	5 (15.6%)	3 (9.4%)	0 (0%)	4.03

JUDGE WILLIAM JEFFREY MOORE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	32	7 (21.9%)	8 (25.0%)	10 (31.3%)	4 (12.5%)	3 (9.4%)	3.38
Legal Ability	32	8 (25.0%)	7 (21.9%)	9 (28.1%)	7 (21.9%)	1 (3.1%)	3.44
Professionalism	31	7 (22.6%)	10 (32.3%)	8 (25.8%)	4 (12.9%)	2 (6.5%)	3.52
Communication	31	7 (22.6%)	6 (19.4%)	12 (38.7%)	4 (12.9%)	2 (6.5%)	3.39
Administrative Skills	28	6 (21.4%)	8 (28.6%)	8 (28.6%)	3 (10.7%)	3 (10.7%)	3.39
Overall Performance	32	7 (21.9%)	8 (25.0%)	9 (28.1%)	5 (15.6%)	3 (9.4%)	3.34

DISTRICT 17A

JUDGE JAMES A. GROGAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 17A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	33	22 (66.7%)	7 (21.2%)	4 (12.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.55
Legal Ability	32	21 (65.6%)	7 (21.9%)	4 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.53
Professionalism	33	26 (78.8%)	6 (18.2%)	1 (3.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.76
Communication	33	23 (69.7%)	8 (24.2%)	2 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.64
Administrative Skills	30	20 (66.7%)	9 (30.0%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.63
Overall Performance	32	21 (65.6%)	9 (28.1%)	2 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.59

DISTRICT 17B

JUDGE WILLIAM F. SOUTHERN III • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 17B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	56	31 (55.4%)	15 (26.8%)	7 (12.5%)	2 (3.6%)	1 (1.8%)	4.30
Legal Ability	56	22 (39.3%)	20 (35.7%)	10 (17.9%)	3 (5.4%)	1 (1.8%)	4.05
Professionalism	56	34 (60.7%)	18 (32.1%)	3 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.8%)	4.50
Communication	56	27 (48.2%)	21 (37.5%)	7 (12.5%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0%)	4.32
Administrative Skills	45	22 (48.9%)	19 (42.2%)	4 (8.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.40
Overall Performance	55	23 (41.8%)	24 (43.6%)	5 (9.1%)	3 (5.5%)	0 (0%)	4.22

DISTRICT 18

JUDGE SHERRY FOWLER ALLOWAY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	178	76 (42.7%)	58 (32.6%)	32 (18.0%)	8 (4.5%)	4 (2.2%)	4.09
Legal Ability	178	50 (28.1%)	64 (36.0%)	46 (25.8%)	12 (6.7%)	6 (3.4%)	3.79
Professionalism	177	67 (37.9%)	50 (28.2%)	39 (22.0%)	14 (7.9%)	7 (4.0%)	3.88
Communication	175	54 (30.9%)	63 (36.0%)	38 (21.7%)	12 (6.9%)	8 (4.6%)	3.82
Administrative Skills	143	47 (32.9%)	51 (35.7%)	30 (21.0%)	9 (6.3%)	6 (4.2%)	3.87
Overall Performance	176	53 (30.1%)	61 (34.7%)	43 (24.4%)	13 (7.4%)	6 (3.4%)	3.81

JUDGE SUSAN E. BRAY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	219	117 (53.4%)	54 (24.7%)	24 (11.0%)	16 (7.3%)	8 (3.7%)	4.17
Legal Ability	216	126 (58.3%)	65 (30.1%)	16 (7.4%)	5 (2.3%)	4 (1.9%)	4.41
Professionalism	217	104 (47.9%)	51 (23.5%)	38 (17.5%)	14 (6.5%)	10 (4.6%)	4.04
Communication	215	105 (48.8%)	64 (29.8%)	27 (12.6%)	13 (6.0%)	6 (2.8%)	4.16
Administrative Skills	179	97 (54.2%)	53 (29.6%)	21 (11.7%)	0 (0%)	8 (4.5%)	4.29
Overall Performance	216	104 (48.1%)	70 (32.4%)	28 (13.0%)	10 (4.6%)	4 (1.9%)	4.20

JUDGE BETTY J. BROWN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	149	78 (52.3%)	45 (30.2%)	19 (12.8%)	7 (4.7%)	0 (0%)	4.30
Legal Ability	148	35 (23.6%)	57 (38.5%)	30 (20.3%)	19 (12.8%)	7 (4.7%)	3.64
Professionalism	150	86 (57.3%)	47 (31.3%)	11 (7.3%)	6 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	4.42
Communication	149	66 (44.3%)	56 (37.6%)	20 (13.4%)	6 (4.0%)	1 (0.7%)	4.21
Administrative Skills	123	32 (26.0%)	53 (43.1%)	32 (26.0%)	4 (3.3%)	2 (1.6%)	3.89
Overall Performance	150	50 (33.3%)	64 (42.7%)	26 (17.3%)	9 (6.0%)	1 (0.7%)	4.02

DISTRICT 18, CONTINUED

JUDGE SUSAN R. BURCH • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	190	108 (56.8%)	49 (25.8%)	19 (10.0%)	7 (3.7%)	7 (3.7%)	4.28
Legal Ability	187	116 (62.0%)	50 (26.7%)	14 (7.5%)	4 (2.1%)	3 (1.6%)	4.46
Professionalism	188	117 (62.2%)	48 (25.5%)	13 (6.9%)	6 (3.2%)	4 (2.1%)	4.43
Communication	187	112 (59.9%)	54 (28.9%)	14 (7.5%)	3 (1.6%)	4 (2.1%)	4.43
Administrative Skills	159	72 (45.3%)	59 (37.1%)	20 (12.6%)	3 (1.9%)	5 (3.1%)	4.20
Overall Performance	188	96 (51.1%)	69 (36.7%)	15 (8.0%)	5 (2.7%)	3 (1.6%)	4.33

JUDGE AVERY MICHELLE CRUMP • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	154	37 (24.0%)	30 (19.5%)	44 (28.6%)	23 (14.9%)	20 (13.0%)	3.27
Legal Ability	152	33 (21.7%)	34 (22.4%)	38 (25.0%)	26 (17.1%)	21 (13.8%)	3.21
Professionalism	152	25 (16.4%)	37 (24.3%)	39 (25.7%)	31 (20.4%)	20 (13.2%)	3.11
Communication	153	24 (15.7%)	37 (24.2%)	43 (28.1%)	31 (20.3%)	18 (11.8%)	3.12
Administrative Skills	123	26 (21.1%)	34 (27.6%)	40 (32.5%)	14 (11.4%)	9 (7.3%)	3.44
Overall Performance	152	24 (15.8%)	33 (21.7%)	40 (26.3%)	34 (22.4%)	21 (13.8%)	3.03

JUDGE KIMBERLY MICHELLE FLETCHER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	154	90 (58.4%)	42 (27.3%)	16 (10.4%)	3 (1.9%)	3 (1.9%)	4.38
Legal Ability	154	65 (42.2%)	66 (42.9%)	16 (10.4%)	4 (2.6%)	3 (1.9%)	4.21
Professionalism	153	98 (64.1%)	40 (26.1%)	8 (5.2%)	4 (2.6%)	3 (2.0%)	4.48
Communication	153	95 (62.1%)	43 (28.1%)	9 (5.9%)	3 (2.0%)	3 (2.0%)	4.46
Administrative Skills	123	52 (42.3%)	50 (40.7%)	12 (9.8%)	3 (2.4%)	6 (4.9%)	4.13
Overall Performance	154	81 (52.6%)	52 (33.8%)	16 (10.4%)	1 (0.6%)	4 (2.6%)	4.33

DISTRICT 18, CONTINUED

JUDGE ANGELA C. FOSTER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	159	40 (25.2%)	47 (29.6%)	35 (22.0%)	21 (13.2%)	16 (10.1%)	3.47
Legal Ability	157	26 (16.6%)	37 (23.6%)	40 (25.5%)	32 (20.4%)	22 (14.0%)	3.08
Professionalism	158	31 (19.6%)	48 (30.4%)	37 (23.4%)	27 (17.1%)	15 (9.5%)	3.34
Communication	157	38 (24.2%)	54 (34.4%)	33 (21.0%)	20 (12.7%)	12 (7.6%)	3.55
Administrative Skills	128	23 (18.0%)	33 (25.8%)	43 (33.6%)	15 (11.7%)	14 (10.9%)	3.28
Overall Performance	158	28 (17.7%)	48 (30.4%)	39 (24.7%)	27 (17.1%)	16 (10.1%)	3.29

JUDGE WILLIAM K. (PETE) HUNTER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	184	104 (56.5%)	42 (22.8%)	29 (15.8%)	8 (4.3%)	1 (0.5%)	4.30
Legal Ability	181	70 (38.7%)	67 (37.0%)	29 (16.0%)	14 (7.7%)	1 (0.6%)	4.06
Professionalism	183	106 (57.9%)	55 (30.1%)	18 (9.8%)	3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	4.43
Communication	181	85 (47.0%)	65 (35.9%)	26 (14.4%)	5 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	4.27
Administrative Skills	142	57 (40.1%)	45 (31.7%)	34 (23.9%)	5 (3.5%)	1 (0.7%)	4.07
Overall Performance	181	85 (47.0%)	62 (34.3%)	28 (15.5%)	5 (2.8%)	1 (0.6%)	4.24

JUDGE JAN H. SAMET • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	198	137 (69.2%)	38 (19.2%)	16 (8.1%)	6 (3.0%)	1 (0.5%)	4.54
Legal Ability	196	112 (57.1%)	53 (27.0%)	19 (9.7%)	9 (4.6%)	3 (1.5%)	4.34
Professionalism	199	152 (76.4%)	35 (17.6%)	10 (5.0%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	4.69
Communication	196	129 (65.8%)	49 (25.0%)	16 (8.2%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	4.55
Administrative Skills	157	89 (56.7%)	39 (24.8%)	22 (14.0%)	3 (1.9%)	4 (2.5%)	4.31
Overall Performance	195	116 (59.5%)	52 (26.7%)	23 (11.8%)	3 (1.5%)	1 (0.5%)	4.43

DISTRICT 18, CONTINUED

JUDGE POLLY D. SIZEMORE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	221	100 (45.2%)	47 (21.3%)	35 (15.8%)	19 (8.6%)	20 (9.0%)	3.85
Legal Ability	217	97 (44.7%)	53 (24.4%)	34 (15.7%)	17 (7.8%)	16 (7.4%)	3.91
Professionalism	222	71 (32.0%)	41 (18.5%)	31 (14.0%)	43 (19.4%)	36 (16.2%)	3.31
Communication	217	64 (29.5%)	36 (16.6%)	44 (20.3%)	42 (19.4%)	31 (14.3%)	3.28
Administrative Skills	178	52 (29.2%)	40 (22.5%)	37 (20.8%)	23 (12.9%)	26 (14.6%)	3.39
Overall Performance	217	65 (30.0%)	43 (19.8%)	49 (22.6%)	37 (17.1%)	23 (10.6%)	3.42

JUDGE TERESA H. VINCENT • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 18							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	193	144 (74.6%)	30 (15.5%)	15 (7.8%)	4 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.63
Legal Ability	191	124 (64.9%)	49 (25.7%)	14 (7.3%)	4 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.53
Professionalism	192	149 (77.6%)	32 (16.7%)	7 (3.6%)	4 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4.70
Communication	191	128 (67.0%)	46 (24.1%)	11 (5.8%)	5 (2.6%)	1 (0.5%)	4.55
Administrative Skills	157	106 (67.5%)	33 (21.0%)	15 (9.6%)	3 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	4.54
Overall Performance	190	130 (68.4%)	45 (23.7%)	10 (5.3%)	5 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	4.58

DISTRICT 19B

JUDGE DONALD W. (SKIPPER) CREED JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	106	31 (29.2%)	30 (28.3%)	16 (15.1%)	15 (14.2%)	14 (13.2%)	3.46
Legal Ability	105	21 (20.0%)	21 (20.0%)	31 (29.5%)	21 (20.0%)	11 (10.5%)	3.19
Professionalism	106	32 (30.2%)	17 (16.0%)	25 (23.6%)	16 (15.1%)	16 (15.1%)	3.31
Communication	105	29 (27.6%)	23 (21.9%)	31 (29.5%)	10 (9.5%)	12 (11.4%)	3.45
Administrative Skills	89	24 (27.0%)	20 (22.5%)	26 (29.2%)	11 (12.4%)	8 (9.0%)	3.46
Overall Performance	105	25 (23.8%)	22 (21.0%)	26 (24.8%)	18 (17.1%)	14 (13.3%)	3.25

JUDGE JAMES P. (JIMMY) HILL • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	98	68 (69.4%)	19 (19.4%)	8 (8.2%)	2 (2.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.54
Legal Ability	98	54 (55.1%)	26 (26.5%)	12 (12.2%)	5 (5.1%)	1 (1.0%)	4.30
Professionalism	98	63 (64.3%)	22 (22.4%)	9 (9.2%)	3 (3.1%)	1 (1.0%)	4.46
Communication	96	52 (54.2%)	31 (32.3%)	9 (9.4%)	3 (3.1%)	1 (1.0%)	4.35
Administrative Skills	88	32 (36.4%)	26 (29.5%)	18 (20.5%)	7 (8.0%)	5 (5.7%)	3.83
Overall Performance	96	58 (60.4%)	21 (21.9%)	14 (14.6%)	3 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	4.40

JUDGE ROBERT M. WILKINS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	96	23 (24.0%)	22 (22.9%)	15 (15.6%)	13 (13.5%)	23 (24.0%)	3.09
Legal Ability	95	19 (20.0%)	12 (12.6%)	20 (21.1%)	19 (20.0%)	25 (26.3%)	2.80
Professionalism	96	19 (19.8%)	20 (20.8%)	18 (18.8%)	19 (19.8%)	20 (20.8%)	2.99
Communication	95	22 (23.2%)	19 (20.0%)	24 (25.3%)	12 (12.6%)	18 (18.9%)	3.16
Administrative Skills	83	19 (22.9%)	17 (20.5%)	20 (24.1%)	9 (10.8%)	18 (21.7%)	3.12
Overall Performance	94	20 (21.3%)	13 (13.8%)	17 (18.1%)	24 (25.5%)	20 (21.3%)	2.88

DISTRICT 19C

JUDGE R. MARSHALL BICKETT JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19C							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	59	23 (39.0%)	14 (23.7%)	11 (18.6%)	7 (11.9%)	4 (6.8%)	3.76
Legal Ability	58	20 (34.5%)	17 (29.3%)	15 (25.9%)	5 (8.6%)	1 (1.7%)	3.86
Professionalism	58	21 (36.2%)	11 (19.0%)	14 (24.1%)	8 (13.8%)	4 (6.9%)	3.64
Communication	58	19 (32.8%)	16 (27.6%)	13 (22.4%)	7 (12.1%)	3 (5.2%)	3.71
Administrative Skills	52	12 (23.1%)	15 (28.8%)	12 (23.1%)	5 (9.6%)	8 (15.4%)	3.35
Overall Performance	57	21 (36.8%)	10 (17.5%)	13 (22.8%)	11 (19.3%)	2 (3.5%)	3.65

DISTRICT 20A

JUDGE LISA D. THACKER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	91	67 (73.6%)	16 (17.6%)	3 (3.3%)	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.4%)	4.55
Legal Ability	91	64 (70.3%)	20 (22.0%)	4 (4.4%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)	4.57
Professionalism	91	69 (75.8%)	14 (15.4%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	4.59
Communication	92	70 (76.1%)	13 (14.1%)	4 (4.3%)	2 (2.2%)	3 (3.3%)	4.58
Administrative Skills	83	64 (77.1%)	11 (13.3%)	4 (4.8%)	2 (2.4%)	2 (2.4%)	4.60
Overall Performance	90	66 (73.3%)	15 (16.7%)	4 (4.4%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	4.56

JUDGE AMANDA L. WILSON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	66	36 (54.5%)	24 (36.4%)	5 (7.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	4.42
Legal Ability	65	16 (24.6%)	24 (36.9%)	18 (27.7%)	3 (4.6%)	4 (6.2%)	3.69
Professionalism	65	35 (53.8%)	20 (30.8%)	9 (13.8%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	4.37
Communication	66	34 (51.5%)	22 (33.3%)	7 (10.6%)	3 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	4.32
Administrative Skills	58	25 (43.1%)	19 (32.8%)	12 (20.7%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.7%)	4.14
Overall Performance	65	29 (44.6%)	22 (33.8%)	6 (9.2%)	7 (10.8%)	1 (1.5%)	4.09

DISTRICT 20B

JUDGE HUNT GWYN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	101	70 (69.3%)	20 (19.8%)	5 (5.0%)	5 (5.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.52
Legal Ability	102	52 (51.0%)	31 (30.4%)	15 (14.7%)	3 (2.9%)	1 (1.0%)	4.28
Professionalism	101	72 (71.3%)	21 (20.8%)	4 (4.0%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4.58
Communication	101	62 (61.4%)	27 (26.7%)	7 (6.9%)	3 (3.0%)	2 (2.0%)	4.43
Administrative Skills	88	54 (61.4%)	24 (27.3%)	6 (6.8%)	3 (3.4%)	1 (1.1%)	4.44
Overall Performance	98	64 (65.3%)	22 (22.4%)	7 (7.1%)	3 (3.1%)	2 (2.0%)	4.46

DISTRICT 20C

JUDGE STEPHEN HIGDON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20C							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	68	53 (77.9%)	11 (16.2%)	2 (2.9%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.68
Legal Ability	66	43 (65.2%)	14 (21.2%)	8 (12.1%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	4.50
Professionalism	69	53 (76.8%)	11 (15.9%)	1 (1.4%)	3 (4.3%)	1 (1.4%)	4.62
Communication	68	51 (75.0%)	12 (17.6%)	3 (4.4%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.63
Administrative Skills	57	38 (66.7%)	11 (19.3%)	7 (12.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.8%)	4.49
Overall Performance	69	48 (69.6%)	14 (20.3%)	6 (8.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)	4.57

JUDGE JOSEPH J. WILLIAMS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20C							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	92	40 (43.5%)	30 (32.6%)	14 (15.2%)	7 (7.6%)	1 (1.1%)	4.10
Legal Ability	92	38 (41.3%)	33 (35.9%)	17 (18.5%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)	4.12
Professionalism	92	30 (32.6%)	23 (25.0%)	23 (25.0%)	10 (10.9%)	6 (6.5%)	3.66
Communication	92	25 (27.2%)	29 (31.5%)	23 (25.0%)	9 (9.8%)	6 (6.5%)	3.63
Administrative Skills	78	28 (35.9%)	33 (42.3%)	14 (17.9%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.8%)	4.06
Overall Performance	89	26 (29.2%)	35 (39.3%)	19 (21.3%)	7 (7.9%)	2 (2.2%)	3.85

DISTRICT 20D

JUDGE WILLIAM F. (TRIPP) HELMS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 20D							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	108	47 (43.5%)	21 (19.4%)	14 (13.0%)	9 (8.3%)	17 (15.7%)	3.67
Legal Ability	107	41 (38.3%)	27 (25.2%)	18 (16.8%)	7 (6.5%)	14 (13.1%)	3.69
Professionalism	107	43 (40.2%)	23 (21.5%)	14 (13.1%)	13 (12.1%)	14 (13.1%)	3.64
Communication	107	42 (39.3%)	22 (20.6%)	17 (15.9%)	10 (9.3%)	16 (15.0%)	3.60
Administrative Skills	94	31 (33.0%)	20 (21.3%)	13 (13.8%)	11 (11.7%)	19 (20.2%)	3.35
Overall Performance	106	40 (37.7%)	23 (21.7%)	17 (16.0%)	14 (13.2%)	12 (11.3%)	3.61

DISTRICT 21

JUDGE CAMILLE D. BANKS-PAYNE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	202	108 (53.5%)	50 (24.8%)	28 (13.9%)	10 (5.0%)	6 (3.0%)	4.21
Legal Ability	201	89 (44.3%)	61 (30.3%)	34 (16.9%)	15 (7.5%)	2 (1.0%)	4.10
Professionalism	203	111 (54.7%)	45 (22.2%)	32 (15.8%)	9 (4.4%)	6 (3.0%)	4.21
Communication	202	103 (51.0%)	57 (28.2%)	32 (15.8%)	7 (3.5%)	3 (1.5%)	4.24
Administrative Skills	169	72 (42.6%)	68 (40.2%)	24 (14.2%)	2 (1.2%)	3 (1.8%)	4.21
Overall Performance	202	95 (47.0%)	56 (27.7%)	36 (17.8%)	12 (5.9%)	3 (1.5%)	4.13

JUDGE CHESTER C. DAVIS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	252	114 (45.2%)	68 (27.0%)	37 (14.7%)	18 (7.1%)	15 (6.0%)	3.98
Legal Ability	251	118 (47.0%)	87 (34.7%)	35 (13.9%)	5 (2.0%)	6 (2.4%)	4.22
Professionalism	253	97 (38.3%)	69 (27.3%)	40 (15.8%)	25 (9.9%)	22 (8.7%)	3.77
Communication	251	89 (35.5%)	80 (31.9%)	47 (18.7%)	24 (9.6%)	11 (4.4%)	3.85
Administrative Skills	220	89 (40.5%)	81 (36.8%)	37 (16.8%)	8 (3.6%)	5 (2.3%)	4.10
Overall Performance	248	90 (36.3%)	91 (36.7%)	38 (15.3%)	18 (7.3%)	11 (4.4%)	3.93

JUDGE LAWRENCE J. (LARRY) FINE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	249	174 (69.9%)	54 (21.7%)	15 (6.0%)	4 (1.6%)	2 (0.8%)	4.58
Legal Ability	250	160 (64.0%)	66 (26.4%)	21 (8.4%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	4.52
Professionalism	245	179 (73.1%)	49 (20.0%)	15 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.8%)	4.65
Communication	245	155 (63.3%)	69 (28.2%)	18 (7.3%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	4.53
Administrative Skills	209	116 (55.5%)	66 (31.6%)	24 (11.5%)	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.0%)	4.40
Overall Performance	242	155 (64.0%)	67 (27.7%)	18 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.8%)	4.54

DISTRICT 21, CONTINUED

JUDGE WILLIAM T. GRAHAM JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	243	104 (42.8%)	78 (32.1%)	37 (15.2%)	15 (6.2%)	9 (3.7%)	4.04
Legal Ability	244	74 (30.3%)	90 (36.9%)	56 (23.0%)	17 (7.0%)	7 (2.9%)	3.85
Professionalism	245	111 (45.3%)	78 (31.8%)	41 (16.7%)	9 (3.7%)	6 (2.4%)	4.14
Communication	243	117 (48.1%)	85 (35.0%)	28 (11.5%)	9 (3.7%)	4 (1.6%)	4.24
Administrative Skills	211	77 (36.5%)	87 (41.2%)	34 (16.1%)	7 (3.3%)	6 (2.8%)	4.05
Overall Performance	243	92 (37.9%)	96 (39.5%)	39 (16.0%)	11 (4.5%)	5 (2.1%)	4.07

JUDGE LAURIE L. HUTCHINS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	228	75 (32.9%)	67 (29.4%)	53 (23.2%)	20 (8.8%)	13 (5.7%)	3.75
Legal Ability	229	61 (26.6%)	75 (32.8%)	60 (26.2%)	22 (9.6%)	11 (4.8%)	3.67
Professionalism	230	82 (35.7%)	71 (30.9%)	46 (20.0%)	19 (8.3%)	12 (5.2%)	3.84
Communication	227	73 (32.2%)	90 (39.6%)	48 (21.1%)	11 (4.8%)	5 (2.2%)	3.95
Administrative Skills	193	57 (29.5%)	72 (37.3%)	46 (23.8%)	10 (5.2%)	8 (4.1%)	3.83
Overall Performance	228	61 (26.8%)	79 (34.6%)	58 (25.4%)	22 (9.6%)	8 (3.5%)	3.72

JUDGE WILLIAM B. REINGOLD • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	281	155 (55.2%)	76 (27.0%)	23 (8.2%)	14 (5.0%)	13 (4.6%)	4.23
Legal Ability	283	175 (61.8%)	78 (27.6%)	17 (6.0%)	6 (2.1%)	7 (2.5%)	4.44
Professionalism	283	170 (60.1%)	71 (25.1%)	20 (7.1%)	10 (3.5%)	12 (4.2%)	4.33
Communication	282	164 (58.2%)	68 (24.1%)	28 (9.9%)	12 (4.3%)	10 (3.5%)	4.29
Administrative Skills	267	148 (55.4%)	70 (26.2%)	26 (9.7%)	8 (3.0%)	15 (5.6%)	4.23
Overall Performance	281	155 (55.2%)	79 (28.1%)	29 (10.3%)	6 (2.1%)	12 (4.3%)	4.28

DISTRICT 21, CONTINUED

JUDGE VICTORIA L. ROEMER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 21							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	254	71 (28.0%)	73 (28.7%)	50 (19.7%)	26 (10.2%)	34 (13.4%)	3.48
Legal Ability	255	43 (16.9%)	55 (21.6%)	59 (23.1%)	52 (20.4%)	46 (18.0%)	2.99
Professionalism	257	74 (28.8%)	63 (24.5%)	64 (24.9%)	28 (10.9%)	28 (10.9%)	3.49
Communication	254	62 (24.4%)	71 (28.0%)	63 (24.8%)	33 (13.0%)	25 (9.8%)	3.44
Administrative Skills	211	53 (25.1%)	60 (28.4%)	50 (23.7%)	25 (11.8%)	23 (10.9%)	3.45
Overall Performance	255	51 (20.0%)	70 (27.5%)	59 (23.1%)	44 (17.3%)	31 (12.2%)	3.26

DISTRICT 22A

JUDGE DEBORAH BROWN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 22A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	58	17 (29.3%)	10 (17.2%)	13 (22.4%)	8 (13.8%)	10 (17.2%)	3.28
Legal Ability	58	16 (27.6%)	14 (24.1%)	17 (29.3%)	6 (10.3%)	5 (8.6%)	3.52
Professionalism	59	17 (28.8%)	7 (11.9%)	19 (32.2%)	6 (10.2%)	10 (16.9%)	3.25
Communication	59	19 (32.2%)	14 (23.7%)	16 (27.1%)	2 (3.4%)	8 (13.6%)	3.58
Administrative Skills	50	15 (30.0%)	13 (26.0%)	14 (28.0%)	2 (4.0%)	6 (12.0%)	3.58
Overall Performance	57	17 (29.8%)	10 (17.5%)	13 (22.8%)	8 (14.0%)	9 (15.8%)	3.32

JUDGE LAWRENCE DALE GRAHAM • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 22A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	78	63 (80.8%)	11 (14.1%)	2 (2.6%)	2 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	4.73
Legal Ability	77	55 (71.4%)	15 (19.5%)	4 (5.2%)	3 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	4.58
Professionalism	77	64 (83.1%)	10 (13.0%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	4.78
Communication	77	61 (79.2%)	12 (15.6%)	2 (2.6%)	2 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	4.71
Administrative Skills	74	60 (81.1%)	9 (12.2%)	3 (4.1%)	2 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.72
Overall Performance	78	60 (76.9%)	13 (16.7%)	3 (3.8%)	2 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	4.68

JUDGE EDWARD L. HEDRICK IV • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 22A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	67	47 (70.1%)	11 (16.4%)	4 (6.0%)	2 (3.0%)	3 (4.5%)	4.45
Legal Ability	66	40 (60.6%)	18 (27.3%)	3 (4.5%)	4 (6.1%)	1 (1.5%)	4.39
Professionalism	66	44 (66.7%)	15 (22.7%)	3 (4.5%)	3 (4.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.49
Communication	66	34 (51.5%)	23 (34.8%)	6 (9.1%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (1.5%)	4.32
Administrative Skills	65	34 (52.3%)	21 (32.3%)	8 (12.3%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.32
Overall Performance	65	39 (60.0%)	17 (26.2%)	5 (7.7%)	2 (3.1%)	2 (3.1%)	4.37

DISTRICT 22A, CONTINUED

JUDGE CHRISTINE UNDERWOOD • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 22A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	54	31 (57.4%)	15 (27.8%)	2 (3.7%)	2 (3.7%)	4 (7.4%)	4.24
Legal Ability	52	27 (51.9%)	18 (34.6%)	2 (3.8%)	4 (7.7%)	1 (1.9%)	4.27
Professionalism	54	32 (59.3%)	13 (24.1%)	2 (3.7%)	4 (7.4%)	3 (5.6%)	4.24
Communication	52	35 (67.3%)	11 (21.2%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)	1 (1.9%)	4.42
Administrative Skills	49	29 (59.2%)	14 (28.6%)	3 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (6.1%)	4.35
Overall Performance	53	29 (54.7%)	16 (30.2%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (5.7%)	3 (5.7%)	4.23

DISTRICT 23

JUDGE JEANIE REAVIS HOUSTON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 23							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	75	35 (46.7%)	19 (25.3%)	10 (13.3%)	8 (10.7%)	3 (4.0%)	4.00
Legal Ability	75	22 (29.3%)	27 (36.0%)	9 (12.0%)	13 (17.3%)	4 (5.3%)	3.67
Professionalism	75	27 (36.0%)	19 (25.3%)	17 (22.7%)	9 (12.0%)	3 (4.0%)	3.77
Communication	75	30 (40.0%)	23 (30.7%)	12 (16.0%)	8 (10.7%)	2 (2.7%)	3.95
Administrative Skills	68	19 (27.9%)	22 (32.4%)	16 (23.5%)	6 (8.8%)	5 (7.4%)	3.65
Overall Performance	75	26 (34.7%)	21 (28.0%)	12 (16.0%)	13 (17.3%)	3 (4.0%)	3.72

DISTRICT 24

JUDGE R. GREGORY HORNE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 24							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	77	63 (81.8%)	7 (9.1%)	5 (6.5%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	4.69
Legal Ability	78	58 (74.4%)	11 (14.1%)	6 (7.7%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	4.59
Professionalism	78	67 (85.9%)	8 (10.3%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	4.81
Communication	78	64 (82.1%)	11 (14.1%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.78
Administrative Skills	72	54 (75.0%)	14 (19.4%)	4 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.69
Overall Performance	77	59 (76.6%)	14 (18.2%)	1 (1.3%)	3 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	4.68

JUDGE ROY ALEXANDER LYERLY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 24							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	81	55 (67.9%)	17 (21.0%)	4 (4.9%)	4 (4.9%)	1 (1.2%)	4.49
Legal Ability	80	54 (67.5%)	14 (17.5%)	6 (7.5%)	6 (7.5%)	0 (0%)	4.45
Professionalism	80	62 (77.5%)	10 (12.5%)	4 (5.0%)	0 (0%)	4 (5.0%)	4.58
Communication	79	50 (63.3%)	15 (19.0%)	9 (11.4%)	3 (3.8%)	2 (2.5%)	4.37
Administrative Skills	76	53 (69.7%)	9 (11.8%)	9 (11.8%)	2 (2.6%)	3 (3.9%)	4.41
Overall Performance	76	53 (69.7%)	11 (14.5%)	6 (7.9%)	5 (6.6%)	1 (1.3%)	4.45

JUDGE TED McENTIRE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 24							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	61	43 (70.5%)	8 (13.1%)	5 (8.2%)	1 (1.6%)	4 (6.6%)	4.39
Legal Ability	61	42 (68.9%)	13 (21.3%)	3 (4.9%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.6%)	4.53
Professionalism	61	36 (59.0%)	16 (26.2%)	5 (8.2%)	3 (4.9%)	1 (1.6%)	4.36
Communication	61	34 (55.7%)	17 (27.9%)	7 (11.5%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.6%)	4.33
Administrative Skills	57	35 (61.4%)	16 (28.1%)	5 (8.8%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0%)	4.49
Overall Performance	60	37 (61.7%)	13 (21.7%)	5 (8.3%)	4 (6.7%)	1 (1.7%)	4.35

DISTRICT 25

JUDGE BURFORD A. CHERRY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 25							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	114	76 (66.7%)	27 (23.7%)	7 (6.1%)	4 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	4.54
Legal Ability	115	64 (55.7%)	36 (31.3%)	12 (10.4%)	3 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	4.40
Professionalism	113	69 (61.1%)	32 (28.3%)	8 (7.1%)	4 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	4.47
Communication	112	66 (58.9%)	30 (26.8%)	14 (12.5%)	2 (1.8%)	0 (0%)	4.43
Administrative Skills	104	55 (52.9%)	34 (32.7%)	12 (11.5%)	3 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	4.36
Overall Performance	114	66 (57.9%)	36 (31.6%)	9 (7.9%)	3 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	4.45

JUDGE J. GARY DELLINGER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 25							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	99	66 (66.7%)	12 (12.1%)	12 (12.1%)	4 (4.0%)	5 (5.1%)	4.31
Legal Ability	98	52 (53.1%)	23 (23.5%)	13 (13.3%)	5 (5.1%)	5 (5.1%)	4.14
Professionalism	99	61 (61.6%)	19 (19.2%)	7 (7.1%)	8 (8.1%)	4 (4.0%)	4.26
Communication	94	56 (59.6%)	16 (17.0%)	14 (14.9%)	5 (5.3%)	3 (3.2%)	4.25
Administrative Skills	88	46 (52.3%)	24 (27.3%)	10 (11.4%)	4 (4.5%)	4 (4.5%)	4.18
Overall Performance	98	59 (60.2%)	19 (19.4%)	9 (9.2%)	6 (6.1%)	5 (5.1%)	4.24

DISTRICT 26

JUDGE KIMBERLY Y. BEST • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	210	82 (39.0%)	48 (22.9%)	27 (12.9%)	26 (12.4%)	27 (12.9%)	3.63
Legal Ability	210	69 (32.9%)	48 (22.9%)	38 (18.1%)	32 (15.2%)	23 (11.0%)	3.51
Professionalism	214	84 (39.3%)	47 (22.0%)	27 (12.6%)	27 (12.6%)	29 (13.6%)	3.61
Communication	208	76 (36.5%)	55 (26.4%)	40 (19.2%)	21 (10.1%)	16 (7.7%)	3.74
Administrative Skills	155	64 (41.3%)	38 (24.5%)	21 (13.5%)	19 (12.3%)	13 (8.4%)	3.78
Overall Performance	212	75 (35.4%)	50 (23.6%)	25 (11.8%)	39 (18.4%)	23 (10.8%)	3.54

JUDGE CHARLOTTE BROWN-WILLIAMS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	307	123 (40.1%)	59 (19.2%)	50 (16.3%)	41 (13.4%)	34 (11.1%)	3.64
Legal Ability	307	58 (18.9%)	65 (21.2%)	41 (13.4%)	58 (18.9%)	85 (27.7%)	2.85
Professionalism	311	102 (32.8%)	76 (24.4%)	58 (18.6%)	35 (11.3%)	40 (12.9%)	3.53
Communication	306	100 (32.7%)	69 (22.5%)	48 (15.7%)	54 (17.6%)	35 (11.4%)	3.47
Administrative Skills	237	68 (28.7%)	53 (22.4%)	37 (15.6%)	34 (14.3%)	45 (19.0%)	3.27
Overall Performance	305	78 (25.6%)	72 (23.6%)	35 (11.5%)	59 (19.3%)	61 (20.0%)	3.15

JUDGE RONALD L. CHAPMAN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	291	195 (67.0%)	66 (22.7%)	19 (6.5%)	5 (1.7%)	6 (2.1%)	4.51
Legal Ability	292	186 (63.7%)	82 (28.1%)	16 (5.5%)	6 (2.1%)	2 (0.7%)	4.52
Professionalism	293	202 (68.9%)	68 (23.2%)	14 (4.8%)	4 (1.4%)	5 (1.7%)	4.56
Communication	288	175 (60.8%)	80 (27.8%)	21 (7.3%)	8 (2.8%)	4 (1.4%)	4.44
Administrative Skills	243	119 (49.0%)	79 (32.5%)	25 (10.3%)	11 (4.5%)	9 (3.7%)	4.19
Overall Performance	288	180 (62.5%)	77 (26.7%)	19 (6.6%)	6 (2.1%)	6 (2.1%)	4.46

DISTRICT 26, CONTINUED

JUDGE JENA P. CULLER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	281	168 (59.8%)	69 (24.6%)	25 (8.9%)	13 (4.6%)	6 (2.1%)	4.35
Legal Ability	277	139 (50.2%)	91 (32.9%)	35 (12.6%)	10 (3.6%)	2 (0.7%)	4.28
Professionalism	282	163 (57.8%)	67 (23.8%)	32 (11.3%)	14 (5.0%)	6 (2.1%)	4.30
Communication	278	149 (53.6%)	77 (27.7%)	36 (12.9%)	13 (4.7%)	3 (1.1%)	4.28
Administrative Skills	226	115 (50.9%)	68 (30.1%)	31 (13.7%)	7 (3.1%)	5 (2.2%)	4.24
Overall Performance	285	152 (53.3%)	79 (27.7%)	37 (13.0%)	10 (3.5%)	7 (2.5%)	4.26

JUDGE KAREN EADY-WILLIAMS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	242	132 (54.5%)	75 (31.0%)	25 (10.3%)	8 (3.3%)	2 (0.8%)	4.35
Legal Ability	240	121 (50.4%)	78 (32.5%)	26 (10.8%)	10 (4.2%)	5 (2.1%)	4.25
Professionalism	246	158 (64.2%)	67 (27.2%)	18 (7.3%)	3 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	4.55
Communication	244	138 (56.6%)	79 (32.4%)	22 (9.0%)	5 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	4.43
Administrative Skills	192	100 (52.1%)	64 (33.3%)	20 (10.4%)	6 (3.1%)	2 (1.0%)	4.32
Overall Performance	243	122 (50.2%)	84 (34.6%)	27 (11.1%)	8 (3.3%)	2 (0.8%)	4.30

JUDGE TYAWDI M. HANDS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	280	179 (63.9%)	71 (25.4%)	22 (7.9%)	5 (1.8%)	3 (1.1%)	4.49
Legal Ability	277	135 (48.7%)	91 (32.9%)	42 (15.2%)	8 (2.9%)	1 (0.4%)	4.27
Professionalism	282	180 (63.8%)	68 (24.1%)	22 (7.8%)	7 (2.5%)	5 (1.8%)	4.46
Communication	277	171 (61.7%)	72 (26.0%)	25 (9.0%)	7 (2.5%)	2 (0.7%)	4.46
Administrative Skills	218	114 (52.3%)	69 (31.7%)	28 (12.8%)	6 (2.8%)	1 (0.5%)	4.33
Overall Performance	278	153 (55.0%)	89 (32.0%)	24 (8.6%)	10 (3.6%)	2 (0.7%)	4.37

DISTRICT 26, CONTINUED

JUDGE DONNIE HOOVER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	304	180 (59.2%)	76 (25.0%)	29 (9.5%)	12 (3.9%)	7 (2.3%)	4.35
Legal Ability	304	91 (29.9%)	99 (32.6%)	76 (25.0%)	24 (7.9%)	14 (4.6%)	3.75
Professionalism	306	169 (55.2%)	86 (28.1%)	36 (11.8%)	8 (2.6%)	7 (2.3%)	4.31
Communication	303	95 (31.4%)	108 (35.6%)	70 (23.1%)	21 (6.9%)	9 (3.0%)	3.86
Administrative Skills	250	56 (22.4%)	56 (22.4%)	58 (23.2%)	54 (21.6%)	26 (10.4%)	3.25
Overall Performance	306	93 (30.4%)	118 (38.6%)	60 (19.6%)	26 (8.5%)	9 (2.9%)	3.85

JUDGE CHRISTY TOWNLEY MANN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	263	152 (57.8%)	57 (21.7%)	22 (8.4%)	21 (8.0%)	11 (4.2%)	4.21
Legal Ability	263	174 (66.2%)	48 (18.3%)	29 (11.0%)	8 (3.0%)	4 (1.5%)	4.45
Professionalism	265	140 (52.8%)	61 (23.0%)	30 (11.3%)	23 (8.7%)	11 (4.2%)	4.12
Communication	261	160 (61.3%)	62 (23.8%)	21 (8.0%)	11 (4.2%)	7 (2.7%)	4.37
Administrative Skills	230	137 (59.6%)	57 (24.8%)	21 (9.1%)	8 (3.5%)	7 (3.0%)	4.34
Overall Performance	261	151 (57.9%)	59 (22.6%)	28 (10.7%)	17 (6.5%)	6 (2.3%)	4.27

JUDGE THOMAS F. MOORE JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	289	82 (28.4%)	61 (21.1%)	51 (17.6%)	43 (14.9%)	52 (18.0%)	3.27
Legal Ability	287	110 (38.3%)	65 (22.6%)	55 (19.2%)	35 (12.2%)	22 (7.7%)	3.72
Professionalism	289	74 (25.6%)	76 (26.3%)	60 (20.8%)	46 (15.9%)	33 (11.4%)	3.39
Communication	286	66 (23.1%)	69 (24.1%)	66 (23.1%)	35 (12.2%)	50 (17.5%)	3.23
Administrative Skills	225	86 (38.2%)	57 (25.3%)	42 (18.7%)	15 (6.7%)	25 (11.1%)	3.73
Overall Performance	289	74 (25.6%)	70 (24.2%)	58 (20.1%)	51 (17.6%)	36 (12.5%)	3.33

DISTRICT 26, CONTINUED

JUDGE JOHN TOTTEN • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	249	21 (8.4%)	18 (7.2%)	27 (10.8%)	53 (21.3%)	130 (52.2%)	1.98
Legal Ability	247	19 (7.7%)	26 (10.5%)	55 (22.3%)	49 (19.8%)	98 (39.7%)	2.27
Professionalism	252	22 (8.7%)	20 (7.9%)	30 (11.9%)	45 (17.9%)	135 (53.6%)	2.00
Communication	244	25 (10.2%)	34 (13.9%)	58 (23.8%)	46 (18.9%)	81 (33.2%)	2.49
Administrative Skills	189	17 (9.0%)	25 (13.2%)	32 (16.9%)	36 (19.0%)	79 (41.8%)	2.29
Overall Performance	249	15 (6.0%)	26 (10.4%)	27 (10.8%)	65 (26.1%)	116 (46.6%)	2.03

JUDGE ELIZABETH THORNTON TROSCH • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	201	112 (55.7%)	47 (23.4%)	34 (16.9%)	5 (2.5%)	3 (1.5%)	4.29
Legal Ability	202	96 (47.5%)	60 (29.7%)	30 (14.9%)	10 (5.0%)	6 (3.0%)	4.14
Professionalism	202	120 (59.4%)	47 (23.3%)	25 (12.4%)	9 (4.5%)	1 (0.5%)	4.37
Communication	200	89 (44.5%)	56 (28.0%)	43 (21.5%)	10 (5.0%)	2 (1.0%)	4.10
Administrative Skills	157	70 (44.6%)	47 (29.9%)	23 (14.6%)	8 (5.1%)	9 (5.7%)	4.03
Overall Performance	201	98 (48.8%)	57 (28.4%)	33 (16.4%)	12 (6.0%)	1 (0.5%)	4.19

JUDGE LOUIS A. TROSCH JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 26							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	266	149 (56.0%)	66 (24.8%)	28 (10.5%)	13 (4.9%)	10 (3.8%)	4.24
Legal Ability	268	155 (57.8%)	71 (26.5%)	31 (11.6%)	6 (2.2%)	5 (1.9%)	4.36
Professionalism	269	140 (52.0%)	61 (22.7%)	40 (14.9%)	17 (6.3%)	11 (4.1%)	4.12
Communication	269	130 (48.3%)	75 (27.9%)	43 (16.0%)	14 (5.2%)	7 (2.6%)	4.14
Administrative Skills	214	103 (48.1%)	64 (29.9%)	31 (14.5%)	10 (4.7%)	6 (2.8%)	4.16
Overall Performance	267	139 (52.1%)	78 (29.2%)	31 (11.6%)	13 (4.9%)	6 (2.2%)	4.24

DISTRICT 27A

JUDGE RICHARD B. ABERNETHY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	98	56 (57.1%)	27 (27.6%)	10 (10.2%)	3 (3.1%)	2 (2.0%)	4.35
Legal Ability	97	48 (49.5%)	33 (34.0%)	12 (12.4%)	2 (2.1%)	2 (2.1%)	4.27
Professionalism	97	52 (53.6%)	28 (28.9%)	9 (9.3%)	3 (3.1%)	5 (5.2%)	4.23
Communication	95	58 (61.1%)	27 (28.4%)	6 (6.3%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.2%)	4.43
Administrative Skills	86	41 (47.7%)	30 (34.9%)	9 (10.5%)	3 (3.5%)	3 (3.5%)	4.20
Overall Performance	97	50 (51.5%)	30 (30.9%)	11 (11.3%)	4 (4.1%)	2 (2.1%)	4.26

JUDGE JOHN K. GREENLEE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	106	53 (50.0%)	30 (28.3%)	13 (12.3%)	6 (5.7%)	4 (3.8%)	4.15
Legal Ability	106	53 (50.0%)	32 (30.2%)	14 (13.2%)	6 (5.7%)	1 (0.9%)	4.23
Professionalism	106	38 (35.8%)	41 (38.7%)	17 (16.0%)	3 (2.8%)	7 (6.6%)	3.94
Communication	105	50 (47.6%)	28 (26.7%)	22 (21.0%)	3 (2.9%)	2 (1.9%)	4.15
Administrative Skills	96	43 (44.8%)	31 (32.3%)	15 (15.6%)	3 (3.1%)	4 (4.2%)	4.10
Overall Performance	106	41 (38.7%)	42 (39.6%)	15 (14.2%)	4 (3.8%)	4 (3.8%)	4.06

JUDGE ANGELA G. HOYLE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	98	27 (27.6%)	21 (21.4%)	22 (22.4%)	15 (15.3%)	13 (13.3%)	3.35
Legal Ability	97	25 (25.8%)	26 (26.8%)	28 (28.9%)	11 (11.3%)	7 (7.2%)	3.53
Professionalism	97	26 (26.8%)	17 (17.5%)	20 (20.6%)	19 (19.6%)	15 (15.5%)	3.21
Communication	98	30 (30.6%)	27 (27.6%)	21 (21.4%)	12 (12.2%)	8 (8.2%)	3.60
Administrative Skills	82	21 (25.6%)	16 (19.5%)	17 (20.7%)	12 (14.6%)	16 (19.5%)	3.17
Overall Performance	95	23 (24.2%)	21 (22.1%)	23 (24.2%)	17 (17.9%)	11 (11.6%)	3.30

DISTRICT 27A, CONTINUED

JUDGE JAMES A. JACKSON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	91	50 (54.9%)	25 (27.5%)	12 (13.2%)	4 (4.4%)	0 (0%)	4.33
Legal Ability	91	40 (44.0%)	33 (36.3%)	18 (19.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.24
Professionalism	91	48 (52.7%)	30 (33.0%)	11 (12.1%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	4.36
Communication	90	37 (41.1%)	41 (45.6%)	10 (11.1%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	4.26
Administrative Skills	80	35 (43.8%)	27 (33.8%)	16 (20.0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	4.19
Overall Performance	91	38 (41.8%)	38 (41.8%)	14 (15.4%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	4.24

JUDGE THOMAS G. TAYLOR • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27A							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	95	42 (44.2%)	22 (23.2%)	10 (10.5%)	13 (13.7%)	8 (8.4%)	3.81
Legal Ability	95	38 (40.0%)	24 (25.3%)	11 (11.6%)	14 (14.7%)	8 (8.4%)	3.74
Professionalism	95	41 (43.2%)	27 (28.4%)	11 (11.6%)	9 (9.5%)	7 (7.4%)	3.91
Communication	95	47 (49.5%)	30 (31.6%)	10 (10.5%)	4 (4.2%)	4 (4.2%)	4.18
Administrative Skills	88	37 (42.0%)	29 (33.0%)	11 (12.5%)	7 (8.0%)	4 (4.5%)	4.00
Overall Performance	93	39 (41.9%)	27 (29.0%)	11 (11.8%)	10 (10.8%)	6 (6.5%)	3.89

DISTRICT 27B

JUDGE KELVIN DEAN BLACK • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	75	41 (54.7%)	17 (22.7%)	15 (20.0%)	2 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.29
Legal Ability	75	30 (40.0%)	27 (36.0%)	14 (18.7%)	4 (5.3%)	0 (0%)	4.11
Professionalism	75	40 (53.3%)	22 (29.3%)	9 (12.0%)	3 (4.0%)	1 (1.3%)	4.29
Communication	75	30 (40.0%)	23 (30.7%)	12 (16.0%)	7 (9.3%)	3 (4.0%)	3.93
Administrative Skills	72	22 (30.6%)	21 (29.2%)	17 (23.6%)	4 (5.6%)	8 (11.1%)	3.63
Overall Performance	74	28 (37.8%)	26 (35.1%)	14 (18.9%)	2 (2.7%)	4 (5.4%)	3.97

JUDGE ANNA F. FOSTER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	77	50 (64.9%)	21 (27.3%)	3 (3.9%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.6%)	4.51
Legal Ability	77	51 (66.2%)	22 (28.6%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	4.57
Professionalism	76	44 (57.9%)	25 (32.9%)	5 (6.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.6%)	4.43
Communication	77	54 (70.1%)	18 (23.4%)	3 (3.9%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	4.60
Administrative Skills	72	42 (58.3%)	24 (33.3%)	5 (6.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)	4.47
Overall Performance	74	50 (67.6%)	18 (24.3%)	4 (5.4%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)	4.55

JUDGE MEREDITH A. SHUFORD • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	68	33 (48.5%)	12 (17.6%)	9 (13.2%)	5 (7.4%)	9 (13.2%)	3.81
Legal Ability	68	28 (41.2%)	16 (23.5%)	9 (13.2%)	9 (13.2%)	6 (8.8%)	3.75
Professionalism	68	35 (51.5%)	15 (22.1%)	7 (10.3%)	6 (8.8%)	5 (7.4%)	4.02
Communication	68	34 (50.0%)	16 (23.5%)	11 (16.2%)	2 (2.9%)	5 (7.4%)	4.06
Administrative Skills	60	25 (41.7%)	17 (28.3%)	9 (15.0%)	4 (6.7%)	5 (8.3%)	3.88
Overall Performance	67	31 (46.3%)	15 (22.4%)	7 (10.4%)	5 (7.5%)	9 (13.4%)	3.81

DISTRICT 27B, CONTINUED

JUDGE LARRY JAMES WILSON • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 27B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	72	49 (68.1%)	10 (13.9%)	8 (11.1%)	1 (1.4%)	4 (5.6%)	4.38
Legal Ability	72	42 (58.3%)	18 (25.0%)	8 (11.1%)	1 (1.4%)	3 (4.2%)	4.32
Professionalism	72	47 (65.3%)	15 (20.8%)	7 (9.7%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.2%)	4.43
Communication	72	38 (52.8%)	24 (33.3%)	6 (8.3%)	1 (1.4%)	3 (4.2%)	4.29
Administrative Skills	67	37 (55.2%)	18 (26.9%)	8 (11.9%)	1 (1.5%)	3 (4.5%)	4.27
Overall Performance	70	45 (64.3%)	15 (21.4%)	7 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.3%)	4.41

DISTRICT 28

JUDGE ANDREA DRAY • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 28							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	83	67 (80.7%)	12 (14.5%)	4 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.76
Legal Ability	84	48 (57.1%)	32 (38.1%)	4 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.52
Professionalism	86	73 (84.9%)	12 (14.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.84
Communication	84	64 (76.2%)	17 (20.2%)	3 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.73
Administrative Skills	61	38 (62.3%)	16 (26.2%)	7 (11.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.51
Overall Performance	80	56 (70.0%)	20 (25.0%)	4 (5.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.65

JUDGE J. CALVIN HILL • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 28							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	163	113 (69.3%)	25 (15.3%)	13 (8.0%)	5 (3.1%)	7 (4.3%)	4.42
Legal Ability	160	86 (53.8%)	48 (30.0%)	17 (10.6%)	5 (3.1%)	4 (2.5%)	4.29
Professionalism	163	118 (72.4%)	23 (14.1%)	11 (6.7%)	7 (4.3%)	4 (2.5%)	4.50
Communication	162	88 (54.3%)	42 (25.9%)	16 (9.9%)	10 (6.2%)	6 (3.7%)	4.21
Administrative Skills	143	72 (50.3%)	40 (28.0%)	21 (14.7%)	4 (2.8%)	6 (4.2%)	4.18
Overall Performance	158	92 (58.2%)	39 (24.7%)	18 (11.4%)	2 (1.3%)	7 (4.4%)	4.31

DISTRICT 29B

JUDGE THOMAS McAVOY BRITAIN JR. • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 29B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	67	41 (61.2%)	21 (31.3%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.0%)	4.46
Legal Ability	67	33 (49.3%)	24 (35.8%)	6 (9.0%)	3 (4.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.27
Professionalism	68	40 (58.8%)	22 (32.4%)	4 (5.9%)	2 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	4.47
Communication	68	33 (48.5%)	27 (39.7%)	6 (8.8%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.32
Administrative Skills	55	28 (50.9%)	23 (41.8%)	3 (5.5%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0%)	4.42
Overall Performance	67	35 (52.2%)	25 (37.3%)	4 (6.0%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (1.5%)	4.36

JUDGE ATHENA F. BROOKS • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 29B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	111	60 (54.1%)	37 (33.3%)	9 (8.1%)	3 (2.7%)	2 (1.8%)	4.35
Legal Ability	111	67 (60.4%)	31 (27.9%)	9 (8.1%)	4 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	4.45
Professionalism	111	63 (56.8%)	36 (32.4%)	9 (8.1%)	3 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	4.43
Communication	109	65 (59.6%)	31 (28.4%)	9 (8.3%)	4 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	4.44
Administrative Skills	100	56 (56.0%)	30 (30.0%)	12 (12.0%)	2 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	4.40
Overall Performance	110	63 (57.3%)	32 (29.1%)	14 (12.7%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	4.43

JUDGE DAVID KENNEDY FOX • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 29B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	94	57 (60.6%)	20 (21.3%)	12 (12.8%)	4 (4.3%)	1 (1.1%)	4.36
Legal Ability	93	49 (52.7%)	33 (35.5%)	8 (8.6%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.1%)	4.37
Professionalism	94	56 (59.6%)	23 (24.5%)	9 (9.6%)	4 (4.3%)	2 (2.1%)	4.35
Communication	93	51 (54.8%)	29 (31.2%)	10 (10.8%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.1%)	4.37
Administrative Skills	77	37 (48.1%)	27 (35.1%)	9 (11.7%)	3 (3.9%)	1 (1.3%)	4.25
Overall Performance	92	46 (50.0%)	33 (35.9%)	8 (8.7%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	4.28

DISTRICT 29B, CONTINUED

JUDGE PETER KNIGHT • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 29B							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	66	36 (54.5%)	15 (22.7%)	13 (19.7%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4.27
Legal Ability	66	23 (34.8%)	14 (21.2%)	22 (33.3%)	6 (9.1%)	1 (1.5%)	3.79
Professionalism	66	38 (57.6%)	18 (27.3%)	9 (13.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	4.39
Communication	66	27 (40.9%)	19 (28.8%)	17 (25.8%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.0%)	4.03
Administrative Skills	47	15 (31.9%)	16 (34.0%)	14 (29.8%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	3.92
Overall Performance	65	25 (38.5%)	18 (27.7%)	19 (29.2%)	2 (3.1%)	1 (1.5%)	3.99

DISTRICT 30

JUDGE RICHLYN D. HOLT • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 30							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	121	106 (87.6%)	10 (8.3%)	5 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.84
Legal Ability	121	99 (81.8%)	17 (14.0%)	5 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.78
Professionalism	121	100 (82.6%)	17 (14.0%)	2 (1.7%)	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	4.78
Communication	121	94 (77.7%)	23 (19.0%)	3 (2.5%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	4.74
Administrative Skills	106	83 (78.3%)	18 (17.0%)	4 (3.8%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	4.73
Overall Performance	118	97 (82.2%)	17 (14.4%)	3 (2.5%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	4.78

JUDGE MONICA HAYES LESLIE • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 30							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	127	84 (66.1%)	27 (21.3%)	13 (10.2%)	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	4.50
Legal Ability	126	66 (52.4%)	40 (31.7%)	16 (12.7%)	4 (3.2%)	0 (0%)	4.33
Professionalism	126	77 (61.1%)	30 (23.8%)	15 (11.9%)	4 (3.2%)	0 (0%)	4.43
Communication	126	83 (65.9%)	28 (22.2%)	12 (9.5%)	3 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	4.52
Administrative Skills	112	61 (54.5%)	21 (18.8%)	19 (17.0%)	9 (8.0%)	2 (1.8%)	4.16
Overall Performance	123	70 (56.9%)	37 (30.1%)	13 (10.6%)	3 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	4.42

JUDGE RICHARD K. WALKER • JUDICIAL DISTRICT 30							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	100	75 (75.0%)	16 (16.0%)	9 (9.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.66
Legal Ability	99	65 (65.7%)	25 (25.3%)	7 (7.1%)	2 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	4.55
Professionalism	99	77 (77.8%)	16 (16.2%)	6 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.72
Communication	99	68 (68.7%)	23 (23.2%)	7 (7.1%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Administrative Skills	87	59 (67.8%)	22 (25.3%)	5 (5.7%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	4.60
Overall Performance	98	65 (66.3%)	25 (25.5%)	7 (7.1%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	4.57