

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

3 | **PREFACE**

5 | **SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES**

6 | **DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES**

**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS**

- 9 | BILL ROGERS
- 10 | RICHARD GOTTLIEB
- 10 | STACEY RUBAIN
- 10 | DONNA TAYLOR
- 11 | DANIEL (DAN) KUEHNERT
- 12 | JASON WHITE
- 13 | JUSTIN WILLIAM MOORE
- 14 | JUDGE BILL COWARD

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS**

**DISTRICT 1**

- 15 | MEADER W. HARRISS III

**DISTRICT 3A**

- 16 | FARIS DIXON
- 16 | DANIEL HINES ENTZMINGER
- 16 | DAVID C. SUTTON
- 17 | JUDGE LEE F. TEAGUE

**DISTRICT 5**

- 18 | KENT HARRELL
- 18 | CHARLES (DUKE) LINEBERRY
- 18 | LINDSEY McKEE LUTHER

**DISTRICT 7**

- 19 | WAYNE SHELTON BOYETTE
- 19 | LAMONT WIGGINS

**DISTRICT 10**

- 20 | RONNIE ANSLEY
- 20 | JUDGE CRAIG CROOM
- 20 | CHARLES GILLIAM

**DISTRICT 11**

- 21 | JOY JONES
- 21 | KENNETH R. JONES
- 21 | LeVONDA G. WOOD

**DISTRICT 12**

- 22 | RITA COX
- 22 | J. DUANE GILLIAM JR.
- 22 | ROSALYN HOOD
- 23 | CHERI SILER-MACK
- 23 | JUDGE CLARK REAVES
- 23 | APRIL M. SMITH
- 24 | STEPHEN C. STOKES
- 24 | JONATHAN C. STRANGE

**DISTRICT 13**

- 25 | WILLIE (FRED) GORE

**DISTRICT 14**

- 26 | FRED BATTAGLIA JR.
- 26 | HENRY PRUETTE
- 26 | MARK J. SIMEON
- 27 | STEVEN STORCH
- 27 | AMINAH M. THOMPSON

**DISTRICT 15A**

- 28 | JOHN W. COX

**DISTRICT 16A**

- 29 | CHRIS RHUE

**DISTRICT 17A**

- 30 | CHRIS FREEMAN
- 30 | WAYNE HOLLOWELL
- 30 | CHRISTINE FIELDS STRADER

**DISTRICT 19A**

- 31 | JUANITA BOGER ALLEN
- 31 | BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JR.
- 31 | STEVEN A. GROSSMAN
- 32 | CHRISTY WILHELM

**TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED****DISTRICT 19B**

33 | STEVE BIBEY

33 | JUDGE WILLIAM H. HEAFNER

**DISTRICT 19C**

34 | TED BLANTON

34 | JAMES RANDOLPH

34 | DOUGLAS A. SMITH

**DISTRICT 20A**

35 | JOHN R. NANCE

35 | JOHN W. WEBSTER

**DISTRICT 21**

36 | DANIEL B. (DAN) ANTHONY

36 | DONALD R. BUIE

36 | VALENE FRANCO

37 | THEODORE (TED) KAZAKOS

37 | ANDREW KEEVER

**DISTRICT 22A**

38 | CAROLE A. HICKS

**DISTRICT 23**

39 | FRED BAUER

39 | JUDGE WILLIAM (BILL) BROOKS

39 | ROBERT (ROB) CRUMPTON

40 | REGINA GILLESPIE

40 | TRACIE McMILLAN JORDAN

40 | DONNA L. SHUMATE

**DISTRICT 25**

41 | DAVID W. AYCOCK

41 | WES W. BARKLEY

41 | F. WESLEY SIGMON

42 | JUDGE CLIFTON SMITH

**DISTRICT 26**

43 | ALICIA D. BROOKS

43 | YOLANDA M. TROTMAN

43 | JUDGE CASEY VISER

**DISTRICT 28**

44 | J. THOMAS AMBURGEY

44 | J. MATTHEW MARTIN

## PREFACE

**INTRODUCTION** | The Judicial Performance Evaluation (JPE) Committee of the North Carolina Bar Association is pleased to provide this report summarizing the results of Phase II of its survey of North Carolina Superior and District Court judges and judicial candidates. In a 2013 survey conducted from October 15 to November 15 (Phase I), attorneys evaluated sitting Superior and District Court judges elected or appointed to the bench before March 31, 2013, whose terms expire in 2014, as well as Special Superior Court judges. The report of that survey was released in January 2014 and is available at [www.electncjudges.org](http://www.electncjudges.org). In a second survey conducted in March 2014 (Phase II), attorneys evaluated Superior and District Court judges who were appointed to the bench after March 31, 2013, whose terms expire in 2014 and lawyers who filed as candidates for Superior and District Court.

**BACKGROUND** | In 2006, the NCBA's Administration of Justice 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 recommended 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 currently led by former District Court Judge Nancy Black Norelli and it is composed 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 retired 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.

**SURVEY DETAILS** | The survey asked attorneys with an active North Carolina law license to rate each included judge and each lawyer candidate with whom the attorney had sufficient professional contact to be able to evaluate the judge or candidate's performance in the six categories below, using a scale of 5 (excellent), 4 (good), 3 (average), 2 (below average) and 1 (poor):

**1. Integrity & Impartiality** | Is fair to all persons and refrains from inappropriate *ex parte* communications. As a lawyer, bases legal arguments on facts and law. As a judge, bases decisions on facts and law;

**2. Legal Ability** | Demonstrates knowledge of law and rules of procedure and evidence;

**3. Professionalism** | Exercises patience; is courteous to all and attentive to proceedings; fulfills duties and responsibilities; upholds the dignity of the court and the legal profession;

**4. Communication** | Speaks clearly and understandably. As a lawyer, prepares coherent and carefully reviewed papers for use in-and-out of court. As a judge, prepares coherent decisions and carefully reviews orders before entry;

**5. Administrative Skills** | Is punctual and prepared; uses time efficiently; meets deadlines appropriately and demonstrates an organized approach to matters. As a judge, enforces deadlines appropriately, makes timely decisions and enters orders promptly; and

**6. Overall Performance** | Rate the individual's overall performance.

If the rating attorney felt that his or her knowledge of a particular judge or lawyer candidate was sufficient to rate some but not all of the qualities, the lawyer indicated "don't know" for the quality or qualities that he or she felt unqualified to rate. As a result, the number of responses for a single judge or lawyer candidate may vary somewhat among the six categories.

To identify those Superior and District Court judges appointed after March 31, 2013, and the lawyers who had filed as candidates for the Superior and District Courts, the JPE Committee collected information from the North Carolina State Board of Elections and the Administrative Office of the Court. A total of 76 individuals were included in the survey. A total of 7 judges, 1 in Superior Court and 6 in District Court, were subject to the survey, including one judge who was sworn in prior to March 31, 2013, but was unintentionally omitted from Phase I. A total of 69 lawyer candidates were subject to the survey.

A list was compiled of the more than 20,000 lawyers 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. Attorneys without email addresses; attorneys who notified the NCBA that they did not wish to participate online; attorneys working for the government, including judges, clerks of court, district attorneys and public defenders; and members of the NCBA's Senior Lawyers Division were provided a paper version of the survey.

On March 4, 2014, 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 survey responses were directed to BDO USA, who protected confidentiality, 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 from March 4 to March 24, 2014. 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 or lawyer candidates. Upon review of the data, Professor Nelson reported that the results were statistically valid for each judge and lawyer candidate included in the survey.

## PREFACE, CONTINUED

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS** | The total number of responses per judge or lawyer candidate varied, reflecting the total number of attorneys who practice in the particular judicial district in which the candidate proposes to serve. The numbers may also be an indication of how well known the candidate is in the legal community.

**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 judge or lawyer candidate 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 or lawyer candidate was evaluated.

The second section provides detailed results for each judge or lawyer candidate included in the report. This section reports the total number of lawyers who responded for each judge or lawyer candidate and a breakdown of the number of responses in each rating (5 to 1) for each category for each judge and lawyer candidate.

In both sections, the Superior Court candidates are listed first and then the District Court candidates, 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 candidates.

**SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES**

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES							
DISTRICT	JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
19A	<b>BILL ROGERS</b>	4.58	4.52	4.73	4.59	4.57	<b>4.60</b>
21A	<b>RICHARD GOTTLIEB</b>	4.78	4.84	4.81	4.72	4.76	<b>4.76</b>
21A	<b>STACEY RUBAIN</b>	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.17	4.03	<b>4.15</b>
21A	<b>DONNA TAYLOR</b>	2.92	2.40	2.96	2.80	2.49	<b>2.58</b>
25A	<b>DANIEL (DAN) KUEHNERT</b>	3.48	3.37	3.73	3.54	3.41	<b>3.34</b>
25B	<b>JASON WHITE</b>	4.78	4.71	4.82	4.63	4.53	<b>4.73</b>
26C	<b>JUSTIN WILLIAM MOORE</b>	1.94	1.52	1.84	1.95	1.71	<b>1.57</b>
30A	<b>JUDGE BILL COWARD</b>	4.39	4.16	4.42	4.25	4.14	<b>4.28</b>

**DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES**

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS 1 – 14							
	JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
1	MEADER W. HARRISS III	4.46	3.98	4.46	4.44	4.24	<b>4.24</b>
3A	FARIS DIXON	4.33	4.13	4.43	4.05	4.03	<b>4.22</b>
3A	DANIEL HINES ENTZMINGER	4.11	3.83	4.21	3.87	3.72	<b>3.93</b>
3A	DAVID C. SUTTON	1.49	2.39	1.32	1.75	1.60	<b>1.45</b>
3A	JUDGE LEE F. TEAGUE	4.07	3.99	4.25	4.09	4.05	<b>4.10</b>
5	KENT HARRELL	4.59	4.46	4.70	4.51	4.47	<b>4.52</b>
5	CHARLES (DUKE) LINEBERRY	3.61	3.68	3.64	3.53	3.41	<b>3.61</b>
5	LINDSEY McKEE LUTHER	3.98	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.24	<b>3.94</b>
7	WAYNE SHELTON BOYETTE	4.75	4.52	4.67	4.63	4.74	<b>4.63</b>
7	LAMONT WIGGINS	4.05	3.93	4.14	3.95	3.86	<b>3.88</b>
10	RONNIE ANSLEY	4.27	3.84	4.25	4.15	4.03	<b>4.01</b>
10	JUDGE CRAIG CROOM	4.65	4.51	4.65	4.64	4.56	<b>4.62</b>
10	CHARLES GILLIAM	2.91	2.75	3.12	2.95	2.84	<b>2.77</b>
11	JOY JONES	4.47	4.45	4.57	4.45	4.45	<b>4.46</b>
11	KENNETH R. JONES	3.74	3.46	3.74	3.52	3.52	<b>3.48</b>
11	LeVONDA G. WOOD	2.95	2.36	2.98	2.70	2.59	<b>2.57</b>
12	RITA COX	3.92	4.05	3.99	3.71	3.99	<b>3.83</b>
12	J. DUANE GILLIAM JR.	3.60	3.90	3.76	3.53	3.70	<b>3.66</b>
12	ROSALYN HOOD	3.29	2.96	3.20	3.25	3.03	<b>3.16</b>
12	CHERI SILER-MACK	3.95	3.72	3.80	3.81	3.80	<b>3.85</b>
12	JUDGE CLARK REAVES	4.61	4.54	4.70	4.50	4.43	<b>4.56</b>
12	APRIL M. SMITH	3.16	3.11	3.13	3.23	3.10	<b>3.05</b>
12	STEPHEN C. STOKES	3.24	3.51	3.44	3.50	3.38	<b>3.31</b>
12	JONATHAN C. STRANGE	3.07	3.29	3.24	3.36	3.13	<b>3.16</b>
13	WILLIE (FRED) GORE	4.04	3.91	4.00	4.08	3.81	<b>3.96</b>
14	FRED BATTAGLIA JR.	4.27	4.36	4.29	4.44	4.34	<b>4.34</b>
14	HENRY PRUETTE	4.07	3.80	4.11	3.93	3.82	<b>3.95</b>
14	MARK J. SIMEON	2.85	2.92	2.91	3.08	2.68	<b>2.87</b>
14	STEVEN STORCH	3.74	3.75	3.61	3.86	3.91	<b>3.77</b>
14	AMINAH M. THOMPSON	3.13	2.93	3.08	3.02	3.04	<b>3.02</b>

**DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES, CONTINUED**

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS 15A – 23							
	JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
15A	JOHN W. COX	4.16	4.18	4.25	4.12	4.17	<b>4.16</b>
16A	CHRIS RHUE	4.56	4.64	4.50	4.41	4.38	<b>4.46</b>
17A	CHRIS FREEMAN	2.67	2.09	3.09	2.44	2.33	<b>2.28</b>
17A	WAYNE HOLLOWELL	4.31	4.31	4.40	4.23	4.23	<b>4.30</b>
17A	CHRISTINE FIELDS STRADER	3.62	3.41	3.87	3.65	3.59	<b>3.50</b>
19A	JUANITA BOGER ALLEN	2.96	2.72	2.85	2.88	2.61	<b>2.67</b>
19A	BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JR.	3.89	3.88	4.00	3.87	3.85	<b>3.88</b>
19A	STEVEN A. GROSSMAN	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.16	4.15	<b>4.26</b>
19A	CHRISTY WILHELM	4.04	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.04	<b>4.00</b>
19B	STEVE BIBEY	3.47	3.25	3.52	3.41	3.30	<b>3.43</b>
19B	JUDGE WILLIAM H. HEAFNER	4.65	4.33	4.65	4.37	4.32	<b>4.51</b>
19C	TED BLANTON	3.86	3.93	3.90	3.81	3.66	<b>3.86</b>
19C	JAMES RANDOLPH	4.43	4.35	4.37	4.29	4.24	<b>4.36</b>
19C	DOUGLAS A. SMITH	4.12	3.81	4.12	3.95	3.86	<b>3.98</b>
20A	JOHN R. NANCE	3.13	2.75	3.09	2.82	2.96	<b>2.89</b>
20A	JOHN W. WEBSTER	4.54	4.48	4.53	4.41	4.51	<b>4.49</b>
21	DANIEL B. (DAN) ANTHONY	3.69	3.39	3.84	3.54	3.35	<b>3.47</b>
21	DONALD R. BUIE	3.74	3.17	3.70	3.17	3.20	<b>3.37</b>
21	VALENE FRANCO	4.46	4.36	4.56	4.35	4.37	<b>4.41</b>
21	THEODORE (TED) KAZAKOS	3.95	3.74	4.12	3.97	3.87	<b>3.89</b>
21	ANDREW KEEVER	4.18	3.90	4.10	3.85	3.73	<b>3.95</b>
22A	CAROLE A. HICKS	3.66	3.11	3.36	3.56	3.35	<b>3.34</b>
23	FRED BAUER	4.39	4.40	4.44	4.31	4.41	<b>4.40</b>
23	JUDGE WILLIAM (BILL) BROOKS	4.58	4.56	4.66	4.58	4.60	<b>4.64</b>
23	ROBERT (ROB) CRUMPTON	4.07	4.09	4.12	4.19	4.03	<b>4.07</b>
23	REGINA GILLESPIE	3.00	3.16	2.90	2.94	2.98	<b>2.98</b>
23	TRACIE McMILLAN JORDAN	3.41	3.26	3.51	3.34	3.44	<b>3.23</b>
23	DONNA L. SHUMATE	4.18	3.97	4.08	3.97	3.74	<b>3.95</b>

**DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CATEGORICAL AVERAGES**

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS 25 – 28							
	JUDGE NAME	INTEGRITY & IMPARTIALITY	LEGAL ABILITY	PROFESSIONALISM	COMMUNICATION	ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	OVERALL PERFORMANCE
25	<b>DAVID W. AYCOCK</b>	4.54	4.05	4.48	4.33	3.91	<b>4.15</b>
25	<b>WES W. BARKLEY</b>	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.18	4.29	<b>4.31</b>
25	<b>F. WESLEY SIGMON</b>	3.72	3.45	3.69	3.53	3.41	<b>3.47</b>
25	<b>JUDGE CLIFTON SMITH</b>	4.03	3.71	4.12	3.89	4.10	<b>3.83</b>
26	<b>ALICIA D. BROOKS</b>	3.91	3.80	3.90	3.73	3.71	<b>3.77</b>
26	<b>YOLANDA M. TROTMAN</b>	3.12	3.31	3.07	3.23	3.35	<b>3.13</b>
26	<b>JUDGE CASEY VISER</b>	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.31	4.21	<b>4.22</b>
28	<b>J. THOMAS AMBURGEY</b>	4.20	4.04	4.26	4.13	4.10	<b>4.21</b>
28	<b>J. MATTHEW MARTIN</b>	4.09	4.06	4.18	4.07	4.04	<b>4.11</b>



**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 19A**

<b>19A • BILL ROGERS</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	78	56 (71.8%)	15 (19.2%)	5 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.6%)	<b>4.58</b>
Legal Ability	75	49 (65.3%)	19 (25.3%)	5 (6.7%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.4%)	<b>4.52</b>
Professionalism	75	59 (78.7%)	12 (16.0%)	4 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.73</b>
Communication	74	51 (68.9%)	17 (23.0%)	5 (6.8%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.59</b>
Administrative Skills	63	44 (69.8%)	12 (19.0%)	6 (9.5%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.57</b>
Overall Performance	75	53 (70.7%)	17 (22.7%)	3 (4.0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.60</b>

**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 21A**

<b>21A • RICHARD GOTTLIEB</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	186	158 (84.9%)	18 (9.7%)	8 (4.3%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.6%)	<b>4.78</b>
Legal Ability	191	168 (88.0%)	17 (8.9%)	5 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	<b>4.84</b>
Professionalism	189	165 (87.3%)	16 (8.5%)	6 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.0%)	<b>4.81</b>
Communication	187	151 (80.7%)	25 (13.4%)	8 (4.3%)	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.1%)	<b>4.72</b>
Administrative Skills	152	124 (81.6%)	21 (13.8%)	6 (3.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	<b>4.76</b>
Overall Performance	187	153 (81.8%)	25 (13.4%)	8 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	<b>4.76</b>

<b>21A • STACEY RUBAIN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	165	92 (55.8%)	34 (20.6%)	27 (16.4%)	5 (3.0%)	7 (4.2%)	<b>4.21</b>
Legal Ability	170	84 (49.4%)	46 (27.1%)	26 (15.3%)	9 (5.3%)	5 (2.9%)	<b>4.15</b>
Professionalism	168	105 (62.5%)	26 (15.5%)	24 (14.3%)	8 (4.8%)	5 (2.9%)	<b>4.30</b>
Communication	167	86 (51.5%)	44 (26.3%)	24 (14.4%)	6 (3.6%)	7 (4.2%)	<b>4.17</b>
Administrative Skills	120	60 (50.0%)	26 (21.7%)	18 (15.0%)	9 (7.5%)	7 (5.8%)	<b>4.03</b>
Overall Performance	169	87 (51.5%)	41 (24.3%)	26 (15.4%)	10 (5.9%)	5 (2.9%)	<b>4.15</b>

<b>21A • DONNA TAYLOR</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	83	10 (12.0%)	16 (19.3%)	29 (34.9%)	13 (15.7%)	15 (18.1%)	<b>2.92</b>
Legal Ability	90	5 (5.6%)	13 (14.4%)	20 (22.2%)	27 (30.0%)	25 (27.8%)	<b>2.40</b>
Professionalism	91	13 (14.3%)	17 (18.7%)	32 (35.2%)	11 (12.1%)	18 (19.7%)	<b>2.96</b>
Communication	89	6 (6.7%)	19 (21.3%)	29 (32.6%)	21 (23.6%)	14 (15.8%)	<b>2.80</b>
Administrative Skills	71	4 (5.6%)	11 (15.5%)	20 (28.2%)	17 (23.9%)	19 (26.8%)	<b>2.49</b>
Overall Performance	91	7 (7.7%)	13 (14.3%)	26 (28.6%)	25 (27.5%)	20 (21.9%)	<b>2.58</b>

**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 25A**

<b>25A • DANIEL (DAN) KUEHNERT</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	63	20 (31.7%)	15 (23.8%)	11 (17.5%)	9 (14.3%)	8 (12.7%)	<b>3.48</b>
Legal Ability	62	16 (25.8%)	9 (14.5%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (16.1%)	4 (6.5%)	<b>3.37</b>
Professionalism	62	22 (35.5%)	15 (24.2%)	14 (22.6%)	8 (12.9%)	3 (4.8%)	<b>3.73</b>
Communication	57	16 (28.1%)	14 (24.6%)	15 (26.3%)	9 (15.8%)	3 (5.2%)	<b>3.54</b>
Administrative Skills	34	10 (29.4%)	6 (17.6%)	11 (32.4%)	2 (5.9%)	5 (14.7%)	<b>3.41</b>
Overall Performance	62	16 (25.8%)	12 (19.4%)	16 (25.8%)	13 (21.0%)	5 (8.0%)	<b>3.34</b>

**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 25B**

<b>25B • JASON WHITE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	91	75 (82.4%)	14 (15.4%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	<b>4.78</b>
Legal Ability	95	74 (77.9%)	18 (18.9%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.1%)	<b>4.71</b>
Professionalism	94	82 (87.2%)	9 (9.6%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	<b>4.82</b>
Communication	90	61 (67.8%)	27 (30.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	<b>4.63</b>
Administrative Skills	68	42 (61.8%)	22 (32.4%)	3 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	<b>4.53</b>
Overall Performance	90	71 (78.9%)	16 (17.8%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	<b>4.73</b>

**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 26C**

<b>26C • JUSTIN WILLIAM MOORE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	32	3 (9.4%)	3 (9.4%)	2 (6.3%)	5 (15.6%)	19 (59.3%)	<b>1.94</b>
Legal Ability	48	1 (2.1%)	4 (8.3%)	1 (2.1%)	7 (14.6%)	35 (72.9%)	<b>1.52</b>
Professionalism	45	3 (6.7%)	4 (8.9%)	4 (8.9%)	6 (13.3%)	28 (62.2%)	<b>1.84</b>
Communication	42	3 (7.1%)	5 (11.9%)	3 (7.1%)	7 (16.7%)	24 (57.2%)	<b>1.95</b>
Administrative Skills	35	1 (2.9%)	4 (11.4%)	1 (2.9%)	7 (20.0%)	22 (62.8%)	<b>1.71</b>
Overall Performance	44	1 (2.3%)	3 (6.8%)	2 (4.5%)	8 (18.2%)	30 (68.2%)	<b>1.57</b>

**INDIVIDUAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 30A**

<b>30A • JUDGE BILL COWARD</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	103	66 (64.1%)	23 (22.3%)	6 (5.8%)	4 (3.9%)	4 (3.9%)	<b>4.39</b>
Legal Ability	102	51 (50.0%)	29 (28.4%)	13 (12.7%)	5 (4.9%)	4 (4.0%)	<b>4.16</b>
Professionalism	103	65 (63.1%)	29 (28.2%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (4.9%)	4 (3.8%)	<b>4.42</b>
Communication	101	54 (53.5%)	30 (29.7%)	9 (8.9%)	4 (4.0%)	4 (3.9%)	<b>4.25</b>
Administrative Skills	81	36 (44.4%)	32 (39.5%)	4 (4.9%)	6 (7.4%)	3 (3.8%)	<b>4.14</b>
Overall Performance	100	52 (52.0%)	34 (34.0%)	7 (7.0%)	4 (4.0%)	3 (3.0%)	<b>4.28</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 1**

<b>1 • MEADER W. HARRISS III</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	57	36 (63.2%)	14 (24.6%)	5 (8.8%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.6%)	<b>4.46</b>
Legal Ability	63	27 (42.9%)	17 (27.0%)	12 (19.0%)	5 (7.9%)	2 (3.2%)	<b>3.98</b>
Professionalism	63	40 (63.5%)	15 (23.8%)	6 (9.5%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	<b>4.46</b>
Communication	61	39 (63.9%)	15 (24.6%)	4 (6.6%)	1 (1.6%)	2 (3.3%)	<b>4.44</b>
Administrative Skills	41	21 (51.2%)	14 (34.1%)	3 (7.3%)	1 (2.4%)	2 (5.0%)	<b>4.24</b>
Overall Performance	58	29 (50.0%)	19 (32.8%)	6 (10.3%)	3 (5.2%)	1 (1.7%)	<b>4.24</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 3A**

<b>3A • FARIS DIXON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	101	61 (60.4%)	23 (22.8%)	10 (9.9%)	3 (3.0%)	4 (3.9%)	<b>4.33</b>
Legal Ability	101	44 (43.6%)	33 (32.7%)	19 (18.8%)	3 (3.0%)	2 (1.9%)	<b>4.13</b>
Professionalism	100	62 (62.0%)	24 (24.0%)	9 (9.0%)	5 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.43</b>
Communication	98	44 (44.9%)	29 (29.6%)	14 (14.3%)	8 (8.2%)	3 (3.0%)	<b>4.05</b>
Administrative Skills	79	34 (43.0%)	23 (29.1%)	14 (17.7%)	6 (7.6%)	2 (2.6%)	<b>4.03</b>
Overall Performance	97	48 (49.5%)	30 (30.9%)	12 (12.4%)	6 (6.2%)	1 (1.0%)	<b>4.22</b>

<b>3A • DANIEL HINES ENTZMINGER</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	84	34 (40.5%)	28 (33.3%)	20 (23.8%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	<b>4.11</b>
Legal Ability	87	25 (28.7%)	31 (35.6%)	24 (27.6%)	5 (5.7%)	2 (2.4%)	<b>3.83</b>
Professionalism	85	36 (42.4%)	36 (42.4%)	9 (10.6%)	3 (3.5%)	1 (1.1%)	<b>4.21</b>
Communication	84	22 (26.2%)	38 (45.2%)	16 (19.0%)	7 (8.3%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>3.87</b>
Administrative Skills	72	15 (20.8%)	32 (44.4%)	17 (23.6%)	6 (8.3%)	2 (2.9%)	<b>3.72</b>
Overall Performance	85	25 (29.4%)	35 (41.2%)	20 (23.5%)	4 (4.7%)	1 (1.2%)	<b>3.93</b>

<b>3A • DAVID C. SUTTON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	154	4 (2.6%)	4 (2.6%)	14 (9.1%)	20 (13.0%)	112 (72.7%)	<b>1.49</b>
Legal Ability	152	10 (6.6%)	29 (19.1%)	29 (19.1%)	27 (17.8%)	57 (37.4%)	<b>2.39</b>
Professionalism	157	3 (1.9%)	2 (1.3%)	6 (3.8%)	20 (12.7%)	126 (80.3%)	<b>1.32</b>
Communication	148	5 (3.4%)	8 (5.4%)	23 (15.5%)	21 (14.2%)	91 (61.5%)	<b>1.75</b>
Administrative Skills	98	2 (2.0%)	6 (6.1%)	9 (9.2%)	15 (15.3%)	66 (67.4%)	<b>1.60</b>
Overall Performance	154	3 (1.9%)	3 (1.9%)	13 (8.4%)	23 (14.9%)	112 (72.9%)	<b>1.45</b>



**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 3A, continued**

<b>3A • JUDGE LEE F. TEAGUE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	107	52 (48.6%)	33 (30.8%)	9 (8.4%)	3 (2.8%)	10 (9.4%)	<b>4.07</b>
Legal Ability	106	42 (39.6%)	41 (38.7%)	11 (10.4%)	4 (3.8%)	8 (7.5%)	<b>3.99</b>
Professionalism	106	60 (56.6%)	30 (28.3%)	6 (5.7%)	2 (1.9%)	8 (7.5%)	<b>4.25</b>
Communication	105	48 (45.7%)	38 (36.2%)	7 (6.7%)	4 (3.8%)	8 (7.6%)	<b>4.09</b>
Administrative Skills	87	37 (42.5%)	36 (41.4%)	4 (4.6%)	1 (1.1%)	9 (10.4%)	<b>4.05</b>
Overall Performance	105	49 (46.7%)	39 (37.1%)	5 (4.8%)	3 (2.9%)	9 (8.5%)	<b>4.10</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 5**

<b>5 • KENT HARRELL</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	116	80 (69.0%)	28 (24.1%)	6 (5.2%)	1 (0.9%)	1 (0.8%)	<b>4.59</b>
Legal Ability	114	64 (56.1%)	40 (35.1%)	8 (7.0%)	2 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.46</b>
Professionalism	115	88 (76.5%)	22 (19.1%)	3 (2.6%)	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.70</b>
Communication	115	67 (58.3%)	41 (35.6%)	6 (5.2%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.51</b>
Administrative Skills	90	56 (62.2%)	22 (24.4%)	10 (11.1%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.47</b>
Overall Performance	113	71 (62.8%)	33 (29.2%)	6 (5.3%)	3 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.52</b>

<b>5 • CHARLES (DUKE) LINEBERRY</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	108	31 (28.7%)	33 (30.6%)	27 (25.0%)	5 (4.6%)	12 (11.1%)	<b>3.61</b>
Legal Ability	108	29 (26.9%)	38 (35.2%)	26 (24.1%)	7 (6.5%)	8 (7.3%)	<b>3.68</b>
Professionalism	107	31 (29.0%)	36 (33.6%)	20 (18.7%)	10 (9.3%)	10 (9.4%)	<b>3.64</b>
Communication	106	25 (23.6%)	37 (34.9%)	23 (21.7%)	11 (10.4%)	10 (9.4%)	<b>3.53</b>
Administrative Skills	83	22 (26.5%)	17 (20.5%)	27 (32.5%)	7 (8.4%)	10 (12.1%)	<b>3.41</b>
Overall Performance	106	29 (27.4%)	31 (29.2%)	29 (27.4%)	10 (9.4%)	7 (6.6%)	<b>3.61</b>

<b>5 • LINDSEY McKEE LUTHER</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	88	47 (53.4%)	15 (17.0%)	12 (13.6%)	5 (5.7%)	9 (10.3%)	<b>3.98</b>
Legal Ability	87	39 (44.8%)	20 (23.0%)	19 (21.8%)	4 (4.6%)	5 (5.8%)	<b>3.97</b>
Professionalism	89	51 (57.3%)	15 (16.9%)	13 (14.6%)	2 (2.2%)	8 (9.0%)	<b>4.11</b>
Communication	89	48 (53.9%)	20 (22.5%)	11 (12.4%)	5 (5.6%)	5 (5.6%)	<b>4.13</b>
Administrative Skills	74	43 (58.1%)	15 (20.3%)	10 (13.5%)	3 (4.1%)	3 (4.0%)	<b>4.24</b>
Overall Performance	89	42 (47.2%)	19 (21.3%)	15 (16.9%)	7 (7.9%)	6 (6.7%)	<b>3.94</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 7**

<b>7 • WAYNE SHELTON BOYETTE</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	60	48 (80.0%)	9 (15.0%)	3 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.75</b>
Legal Ability	61	41 (67.2%)	12 (19.7%)	7 (11.5%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.52</b>
Professionalism	64	48 (75.0%)	12 (18.8%)	3 (4.7%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.67</b>
Communication	64	46 (71.9%)	13 (20.3%)	4 (6.3%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.63</b>
Administrative Skills	50	39 (78.0%)	10 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.74</b>
Overall Performance	62	43 (69.4%)	16 (25.8%)	2 (3.2%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.63</b>

<b>7 • LAMONT WIGGINS</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	56	22 (39.3%)	20 (35.7%)	11 (19.6%)	1 (1.8%)	2 (3.6%)	<b>4.05</b>
Legal Ability	56	23 (41.1%)	14 (25.0%)	14 (25.0%)	2 (3.6%)	3 (5.3%)	<b>3.93</b>
Professionalism	57	25 (43.9%)	20 (35.1%)	9 (15.8%)	1 (1.8%)	2 (3.4%)	<b>4.14</b>
Communication	56	23 (41.1%)	16 (28.6%)	11 (19.6%)	3 (5.4%)	3 (5.3%)	<b>3.95</b>
Administrative Skills	44	18 (40.9%)	11 (25.0%)	10 (22.7%)	1 (2.3%)	4 (9.1%)	<b>3.86</b>
Overall Performance	56	20 (35.7%)	16 (28.6%)	15 (26.8%)	3 (5.4%)	2 (3.5%)	<b>3.88</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 10**

<b>10 • RONNIE ANSLEY</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	207	100 (48.3%)	74 (35.7%)	26 (12.6%)	3 (1.4%)	4 (2.0%)	<b>4.27</b>
Legal Ability	208	65 (31.3%)	66 (31.7%)	60 (28.8%)	12 (5.8%)	5 (2.4%)	<b>3.84</b>
Professionalism	208	99 (47.6%)	75 (36.1%)	25 (12.0%)	5 (2.4%)	4 (1.9%)	<b>4.25</b>
Communication	204	92 (45.1%)	67 (32.8%)	32 (15.7%)	9 (4.4%)	4 (2.0%)	<b>4.15</b>
Administrative Skills	147	55 (37.4%)	57 (38.8%)	25 (17.0%)	5 (3.4%)	5 (3.4%)	<b>4.03</b>
Overall Performance	202	73 (36.1%)	79 (39.1%)	35 (17.3%)	10 (5.0%)	5 (2.5%)	<b>4.01</b>

<b>10 • JUDGE CRAIG CROOM</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	428	325 (75.9%)	74 (17.3%)	18 (4.2%)	4 (0.9%)	7 (1.7%)	<b>4.65</b>
Legal Ability	424	282 (66.5%)	97 (22.9%)	32 (7.5%)	7 (1.7%)	6 (1.4%)	<b>4.51</b>
Professionalism	432	337 (78.0%)	63 (14.6%)	17 (3.9%)	5 (1.2%)	10 (2.3%)	<b>4.65</b>
Communication	430	319 (74.2%)	85 (19.8%)	14 (3.3%)	5 (1.2%)	7 (1.5%)	<b>4.64</b>
Administrative Skills	367	251 (68.4%)	88 (24.0%)	17 (4.6%)	4 (1.1%)	7 (1.9%)	<b>4.56</b>
Overall Performance	424	311 (73.3%)	85 (20.0%)	15 (3.5%)	6 (1.4%)	7 (1.8%)	<b>4.62</b>

<b>10 • CHARLES GILLIAM</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	65	13 (20.0%)	9 (13.8%)	18 (27.7%)	9 (13.8%)	16 (24.7%)	<b>2.91</b>
Legal Ability	61	11 (18.0%)	5 (8.2%)	19 (31.1%)	10 (16.4%)	16 (26.3%)	<b>2.75</b>
Professionalism	65	12 (18.5%)	15 (23.1%)	20 (7.0%)	5 (7.7%)	13 (43.7%)	<b>3.12</b>
Communication	65	13 (20.0%)	5 (7.7%)	26 (40.0%)	8 (12.3%)	13 (20.0%)	<b>2.95</b>
Administrative Skills	49	10 (20.4%)	6 (12.2%)	12 (24.5%)	8 (16.3%)	13 (26.6%)	<b>2.84</b>
Overall Performance	65	11 (16.9%)	8 (12.3%)	17 (16.4%)	13 (20.0%)	16 (34.4%)	<b>2.77</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 11**

<b>11 • JOY JONES</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	99	69 (69.7%)	16 (16.2%)	9 (9.1%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (3.0%)	<b>4.47</b>
Legal Ability	101	63 (62.4%)	24 (23.8%)	12 (11.9%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.9%)	<b>4.45</b>
Professionalism	100	73 (73.0%)	16 (16.0%)	8 (8.0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	<b>4.57</b>
Communication	99	64 (64.6%)	22 (22.2%)	9 (9.1%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.1%)	<b>4.45</b>
Administrative Skills	88	58 (65.9%)	18 (20.5%)	8 (9.1%)	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.2%)	<b>4.45</b>
Overall Performance	99	67 (67.7%)	17 (17.2%)	11 (11.1%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	<b>4.46</b>

<b>11 • KENNETH R. JONES</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	70	30 (42.9%)	13 (18.6%)	14 (20.0%)	5 (7.1%)	8 (11.4%)	<b>3.74</b>
Legal Ability	69	19 (27.5%)	19 (27.5%)	15 (21.7%)	7 (10.1%)	9 (13.2%)	<b>3.46</b>
Professionalism	70	27 (38.6%)	19 (27.1%)	11 (15.7%)	5 (7.1%)	8 (11.5%)	<b>3.74</b>
Communication	69	20 (29.0%)	19 (27.5%)	16 (23.2%)	5 (7.2%)	9 (13.1%)	<b>3.52</b>
Administrative Skills	62	17 (27.4%)	18 (29.0%)	15 (24.2%)	4 (6.5%)	8 (12.9%)	<b>3.52</b>
Overall Performance	67	17 (25.4%)	20 (29.9%)	16 (23.9%)	6 (9.0%)	8 (11.8%)	<b>3.48</b>

<b>11 • LeVONDA G. WOOD</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	95	15 (15.8%)	23 (24.2%)	21 (22.1%)	14 (14.7%)	22 (23.2%)	<b>2.95</b>
Legal Ability	95	8 (8.4%)	15 (15.8%)	19 (20.0%)	14 (14.7%)	39 (41.1%)	<b>2.36</b>
Professionalism	93	15 (16.1%)	24 (25.8%)	19 (7.0%)	14 (15.1%)	21 (36.0%)	<b>2.98</b>
Communication	93	11 (11.8%)	19 (20.4%)	18 (19.4%)	21 (22.6%)	24 (25.8%)	<b>2.70</b>
Administrative Skills	80	9 (11.3%)	14 (17.5%)	19 (23.8%)	11 (13.8%)	27 (33.6%)	<b>2.59</b>
Overall Performance	91	10 (11.0%)	15 (16.5%)	18 (16.4%)	22 (24.2%)	26 (31.9%)	<b>2.57</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 12**

<b>12 • RITA COX</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	110	54 (49.1%)	20 (18.2%)	19 (17.3%)	7 (6.4%)	10 (9.0%)	<b>3.92</b>
Legal Ability	107	47 (43.9%)	34 (31.8%)	16 (15.0%)	4 (3.7%)	6 (5.6%)	<b>4.05</b>
Professionalism	107	51 (47.7%)	27 (25.2%)	16 (15.0%)	3 (2.8%)	10 (9.3%)	<b>3.99</b>
Communication	107	37 (34.6%)	33 (30.8%)	16 (15.0%)	11 (10.3%)	10 (9.3%)	<b>3.71</b>
Administrative Skills	90	41 (45.6%)	26 (28.9%)	11 (12.2%)	5 (5.6%)	7 (7.7%)	<b>3.99</b>
Overall Performance	103	42 (40.8%)	24 (23.3%)	23 (22.3%)	5 (4.9%)	9 (8.7%)	<b>3.83</b>

<b>12 • J. DUANE GILLIAM JR.</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	86	29 (33.7%)	20 (23.3%)	20 (23.3%)	8 (9.3%)	9 (10.4%)	<b>3.60</b>
Legal Ability	89	31 (34.8%)	33 (37.1%)	16 (18.0%)	3 (3.4%)	6 (6.7%)	<b>3.90</b>
Professionalism	88	31 (35.2%)	25 (28.4%)	18 (20.5%)	8 (9.1%)	6 (6.8%)	<b>3.76</b>
Communication	88	22 (25.0%)	25 (28.4%)	24 (27.3%)	12 (13.6%)	5 (5.7%)	<b>3.53</b>
Administrative Skills	73	24 (32.9%)	21 (28.8%)	15 (20.5%)	8 (11.0%)	5 (6.8%)	<b>3.70</b>
Overall Performance	87	25 (28.7%)	27 (31.0%)	21 (24.1%)	8 (9.2%)	6 (7.0%)	<b>3.66</b>

<b>12 • ROSALYN HOOD</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	75	20 (26.7%)	17 (22.7%)	14 (18.7%)	13 (17.3%)	11 (14.6%)	<b>3.29</b>
Legal Ability	77	17 (22.1%)	11 (14.3%)	19 (24.7%)	12 (15.6%)	18 (23.3%)	<b>2.96</b>
Professionalism	76	22 (28.9%)	10 (13.2%)	18 (23.7%)	13 (17.1%)	13 (17.1%)	<b>3.20</b>
Communication	76	21 (27.6%)	14 (18.4%)	17 (22.4%)	11 (14.5%)	13 (17.1%)	<b>3.25</b>
Administrative Skills	68	16 (23.5%)	11 (16.2%)	14 (20.6%)	13 (19.1%)	14 (20.6%)	<b>3.03</b>
Overall Performance	77	21 (27.3%)	10 (13.0%)	19 (24.7%)	14 (18.2%)	13 (16.8%)	<b>3.16</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 12, continued**

<b>12 • CHERI SILER-MACK</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	103	45 (43.7%)	29 (28.2%)	15 (14.6%)	7 (6.8%)	7 (6.7%)	<b>3.95</b>
Legal Ability	103	35 (34.0%)	28 (27.2%)	25 (24.3%)	6 (5.8%)	9 (8.7%)	<b>3.72</b>
Professionalism	103	38 (36.9%)	28 (27.2%)	21 (20.4%)	10 (9.7%)	6 (5.8%)	<b>3.80</b>
Communication	103	35 (34.0%)	32 (31.1%)	23 (22.3%)	7 (6.8%)	6 (5.8%)	<b>3.81</b>
Administrative Skills	88	31 (35.2%)	26 (29.5%)	18 (20.5%)	8 (9.1%)	5 (5.7%)	<b>3.80</b>
Overall Performance	99	37 (37.4%)	29 (29.3%)	20 (20.2%)	7 (7.1%)	6 (6.0%)	<b>3.85</b>

<b>12 • JUDGE CLARK REAVES</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	98	69 (70.4%)	22 (22.4%)	6 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	<b>4.61</b>
Legal Ability	97	60 (61.9%)	31 (32.0%)	5 (5.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	<b>4.54</b>
Professionalism	98	75 (76.5%)	19 (19.4%)	3 (3.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	<b>4.70</b>
Communication	98	57 (58.2%)	35 (35.7%)	5 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	<b>4.50</b>
Administrative Skills	86	48 (55.8%)	29 (33.7%)	8 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	<b>4.43</b>
Overall Performance	98	61 (62.2%)	33 (33.7%)	3 (3.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	<b>4.56</b>

<b>12 • APRIL M. SMITH</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	61	14 (23.0%)	12 (19.7%)	18 (29.5%)	4 (6.6%)	13 (21.2%)	<b>3.16</b>
Legal Ability	62	11 (17.7%)	13 (21.0%)	22 (35.5%)	4 (6.5%)	12 (19.3%)	<b>3.11</b>
Professionalism	61	12 (19.7%)	12 (19.7%)	19 (31.1%)	8 (13.1%)	10 (16.4%)	<b>3.13</b>
Communication	61	11 (18.0%)	17 (27.9%)	19 (31.1%)	3 (4.9%)	11 (18.1%)	<b>3.23</b>
Administrative Skills	49	10 (20.4%)	10 (20.4%)	15 (30.6%)	3 (6.1%)	11 (22.5%)	<b>3.10</b>
Overall Performance	60	9 (15.0%)	13 (21.7%)	21 (35.0%)	6 (10.0%)	11 (18.3%)	<b>3.05</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 12, continued**

<b>12 • STEPHEN C. STOKES</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	91	25 (27.5%)	17 (18.7%)	17 (18.7%)	19 (20.9%)	13 (14.2%)	<b>3.24</b>
Legal Ability	93	23 (24.7%)	29 (31.2%)	23 (24.7%)	8 (8.6%)	10 (10.8%)	<b>3.51</b>
Professionalism	93	27 (29.0%)	24 (25.8%)	17 (18.3%)	13 (14.0%)	12 (12.9%)	<b>3.44</b>
Communication	92	28 (30.4%)	22 (23.9%)	19 (20.7%)	14 (15.2%)	9 (9.8%)	<b>3.50</b>
Administrative Skills	76	18 (23.7%)	20 (26.3%)	18 (23.7%)	13 (17.1%)	7 (9.2%)	<b>3.38</b>
Overall Performance	91	21 (23.1%)	26 (28.6%)	18 (19.8%)	12 (13.2%)	14 (15.3%)	<b>3.31</b>

<b>12 • JONATHAN C. STRANGE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	74	15 (20.3%)	15 (20.3%)	15 (20.3%)	18 (24.3%)	11 (14.8%)	<b>3.07</b>
Legal Ability	76	17 (22.4%)	14 (18.4%)	27 (35.5%)	10 (13.2%)	8 (10.5%)	<b>3.29</b>
Professionalism	76	17 (22.4%)	16 (21.1%)	21 (27.6%)	12 (15.8%)	10 (13.1%)	<b>3.24</b>
Communication	76	15 (19.7%)	22 (28.9%)	22 (28.9%)	9 (11.8%)	8 (10.7%)	<b>3.36</b>
Administrative Skills	62	12 (19.4%)	11 (17.7%)	20 (32.3%)	11 (17.7%)	8 (12.9%)	<b>3.13</b>
Overall Performance	76	17 (22.4%)	12 (15.8%)	23 (30.3%)	14 (18.4%)	10 (13.1%)	<b>3.16</b>



**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 13**

<b>13 • WILLIE (FRED) GORE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	78	43 (55.1%)	16 (20.5%)	7 (9.0%)	3 (3.8%)	9 (11.6%)	<b>4.04</b>
Legal Ability	79	40 (50.6%)	15 (19.0%)	10 (12.7%)	5 (6.3%)	9 (11.4%)	<b>3.91</b>
Professionalism	79	44 (55.7%)	16 (20.3%)	4 (5.1%)	5 (6.3%)	10 (12.6%)	<b>4.00</b>
Communication	79	46 (58.2%)	16 (20.3%)	3 (3.8%)	5 (6.3%)	9 (11.4%)	<b>4.08</b>
Administrative Skills	75	38 (50.7%)	15 (20.0%)	5 (6.7%)	4 (5.3%)	13 (17.3%)	<b>3.81</b>
Overall Performance	79	41 (51.9%)	16 (20.3%)	10 (12.7%)	2 (2.5%)	10 (12.6%)	<b>3.96</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 14**

<b>14 • FRED BATTAGLIA JR.</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	230	133 (57.8%)	57 (24.8%)	22 (9.6%)	6 (2.6%)	12 (5.2%)	<b>4.27</b>
Legal Ability	235	135 (57.4%)	65 (27.7%)	24 (10.2%)	7 (3.0%)	4 (1.7%)	<b>4.36</b>
Professionalism	235	137 (58.3%)	58 (24.7%)	21 (8.9%)	10 (4.3%)	9 (3.8%)	<b>4.29</b>
Communication	233	148 (63.5%)	56 (24.0%)	18 (7.7%)	6 (2.6%)	5 (2.2%)	<b>4.44</b>
Administrative Skills	169	95 (56.2%)	50 (29.6%)	15 (8.9%)	4 (2.4%)	5 (2.9%)	<b>4.34</b>
Overall Performance	229	130 (56.8%)	64 (27.9%)	23 (10.0%)	7 (3.1%)	5 (2.2%)	<b>4.34</b>

<b>14 • HENRY PRUETTE</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	73	37 (50.7%)	17 (23.3%)	11 (15.1%)	3 (4.1%)	5 (6.8%)	<b>4.07</b>
Legal Ability	74	27 (36.5%)	21 (28.4%)	15 (20.3%)	6 (8.1%)	5 (6.7%)	<b>3.80</b>
Professionalism	74	38 (51.4%)	18 (24.3%)	10 (13.5%)	4 (5.4%)	4 (5.4%)	<b>4.11</b>
Communication	72	29 (40.3%)	23 (31.9%)	10 (13.9%)	6 (8.3%)	4 (5.6%)	<b>3.93</b>
Administrative Skills	56	21 (37.5%)	16 (28.6%)	12 (21.4%)	2 (3.6%)	5 (8.9%)	<b>3.82</b>
Overall Performance	73	30 (41.1%)	23 (31.5%)	11 (15.1%)	4 (5.5%)	5 (6.8%)	<b>3.95</b>

<b>14 • MARK J. SIMEON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	166	25 (15.1%)	30 (18.1%)	44 (26.5%)	29 (17.5%)	38 (22.8%)	<b>2.85</b>
Legal Ability	170	26 (15.3%)	26 (15.3%)	57 (33.5%)	31 (18.2%)	30 (17.7%)	<b>2.92</b>
Professionalism	174	30 (17.2%)	34 (19.5%)	37 (21.3%)	36 (20.7%)	37 (21.3%)	<b>2.91</b>
Communication	165	25 (15.2%)	43 (26.1%)	45 (27.3%)	24 (14.5%)	28 (16.9%)	<b>3.08</b>
Administrative Skills	122	16 (13.1%)	14 (11.5%)	39 (32.0%)	21 (17.2%)	32 (26.2%)	<b>2.68</b>
Overall Performance	165	23 (13.9%)	28 (17.0%)	50 (30.3%)	32 (19.4%)	32 (19.4%)	<b>2.87</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 14, continued**

<b>14 • STEVEN STORCH</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	156	73 (46.8%)	26 (16.7%)	21 (13.5%)	16 (10.3%)	20 (12.7%)	<b>3.74</b>
Legal Ability	155	63 (40.6%)	37 (23.9%)	25 (16.1%)	14 (9.0%)	16 (10.4%)	<b>3.75</b>
Professionalism	158	64 (40.5%)	29 (18.4%)	25 (15.8%)	19 (12.0%)	21 (13.3%)	<b>3.61</b>
Communication	157	67 (42.7%)	38 (24.2%)	28 (17.8%)	11 (7.0%)	13 (8.3%)	<b>3.86</b>
Administrative Skills	137	68 (49.6%)	27 (19.7%)	18 (13.1%)	10 (7.3%)	14 (10.3%)	<b>3.91</b>
Overall Performance	155	66 (42.6%)	34 (21.9%)	26 (16.8%)	12 (7.7%)	17 (11.0%)	<b>3.77</b>

<b>14 • AMINAH M. THOMPSON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	60	16 (26.7%)	13 (21.7%)	10 (16.7%)	5 (8.3%)	16 (26.6%)	<b>3.13</b>
Legal Ability	61	13 (21.3%)	10 (16.4%)	15 (24.6%)	6 (9.8%)	17 (27.9%)	<b>2.93</b>
Professionalism	61	13 (21.3%)	17 (27.9%)	9 (14.8%)	6 (9.8%)	16 (26.2%)	<b>3.08</b>
Communication	59	14 (23.7%)	10 (16.9%)	12 (20.3%)	9 (15.3%)	14 (23.8%)	<b>3.02</b>
Administrative Skills	55	15 (27.3%)	11 (20.0%)	6 (10.9%)	7 (12.7%)	16 (29.1%)	<b>3.04</b>
Overall Performance	61	13 (21.3%)	13 (21.3%)	11 (18.0%)	10 (16.4%)	14 (23.0%)	<b>3.02</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 15A**

<b>15A • JOHN W. COX</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	62	39 (62.9%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.7%)	4 (6.5%)	5 (8.0%)	<b>4.16</b>
Legal Ability	61	31 (50.8%)	17 (27.9%)	8 (13.1%)	3 (4.9%)	2 (3.3%)	<b>4.18</b>
Professionalism	60	39 (65.0%)	7 (11.7%)	8 (13.3%)	2 (3.3%)	4 (6.7%)	<b>4.25</b>
Communication	59	33 (55.9%)	12 (20.3%)	7 (11.9%)	2 (3.4%)	5 (8.5%)	<b>4.12</b>
Administrative Skills	46	28 (60.9%)	8 (17.4%)	4 (8.7%)	2 (4.3%)	4 (8.7%)	<b>4.17</b>
Overall Performance	58	33 (56.9%)	11 (19.0%)	7 (12.1%)	4 (6.9%)	3 (5.1%)	<b>4.16</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 16A**

<b>16A • CHRIS RHUE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	27	18 (66.7%)	7 (25.9%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.56</b>
Legal Ability	28	20 (71.4%)	6 (21.4%)	2 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.64</b>
Professionalism	28	19 (67.9%)	7 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.6%)	1 (3.5%)	<b>4.50</b>
Communication	27	17 (63.0%)	7 (25.9%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.7%)	<b>4.41</b>
Administrative Skills	24	14 (58.3%)	7 (29.2%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.2%)	<b>4.38</b>
Overall Performance	28	17 (60.7%)	9 (32.1%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.6%)	<b>4.46</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 17A**

<b>17A • CHRIS FREEMAN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	33	7 (21.2%)	3 (9.1%)	5 (15.2%)	8 (24.2%)	10 (30.3%)	<b>2.67</b>
Legal Ability	33	4 (12.1%)	1 (3.0%)	7 (21.2%)	3 (9.1%)	18 (54.6%)	<b>2.09</b>
Professionalism	33	9 (27.3%)	4 (12.1%)	9 (27.3%)	3 (9.1%)	8 (24.2%)	<b>3.09</b>
Communication	32	5 (15.6%)	3 (9.4%)	4 (12.5%)	9 (28.1%)	11 (34.4%)	<b>2.44</b>
Administrative Skills	27	4 (14.8%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (29.6%)	4 (14.8%)	11 (40.8%)	<b>2.33</b>
Overall Performance	32	4 (12.5%)	4 (12.5%)	3 (9.4%)	7 (21.9%)	14 (43.7%)	<b>2.28</b>

<b>17A • WAYNE HOLLOWELL</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	45	27 (60.0%)	11 (24.4%)	3 (6.7%)	2 (4.4%)	2 (4.5%)	<b>4.31</b>
Legal Ability	45	26 (57.8%)	12 (26.7%)	4 (8.9%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.4%)	<b>4.31</b>
Professionalism	45	28 (62.2%)	12 (26.7%)	2 (4.4%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.5%)	<b>4.40</b>
Communication	43	23 (53.5%)	12 (27.9%)	5 (11.6%)	1 (2.3%)	2 (4.7%)	<b>4.23</b>
Administrative Skills	40	22 (55.0%)	10 (25.0%)	5 (12.5%)	1 (2.5%)	2 (5.0%)	<b>4.23</b>
Overall Performance	43	24 (55.8%)	13 (30.2%)	3 (7.0%)	1 (2.3%)	2 (4.7%)	<b>4.30</b>

<b>17A • CHRISTINE FIELDS STRADER</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	37	13 (35.1%)	9 (24.3%)	7 (18.9%)	4 (10.8%)	4 (10.9%)	<b>3.62</b>
Legal Ability	37	11 (29.7%)	7 (18.9%)	10 (27.0%)	4 (10.8%)	5 (13.6%)	<b>3.41</b>
Professionalism	38	16 (42.1%)	10 (26.3%)	7 (18.4%)	1 (2.6%)	4 (10.6%)	<b>3.87</b>
Communication	37	12 (32.4%)	11 (29.7%)	7 (18.9%)	3 (8.1%)	4 (10.9%)	<b>3.65</b>
Administrative Skills	29	10 (34.5%)	7 (24.1%)	6 (20.7%)	2 (6.9%)	4 (13.8%)	<b>3.59</b>
Overall Performance	36	11 (30.6%)	9 (25.0%)	9 (25.0%)	1 (2.8%)	6 (16.6%)	<b>3.50</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 19A**

<b>19A • JUANITA BOGER ALLEN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	50	12 (24.0%)	6 (12.0%)	10 (20.0%)	12 (24.0%)	10 (20.0%)	<b>2.96</b>
Legal Ability	54	13 (24.1%)	3 (5.6%)	10 (18.5%)	12 (22.2%)	16 (29.6%)	<b>2.72</b>
Professionalism	53	12 (22.6%)	4 (7.5%)	13 (24.5%)	12 (22.6%)	12 (22.8%)	<b>2.85</b>
Communication	50	12 (24.0%)	4 (8.0%)	12 (24.0%)	10 (20.0%)	12 (24.0%)	<b>2.88</b>
Administrative Skills	46	11 (23.9%)	2 (4.3%)	7 (15.2%)	10 (21.7%)	16 (34.9%)	<b>2.61</b>
Overall Performance	54	12 (22.2%)	3 (5.6%)	9 (16.7%)	15 (27.8%)	15 (27.7%)	<b>2.67</b>

<b>19A • BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JR.</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	46	26 (56.5%)	6 (13.0%)	4 (8.7%)	3 (6.5%)	7 (15.3%)	<b>3.89</b>
Legal Ability	48	25 (52.1%)	8 (16.7%)	6 (12.5%)	2 (4.2%)	7 (14.5%)	<b>3.88</b>
Professionalism	47	29 (61.7%)	4 (8.5%)	6 (12.8%)	1 (2.1%)	7 (14.9%)	<b>4.00</b>
Communication	46	24 (52.2%)	9 (19.6%)	3 (6.5%)	3 (6.5%)	7 (15.2%)	<b>3.87</b>
Administrative Skills	40	21 (52.5%)	7 (17.5%)	4 (10.0%)	1 (2.5%)	7 (17.5%)	<b>3.85</b>
Overall Performance	48	25 (52.1%)	8 (16.7%)	6 (12.5%)	2 (4.2%)	7 (14.5%)	<b>3.88</b>

<b>19A • STEVEN A. GROSSMAN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	78	37 (47.4%)	31 (39.7%)	8 (10.3%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.31</b>
Legal Ability	79	37 (46.8%)	35 (44.3%)	5 (6.3%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.35</b>
Professionalism	79	38 (48.1%)	31 (39.2%)	7 (8.9%)	2 (2.5%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.30</b>
Communication	79	34 (43.0%)	30 (38.0%)	9 (11.4%)	6 (7.6%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.16</b>
Administrative Skills	71	29 (40.8%)	28 (39.4%)	11 (15.5%)	2 (2.8%)	1 (1.5%)	<b>4.15</b>
Overall Performance	77	35 (45.5%)	30 (39.0%)	10 (13.0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.2%)	<b>4.26</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 19A, continued**

<b>19A • CHRISTY WILHELM</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	80	44 (55.0%)	16 (20.0%)	6 (7.5%)	7 (8.8%)	7 (8.7%)	<b>4.04</b>
Legal Ability	78	42 (53.8%)	18 (23.1%)	4 (5.1%)	8 (10.3%)	6 (7.7%)	<b>4.05</b>
Professionalism	82	46 (56.1%)	14 (17.1%)	7 (8.5%)	7 (8.5%)	8 (9.8%)	<b>4.01</b>
Communication	80	39 (48.8%)	21 (26.3%)	7 (8.8%)	7 (8.8%)	6 (7.3%)	<b>4.00</b>
Administrative Skills	69	33 (47.8%)	18 (26.1%)	10 (14.5%)	4 (5.8%)	4 (5.8%)	<b>4.04</b>
Overall Performance	79	41 (51.9%)	17 (21.5%)	7 (8.9%)	8 (10.1%)	6 (7.6%)	<b>4.00</b>



**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 19B**

<b>19B • STEVE BIBEY</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	49	20 (40.8%)	5 (10.2%)	10 (20.4%)	6 (12.2%)	8 (16.4%)	<b>3.47</b>
Legal Ability	48	12 (25.0%)	10 (20.8%)	13 (27.1%)	4 (8.3%)	9 (18.8%)	<b>3.25</b>
Professionalism	50	22 (44.0%)	5 (10.0%)	8 (16.0%)	7 (14.0%)	8 (16.0%)	<b>3.52</b>
Communication	49	16 (32.7%)	10 (20.4%)	9 (18.4%)	6 (12.2%)	8 (16.3%)	<b>3.41</b>
Administrative Skills	44	15 (34.1%)	5 (11.4%)	11 (25.0%)	4 (9.1%)	9 (20.4%)	<b>3.30</b>
Overall Performance	49	19 (38.8%)	5 (10.2%)	12 (24.5%)	4 (8.2%)	9 (18.3%)	<b>3.43</b>

<b>19B • JUDGE WILLIAM H. HEAFNER</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	83	68 (81.9%)	7 (8.4%)	3 (3.6%)	4 (4.8%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.65</b>
Legal Ability	83	45 (54.2%)	27 (32.5%)	5 (6.0%)	5 (6.0%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.33</b>
Professionalism	83	66 (79.5%)	11 (13.3%)	2 (2.4%)	2 (2.4%)	2 (2.4%)	<b>4.65</b>
Communication	83	47 (56.6%)	25 (30.1%)	7 (8.4%)	3 (3.6%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.37</b>
Administrative Skills	75	42 (56.0%)	21 (28.0%)	7 (9.3%)	4 (5.3%)	1 (1.4%)	<b>4.32</b>
Overall Performance	81	55 (67.9%)	17 (21.0%)	5 (6.2%)	3 (3.7%)	1 (1.2%)	<b>4.51</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 19C**

<b>19C • TED BLANTON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	58	23 (39.7%)	17 (29.3%)	9 (15.5%)	5 (8.6%)	4 (6.9%)	<b>3.86</b>
Legal Ability	58	21 (36.2%)	22 (37.9%)	9 (15.5%)	2 (3.4%)	4 (7.0%)	<b>3.93</b>
Professionalism	58	26 (44.8%)	16 (27.6%)	6 (10.3%)	4 (6.9%)	6 (10.4%)	<b>3.90</b>
Communication	57	21 (36.8%)	17 (29.8%)	10 (17.5%)	5 (8.8%)	4 (7.1%)	<b>3.81</b>
Administrative Skills	50	11 (22.0%)	21 (42.0%)	11 (22.0%)	4 (8.0%)	3 (6.0%)	<b>3.66</b>
Overall Performance	57	20 (35.1%)	19 (33.3%)	11 (19.3%)	4 (7.0%)	3 (5.3%)	<b>3.86</b>

<b>19C • JAMES RANDOLPH</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	46	28 (60.9%)	12 (26.1%)	4 (8.7%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.43</b>
Legal Ability	46	23 (50.0%)	17 (37.0%)	5 (10.9%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.35</b>
Professionalism	46	24 (52.2%)	16 (34.8%)	5 (10.9%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.37</b>
Communication	45	21 (46.7%)	19 (42.2%)	2 (4.4%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.29</b>
Administrative Skills	38	17 (44.7%)	14 (36.8%)	6 (15.8%)	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.24</b>
Overall Performance	45	22 (48.9%)	18 (40.0%)	4 (8.9%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.36</b>

<b>19C • DOUGLAS A. SMITH</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	43	17 (39.5%)	16 (37.2%)	9 (20.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.4%)	<b>4.12</b>
Legal Ability	43	10 (23.3%)	19 (44.2%)	10 (23.2%)	4 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>3.81</b>
Professionalism	43	16 (37.2%)	17 (39.5%)	9 (20.9%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.12</b>
Communication	43	16 (37.2%)	16 (37.2%)	5 (11.6%)	5 (11.6%)	1 (2.4%)	<b>3.95</b>
Administrative Skills	36	11 (30.6%)	15 (41.7%)	6 (16.7%)	2 (5.6%)	2 (5.4%)	<b>3.86</b>
Overall Performance	42	12 (28.6%)	21 (50.0%)	6 (14.3%)	2 (4.8%)	1 (2.3%)	<b>3.98</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 20A**

<b>20A • JOHN R. NANCE</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	56	15 (26.8%)	9 (16.1%)	12 (21.4%)	8 (14.3%)	12 (21.4%)	<b>3.13</b>
Legal Ability	57	11 (19.3%)	7 (12.3%)	10 (17.5%)	15 (26.3%)	14 (24.6%)	<b>2.75</b>
Professionalism	57	13 (22.8%)	11 (19.3%)	11 (19.3%)	12 (21.1%)	10 (17.5%)	<b>3.09</b>
Communication	57	12 (21.1%)	7 (12.3%)	12 (21.1%)	11 (19.3%)	15 (26.2%)	<b>2.82</b>
Administrative Skills	48	10 (20.8%)	9 (18.8%)	8 (16.7%)	11 (22.9%)	10 (20.8%)	<b>2.96</b>
Overall Performance	57	12 (21.1%)	8 (14.0%)	12 (21.1%)	12 (21.1%)	13 (22.7%)	<b>2.89</b>

<b>20A • JOHN W. WEBSTER</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	46	34 (73.9%)	8 (17.4%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.3%)	<b>4.54</b>
Legal Ability	46	30 (65.2%)	12 (26.1%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.4%)	<b>4.48</b>
Professionalism	45	35 (77.8%)	6 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	3 (6.7%)	<b>4.53</b>
Communication	46	29 (63.0%)	13 (28.3%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.5%)	<b>4.41</b>
Administrative Skills	43	29 (67.4%)	11 (25.6%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.7%)	<b>4.51</b>
Overall Performance	45	31 (68.9%)	10 (22.2%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.5%)	<b>4.49</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 21**

<b>21 • DANIEL B. (DAN) ANTHONY</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	86	27 (31.4%)	26 (30.2%)	18 (20.9%)	9 (10.5%)	6 (7.0%)	<b>3.69</b>
Legal Ability	84	16 (19.0%)	25 (29.8%)	24 (28.6%)	14 (16.7%)	5 (5.9%)	<b>3.39</b>
Professionalism	88	31 (35.2%)	27 (30.7%)	19 (21.6%)	7 (8.0%)	4 (4.5%)	<b>3.84</b>
Communication	85	17 (20.0%)	31 (36.5%)	24 (28.2%)	7 (8.2%)	6 (7.1%)	<b>3.54</b>
Administrative Skills	60	11 (18.3%)	19 (31.7%)	15 (25.0%)	10 (16.7%)	5 (8.3%)	<b>3.35</b>
Overall Performance	87	18 (20.7%)	28 (32.2%)	22 (25.3%)	15 (17.2%)	4 (4.6%)	<b>3.47</b>

<b>21 • DONALD R. BUIE</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	68	21 (30.9%)	20 (29.4%)	18 (26.5%)	6 (8.8%)	3 (4.4%)	<b>3.74</b>
Legal Ability	72	8 (11.1%)	15 (20.8%)	34 (47.2%)	11 (15.3%)	4 (5.6%)	<b>3.17</b>
Professionalism	69	19 (27.5%)	21 (30.4%)	21 (30.4%)	5 (7.2%)	3 (4.5%)	<b>3.70</b>
Communication	70	9 (12.9%)	17 (24.3%)	25 (35.7%)	15 (21.4%)	4 (5.7%)	<b>3.17</b>
Administrative Skills	45	5 (11.1%)	14 (31.1%)	16 (35.6%)	5 (11.1%)	5 (11.1%)	<b>3.20</b>
Overall Performance	70	9 (12.9%)	23 (32.9%)	26 (37.1%)	9 (12.9%)	3 (4.2%)	<b>3.37</b>

<b>21 • VALENE FRANCO</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	136	92 (67.6%)	27 (19.9%)	8 (5.9%)	5 (3.7%)	4 (2.9%)	<b>4.46</b>
Legal Ability	134	78 (58.2%)	35 (26.1%)	14 (10.4%)	5 (3.7%)	2 (1.6%)	<b>4.36</b>
Professionalism	138	100 (72.5%)	23 (16.7%)	10 (7.2%)	2 (1.4%)	3 (2.2%)	<b>4.56</b>
Communication	136	78 (57.4%)	38 (27.9%)	12 (8.8%)	6 (4.4%)	2 (1.5%)	<b>4.35</b>
Administrative Skills	119	71 (59.7%)	30 (25.2%)	12 (10.1%)	3 (2.5%)	3 (2.5%)	<b>4.37</b>
Overall Performance	137	84 (61.3%)	35 (25.5%)	11 (8.0%)	4 (2.9%)	3 (2.3%)	<b>4.41</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 21, continued**

<b>21 • THEODORE (TED) KAZAKOS</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	128	59 (46.1%)	30 (23.4%)	21 (16.4%)	9 (7.0%)	9 (7.1%)	<b>3.95</b>
Legal Ability	128	50 (39.1%)	28 (21.9%)	26 (20.3%)	15 (11.7%)	9 (7.0%)	<b>3.74</b>
Professionalism	128	64 (50.0%)	30 (23.4%)	24 (18.8%)	5 (3.9%)	5 (3.9%)	<b>4.12</b>
Communication	127	53 (41.7%)	31 (24.4%)	31 (24.4%)	10 (7.9%)	2 (1.6%)	<b>3.97</b>
Administrative Skills	110	47 (42.7%)	24 (21.8%)	23 (20.9%)	10 (9.1%)	6 (5.5%)	<b>3.87</b>
Overall Performance	128	53 (41.4%)	30 (23.4%)	29 (22.7%)	10 (7.8%)	6 (4.7%)	<b>3.89</b>

<b>21 • ANDREW KEEVER</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	131	71 (54.2%)	32 (24.4%)	16 (12.2%)	4 (3.1%)	8 (6.1%)	<b>4.18</b>
Legal Ability	134	46 (34.3%)	49 (36.6%)	23 (17.2%)	12 (9.0%)	4 (2.9%)	<b>3.90</b>
Professionalism	136	65 (47.8%)	36 (26.5%)	22 (16.2%)	9 (6.6%)	4 (2.9%)	<b>4.10</b>
Communication	133	50 (37.6%)	32 (24.1%)	37 (27.8%)	9 (6.8%)	5 (3.7%)	<b>3.85</b>
Administrative Skills	111	35 (31.5%)	31 (27.9%)	31 (27.9%)	8 (7.2%)	6 (5.5%)	<b>3.73</b>
Overall Performance	133	50 (37.6%)	49 (36.8%)	19 (14.3%)	8 (6.0%)	7 (5.3%)	<b>3.95</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 22A**

<b>22A • CAROLE A. HICKS</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	44	9 (20.5%)	20 (45.5%)	8 (18.2%)	5 (11.4%)	2 (4.4%)	<b>3.66</b>
Legal Ability	44	5 (11.4%)	13 (29.5%)	13 (29.5%)	8 (18.2%)	5 (11.4%)	<b>3.11</b>
Professionalism	44	7 (15.9%)	14 (31.8%)	16 (36.4%)	2 (4.5%)	5 (11.4%)	<b>3.36</b>
Communication	43	8 (18.6%)	13 (30.2%)	18 (41.9%)	3 (7.0%)	1 (2.3%)	<b>3.56</b>
Administrative Skills	34	7 (20.6%)	8 (23.5%)	12 (35.3%)	4 (11.8%)	3 (8.8%)	<b>3.35</b>
Overall Performance	44	6 (13.6%)	16 (36.4%)	13 (29.5%)	5 (11.4%)	4 (9.1%)	<b>3.34</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 23**

<b>23 • FRED BAUER</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	87	51 (58.6%)	25 (28.7%)	7 (8.0%)	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.4%)	<b>4.39</b>
Legal Ability	87	49 (56.3%)	28 (32.2%)	8 (9.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.3%)	<b>4.40</b>
Professionalism	87	56 (64.4%)	21 (24.1%)	4 (4.6%)	4 (4.6%)	2 (2.3%)	<b>4.44</b>
Communication	85	44 (51.8%)	30 (35.3%)	6 (7.1%)	3 (3.5%)	2 (2.3%)	<b>4.31</b>
Administrative Skills	74	44 (59.5%)	21 (28.4%)	6 (8.1%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.6%)	<b>4.41</b>
Overall Performance	87	49 (56.3%)	28 (32.2%)	8 (9.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.3%)	<b>4.40</b>

<b>23 • JUDGE WILLIAM (BILL) BROOKS</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	73	50 (68.5%)	17 (23.3%)	5 (6.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	<b>4.58</b>
Legal Ability	73	47 (64.4%)	20 (27.4%)	6 (8.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.56</b>
Professionalism	74	55 (74.3%)	15 (20.3%)	3 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	<b>4.66</b>
Communication	74	49 (66.2%)	20 (27.0%)	4 (5.4%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.58</b>
Administrative Skills	63	41 (65.1%)	19 (30.2%)	3 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.60</b>
Overall Performance	75	53 (70.7%)	17 (22.7%)	5 (6.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.64</b>

<b>23 • ROBERT (ROB) CRUMPTON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	43	20 (46.5%)	13 (30.2%)	6 (14.0%)	1 (2.3%)	3 (7.0%)	<b>4.07</b>
Legal Ability	43	17 (39.5%)	14 (32.6%)	11 (25.6%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.09</b>
Professionalism	43	22 (51.2%)	10 (23.3%)	8 (18.6%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.9%)	<b>4.12</b>
Communication	43	20 (46.5%)	14 (32.6%)	6 (14.0%)	3 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.19</b>
Administrative Skills	35	12 (34.3%)	16 (45.7%)	4 (11.4%)	2 (5.7%)	1 (2.9%)	<b>4.03</b>
Overall Performance	44	18 (40.9%)	16 (36.4%)	6 (13.6%)	3 (6.8%)	1 (2.3%)	<b>4.07</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 23, continued**

<b>23 • REGINA GILLESPIE</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	48	9 (18.8%)	5 (10.4%)	18 (37.5%)	9 (18.8%)	7 (14.5%)	<b>3.00</b>
Legal Ability	50	8 (16.0%)	9 (18.0%)	21 (42.0%)	7 (14.0%)	5 (10.0%)	<b>3.16</b>
Professionalism	51	9 (17.6%)	6 (11.8%)	16 (31.4%)	11 (21.6%)	9 (17.6%)	<b>2.90</b>
Communication	49	9 (18.4%)	7 (14.3%)	14 (28.6%)	10 (20.4%)	9 (18.3%)	<b>2.94</b>
Administrative Skills	42	7 (16.7%)	5 (11.9%)	16 (38.1%)	8 (19.0%)	6 (14.3%)	<b>2.98</b>
Overall Performance	51	8 (15.7%)	7 (13.7%)	17 (33.3%)	14 (27.5%)	5 (9.8%)	<b>2.98</b>

<b>23 • TRACIE McMILLAN JORDAN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	34	11 (32.4%)	7 (20.6%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)	7 (20.6%)	<b>3.41</b>
Legal Ability	31	8 (25.8%)	6 (19.4%)	8 (25.8%)	4 (12.9%)	5 (16.1%)	<b>3.26</b>
Professionalism	35	12 (34.3%)	8 (22.9%)	7 (20.0%)	2 (5.7%)	6 (17.1%)	<b>3.51</b>
Communication	35	10 (28.6%)	7 (20.0%)	9 (25.7%)	3 (8.6%)	6 (17.1%)	<b>3.34</b>
Administrative Skills	27	8 (29.6%)	6 (22.2%)	7 (25.9%)	2 (7.4%)	4 (14.9%)	<b>3.44</b>
Overall Performance	35	8 (22.9%)	9 (25.7%)	7 (20.0%)	5 (14.3%)	6 (17.1%)	<b>3.23</b>

<b>23 • DONNA L. SHUMATE</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	39	17 (43.6%)	14 (35.9%)	6 (15.4%)	2 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.18</b>
Legal Ability	39	13 (33.3%)	16 (41.0%)	7 (17.9%)	2 (5.1%)	1 (2.7%)	<b>3.97</b>
Professionalism	39	16 (41.0%)	11 (28.2%)	11 (28.2%)	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.08</b>
Communication	39	13 (33.3%)	15 (38.5%)	8 (20.5%)	3 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>3.97</b>
Administrative Skills	34	9 (26.5%)	15 (44.1%)	5 (14.7%)	2 (5.9%)	3 (8.8%)	<b>3.74</b>
Overall Performance	40	11 (27.5%)	18 (45.0%)	9 (22.5%)	2 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>3.95</b>



**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 25**

<b>25 • DAVID W. AYCOCK</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	56	36 (64.3%)	15 (26.8%)	4 (7.1%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.54</b>
Legal Ability	56	21 (37.5%)	20 (35.7%)	12 (21.4%)	3 (5.4%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.05</b>
Professionalism	56	34 (60.7%)	16 (28.6%)	5 (8.9%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.48</b>
Communication	54	26 (48.1%)	20 (37.0%)	8 (14.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.33</b>
Administrative Skills	45	18 (40.0%)	12 (26.7%)	10 (22.2%)	3 (6.7%)	2 (4.4%)	<b>3.91</b>
Overall Performance	55	22 (40.0%)	22 (40.0%)	8 (14.5%)	3 (5.5%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.15</b>

<b>25 • WES W. BARKLEY</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	59	31 (52.5%)	19 (32.2%)	6 (10.2%)	3 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.32</b>
Legal Ability	59	27 (45.8%)	21 (35.6%)	11 (18.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.27</b>
Professionalism	59	34 (57.6%)	17 (28.8%)	8 (13.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.44</b>
Communication	60	26 (43.3%)	22 (36.7%)	9 (15.0%)	3 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.18</b>
Administrative Skills	42	20 (47.6%)	14 (33.3%)	8 (19.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.29</b>
Overall Performance	58	28 (48.3%)	20 (34.5%)	10 (17.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	<b>4.31</b>

<b>25 • F. WESLEY SIGMON</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	78	28 (35.9%)	18 (23.1%)	20 (25.6%)	6 (7.7%)	6 (7.7%)	<b>3.72</b>
Legal Ability	77	19 (24.7%)	18 (23.4%)	25 (32.5%)	9 (11.7%)	6 (7.7%)	<b>3.45</b>
Professionalism	78	25 (32.1%)	21 (26.9%)	21 (26.9%)	5 (6.4%)	6 (7.7%)	<b>3.69</b>
Communication	76	15 (19.7%)	25 (32.9%)	25 (32.9%)	7 (9.2%)	4 (5.3%)	<b>3.53</b>
Administrative Skills	56	12 (21.4%)	16 (28.6%)	17 (30.4%)	5 (8.9%)	6 (10.7%)	<b>3.41</b>
Overall Performance	79	18 (22.8%)	21 (26.6%)	26 (32.9%)	8 (10.1%)	6 (7.6%)	<b>3.47</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 25, continued**

<b>25 • JUDGE CLIFTON SMITH</b>							
<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (5)</b>	<b>GOOD (4)</b>	<b>AVERAGE (3)</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE (2)</b>	<b>POOR (1)</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
Integrity & Impartiality	71	35 (49.3%)	17 (23.9%)	10 (14.1%)	4 (5.6%)	5 (7.1%)	<b>4.03</b>
Legal Ability	72	23 (31.9%)	21 (29.2%)	16 (22.2%)	8 (11.1%)	4 (5.6%)	<b>3.71</b>
Professionalism	73	36 (49.3%)	18 (24.7%)	14 (19.2%)	2 (2.7%)	3 (4.1%)	<b>4.12</b>
Communication	70	27 (38.6%)	19 (27.1%)	16 (22.9%)	5 (7.1%)	3 (4.3%)	<b>3.89</b>
Administrative Skills	60	26 (43.3%)	20 (33.3%)	9 (15.0%)	4 (6.7%)	1 (1.7%)	<b>4.10</b>
Overall Performance	70	25 (35.7%)	21 (30.0%)	16 (22.9%)	3 (4.3%)	5 (7.1%)	<b>3.83</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 26**

<b>26 • ALICIA D. BROOKS</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	163	69 (42.3%)	39 (23.9%)	36 (22.1%)	9 (5.5%)	10 (6.2%)	<b>3.91</b>
Legal Ability	166	61 (36.7%)	42 (25.3%)	38 (3.9%)	18 (10.8%)	7 (23.3%)	<b>3.80</b>
Professionalism	166	68 (41.0%)	44 (26.5%)	33 (19.9%)	12 (7.2%)	9 (5.4%)	<b>3.90</b>
Communication	160	52 (32.5%)	48 (30.0%)	34 (4.0%)	17 (10.6%)	9 (22.9%)	<b>3.73</b>
Administrative Skills	121	42 (34.7%)	31 (25.6%)	27 (22.3%)	13 (1.5%)	8 (15.9%)	<b>3.71</b>
Overall Performance	162	56 (34.6%)	45 (27.8%)	37 (22.8%)	16 (9.9%)	8 (4.9%)	<b>3.77</b>

<b>26 • YOLANDA M. TROTMAN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	206	64 (31.1%)	31 (15.0%)	34 (16.5%)	19 (9.2%)	58 (28.2%)	<b>3.12</b>
Legal Ability	204	68 (33.3%)	35 (17.2%)	33 (3.9%)	29 (14.2%)	39 (31.4%)	<b>3.31</b>
Professionalism	207	69 (33.3%)	24 (11.6%)	27 (13.0%)	27 (13.0%)	60 (29.1%)	<b>3.07</b>
Communication	202	64 (31.7%)	31 (15.3%)	38 (4.0%)	25 (12.4%)	44 (36.6%)	<b>3.23</b>
Administrative Skills	163	58 (35.6%)	26 (16.0%)	28 (17.2%)	17 (1.5%)	34 (29.7%)	<b>3.35</b>
Overall Performance	202	64 (31.7%)	31 (15.3%)	28 (13.9%)	25 (12.4%)	54 (26.7%)	<b>3.13</b>

<b>26 • JUDGE CASEY VISER</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	253	146 (57.7%)	58 (22.9%)	27 (10.7%)	15 (5.9%)	7 (2.8%)	<b>4.27</b>
Legal Ability	257	143 (55.6%)	68 (26.5%)	35 (13.6%)	7 (2.7%)	4 (1.6%)	<b>4.32</b>
Professionalism	260	153 (58.8%)	54 (20.8%)	29 (11.2%)	11 (4.2%)	13 (5.0%)	<b>4.24</b>
Communication	256	140 (54.7%)	70 (27.3%)	34 (13.3%)	9 (3.5%)	3 (1.2%)	<b>4.31</b>
Administrative Skills	212	114 (53.8%)	55 (25.9%)	27 (12.7%)	6 (2.8%)	10 (4.8%)	<b>4.21</b>
Overall Performance	253	136 (53.8%)	64 (25.3%)	30 (11.9%)	19 (7.5%)	4 (1.5%)	<b>4.22</b>

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REPORTS | DISTRICT 28**

<b>28 • J. THOMAS AMBURGEY</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	80	45 (56.3%)	15 (18.8%)	14 (17.5%)	3 (3.8%)	3 (3.6%)	<b>4.20</b>
Legal Ability	82	39 (47.6%)	16 (19.5%)	21 (25.6%)	3 (3.7%)	3 (3.6%)	<b>4.04</b>
Professionalism	82	47 (57.3%)	18 (22.0%)	11 (13.4%)	3 (3.7%)	3 (3.6%)	<b>4.26</b>
Communication	80	43 (53.8%)	18 (22.5%)	10 (12.5%)	4 (5.0%)	5 (6.2%)	<b>4.13</b>
Administrative Skills	60	30 (50.0%)	14 (23.3%)	11 (18.3%)	2 (3.3%)	3 (5.1%)	<b>4.10</b>
Overall Performance	80	41 (51.3%)	23 (28.8%)	10 (12.5%)	4 (5.0%)	2 (2.4%)	<b>4.21</b>

<b>28 • J. MATTHEW MARTIN</b>							
QUALITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	EXCELLENT (5)	GOOD (4)	AVERAGE (3)	BELOW AVERAGE (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE RATING
Integrity & Impartiality	128	78 (60.9%)	18 (14.1%)	11 (8.6%)	8 (6.3%)	13 (10.1%)	<b>4.09</b>
Legal Ability	124	67 (54.0%)	26 (21.0%)	13 (10.5%)	7 (5.6%)	11 (8.9%)	<b>4.06</b>
Professionalism	128	79 (61.7%)	19 (14.8%)	14 (10.9%)	6 (4.7%)	10 (7.9%)	<b>4.18</b>
Communication	121	66 (54.5%)	26 (21.5%)	13 (10.7%)	4 (3.3%)	12 (10.0%)	<b>4.07</b>
Administrative Skills	100	54 (54.0%)	21 (21.0%)	11 (11.0%)	3 (3.0%)	11 (11.0%)	<b>4.04</b>
Overall Performance	123	72 (58.5%)	20 (16.3%)	13 (10.6%)	8 (6.5%)	10 (8.1%)	<b>4.11</b>