



**2020 Judicial Officer Survey for  
King County Superior Court**

*Published January, 2020*

*[www.kcba.org/judicialsurvey](http://www.kcba.org/judicialsurvey)*

## I. Introduction

The King County Bar Association (KCBA) has conducted surveys and evaluations of judicial officers since 1948. The survey results are a summary of practicing attorneys' personal assessments of the judges who hear and decide their cases. The survey provides information to the public prior to judicial elections by presenting assessments of each judge so that voters can make informed decisions by taking into account the collective assessments of those lawyers who practice in front of these judicial officers. It also provides important information to the public, the Bar, and the Bench on performance of the local judicial branch as a whole.

Every four years this survey is conducted of attorneys practicing in the King County Superior Court. The last survey was published in 2016. In addition, on an alternate four-year cycle, KCBA publishes a similar survey focused on courts of limited jurisdiction. The most recent courts of limited jurisdiction survey was published in 2018; the next one will be released in 2022. It is important to not confuse this survey with any rigorous, scientific, opinion-gathering process. It reflects the opinions of those attorneys who choose to express them. The scuttlebutt of the courthouse writ large. Nothing more, nothing less. These opinions have value, but they must be considered along with KCBA judicial candidate ratings, debates and other efforts the bar makes to offer as complete a picture of judicial performance as it can.

### **About Superior Court**

King County Superior Court is a general jurisdiction trial court with responsibility for felony and misdemeanor criminal matters; civil matters; family law, including divorce, separation, paternity, child support, adoptions, and domestic violence protection orders; probate and guardianship matters; mental illness and involuntary commitment matters; juvenile offender matters and juvenile dependencies involving abused and neglected children, children in need of services, at-risk youth, and truancies.

In 2018, a total of 53,835 cases were filed with King County Superior Court, which included 1,923 trials. All 53 judges are elected to four year terms each presidential election year. In addition, 9 court-appointed commissioners serve as judicial officers. The Court's annual operating budget is \$59 million.

### **Survey Vendor and Oversight**

To maintain objectivity, KCBA contracted with Information Insights, Inc., a public policy and management consulting firm, to administer the surveys. Information Insights conducted similar surveys for the Alaska Judicial Council. The contractor was responsible for all aspects of online survey set-up, distribution, and data collection.

KCBA past board trustee Carl Forsberg (Forsberg Umlauf PS) chairs the KCBA Judicial Officer Survey Committee. Staff support is provided by KCBA Executive Director Andrew Prazuch. A full roster of committee members is included as Appendix A to this report.

## II. Survey Methodology

The 2020 Judicial Officer Survey was conducted on 52 judges and 9 court commissioners serving in King County Superior Court. Judge Wiggs-Martin, who joined the bench in April 2019, is not included in the 52 count. Judges Bradshaw and Inveen retired from the bench as of September 2019 and are included within the 52 count; their successors (Judges Whedbee and McDonald) are not included. The survey was conducted during the month of October 2019. Survey development methods were similar to those used by KCBA since 2007. As in 2016, the survey was administered using a combined online survey for judges and commissioners. When possible, court data was used to pre-select the judicial officers in front of whom respondents appeared and would evaluate.

### **Survey Recipients**

An important component of a judicial evaluation program is to obtain information from individuals who have had an opportunity to personally observe the judicial officer being evaluated during the relevant time period. Accordingly, rather than attempt to survey all members of KCBA or all lawyers practicing in King County, only attorneys who were identified as having appeared before any of the 52 judges or 9 court commissioners up for evaluation on this survey were invited to participate in the survey. Judges were pre-selected for attorneys based on court records. Court commissioners were not pre-selected since the Clerk of the Court does not collect electronic appearance data for cases before commissioners; instead, attorneys were instructed to only self-select those commissioners before whom they had appeared at least once in the past four years.

Attorneys were identified by two means. First, a report of all attorneys and their appearances at all trials, hearings, and other in-court proceedings in the Superior Court during the previous four years was generated by the King County Superior Court Clerk. From this database of nearly a half million records a unique list of attorneys with a recorded appearance before any of the judges and court commissioners to be evaluated was generated. Any attorney who had subsequently become a judge in the Superior Court was eliminated from the distribution list. Second, King County attorneys were alerted via email about the survey. Additionally, a notice about the survey was included in the KCBA Bar Bulletin newspaper. Those who were omitted were instructed to email KCBA to request a survey invitation. The invitation list was checked for duplicates before invitations were sent.

### **Distribution Dates**

Initial invitations to complete the survey were distributed via email on October 8, 2019. Email addresses that were undeliverable were shared with KCBA. Reminder emails were sent during the survey period to non-respondents. Data collection ended on October 31, 2019.

## Survey Questionnaire

Each attorney was allowed to complete one online survey that combined evaluation options for judges and commissioners. The online survey provided each recipient evaluation questions for a list of pre-selected judicial officers based on court appearance records. For the few attorneys who reported not receiving the survey or having incorrect judges pre-selected, the survey provided a list of all 61 judicial officers and instructed attorneys at the beginning of the survey to self-select the judicial officers before whom they had appeared and to evaluate them. Respondents were then only shown evaluation questions for the judicial officers that they had selected.

Following the American Bar Association's Guidelines for the Evaluation of Judicial Performance (February, 2005), the KCBA Judicial Officer Survey focused upon behavior-based measures. To do this, attorneys who appeared before a judge or court commissioner were asked to evaluate judges and court commissioners regarding specific criteria that are widely acknowledged to be qualities that judges and court commissioners are expected to possess. Specifically, attorneys were asked to consider four individual criteria in each of four areas:

Legal Decision Making	Capably identified and analyzed legal and factual issues. Capably applied rules of evidence and procedure. Articulated rulings & grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner. Was prepared for court.
Integrity and Impartiality	Avoided impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. Treated all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic. Based rulings on the facts and the law. Displayed a neutral presence on the bench.

Demeanor, Temperament,  
and Communication

Treated people with courtesy and respect.  
Was attentive to proceedings.  
Acted with patience and self-control.  
Used clear oral communication while in court.

Administrative Skills

Maintained control in the courtroom.  
Appropriately maintained case management and  
enforced court rules and deadlines.  
Made decisions and rulings in a prompt, timely manner.  
Used the court's time efficiently.

A copy of the actual survey questionnaire is attached as Appendix B.

Attorneys were asked to rate judges and court commissioners on the above criteria using one of six possible responses (unacceptable, below expectations, acceptable, very good, excellent, and don't know).

Respondents were required to answer the following certification question in the affirmative in order for their evaluation to be included: "I certify that I will answer this survey truthfully and only evaluate judges and court commissioners whom I have appeared before in the previous four years. If you check "No" your survey will not be included in the analysis." 161 attorneys did not answer the certification question or chose 'no' and thus were not included in the data for analysis.

### **Data Analysis**

Responses to the four questions in each of the four areas were added together to form a composite index for each of the four areas. This method of evaluation and tabulation of results provides a more detailed set of information for use by voters, members of the bar, court commissioners, and judges under evaluation than single-question measures. Using this method, results are reported for individual questions as well as for the composite index developed for each of the four areas.

When tabulating survey results, no attempt has been made to mathematically derive an "overall score" for any particular judge or commissioner. Rather, results of the individual criteria as well as the four different categories that were the subject of the survey are presented for each judge and commissioner. KCBA believes it would be inappropriate, and

potentially misleading, to simply calculate a single mathematical average of the results in these four separate areas.

While each of the four areas are important attributes for a judge or court commissioner to possess and display, they are not necessarily equal in importance; undoubtedly individuals will have their own opinion on relative importance of each attribute. An averaging method that assumed each was of equal weight thus would be presumptuous.

Furthermore, any attempt by KCBA to provide a weighted average by itself assigning differing importance to the four different areas of the survey would substitute the judgment of KCBA for that of the reader, or of the evaluators, regarding the relative important of the different areas. There also was concern that potentially significant information that might appear amid the different areas of the survey would be obscured if those results were then averaged into a single overall score. The results thus are summarized only for the four different areas, which, after all, is the manner in which the survey was administered.

### **Data Security**

Confidentiality of survey data is a paramount concern to the Association and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the Judicial Officer Survey are of a sensitive nature, KCBA and its contractor have instituted rigorous procedures to protect data. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Once entered online, all electronic data are maintained on a secure server. No data are ever maintained on the hard drives of individual desktop or laptop computers.

To ensure that no individual was able to complete the survey more than once, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once, and only from the email address to which it was sent. The contractor screened respondent identifying information to ensure that only one response was collected from each individual.

### *III. SURVEY RELIABILITY AND RESPONSE RATES*

A goal of every type of survey is to ensure the reliability of the results obtained. While there is no minimum number of responses required to validate survey results, KCBA has in recent years decided that at least 20 responses for each judge is desirable. None of the judges or commissioners had less than 20 responses.

Over 8,300 attorneys were invited to participate in the online survey and 1,518 completed all or part of the survey. The response rate for this survey is 18%, compared to 16% in 2016. The analysis was conducted with 1,357 completed surveys since 161 respondents were eliminated due to an incomplete or negative response to the certification question.

The number of responses per judge and commissioner ranged from a high of 351 to a low of 20. The average and median numbers of responses per judge and commissioner were 113.6 and 112 respectively. These figures are sufficiently high so as not to indicate unreliability. Table 1 shows the number of respondents for all judges and commissioners. Note that judges whose length of service field is marked with an asterisk were first elected to their seats, but began serving early when appointed by the Governor to complete the remaining months on their predecessor's term, before their own elected terms began.

**Table 1: Judicial Officers, Length of Service, and Number of Evaluations**

Name	Length of Service	Number of Evaluations
<i>Superior Court Judges</i>		
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan	Appointed, 2015	188
Judge Chad Allred	Appointed, 2014	114
Judge Susan Amini	Appointed, 2013	159
Judge Johanna Bender	Appointed, 2015	134
Judge Elizabeth Berns	Elected, 2013	129
Judge Bill Bowman	Appointed, 2012*	134
Judge Timothy Bradshaw	Elected, 2009/Retired, 2019	129
Judge Regina Cahan	Appointed, 2009*	96
Judge Samuel Chung	Appointed, 2014	126
Judge Susan Craighead	Appointed, 2007	141
Judge Andrea Darvas	Elected, 2005	119
Judge J. Michael Diaz	Appointed, 2018	45
Judge Karen Donohue	Appointed, 2018	47
Judge Theresa Doyle	Elected, 2005	145
Judge John Erlick	Elected, 2001	156
Judge Marshall Ferguson	Appointed, 2018	70
Judge Julia Garratt	Appointed, 2013	75
Judge Janet Helson	Appointed, 2015	122
Judge Laura Inveen	Appointed, 1992/Retired, 2019	84
Judge David Keenan	Elected, 2017	101
Judge Dean Lum	Appointed, 1998	121

Judge LeRoy McCullough	Appointed, 1989	104
Judge John McHale	Elected, 2017	85
Judge Maureen McKee	Appointed, 2018	46
Judge Annette Messitt	Appointed, 2019	43
Judge Catherine Moore	Elected, 2017	92
Judge Douglass North	Elected, 2000	93
Judge Sean O'Donnell	Elected, 2013	198
Judge Patrick Oishi	Appointed, 2011	158
Judge Suzanne Parisien	Elected, 2013	171
Judge Nicole Phelps	Elected, 2017	85
Judge Mafe Rajul	Appointed, 2018	37
Judge Judith Ramseyer	Appointed, 2012*	88
Judge Kristin Richardson	Elected, 2017	104
Judge Mary Roberts	Appointed, 2003	117
Judge Jim Rogers	Elected, 2005	133
Judge Roger Rogoff	Appointed, 2014	126
Judge Steve Rosen	Elected, 2017	104
Judge Averil Rothrock	Appointed, 2018	53
Judge John Ruhl	Appointed, 2014	130
Judge Michael Ryan	Appointed, 2019	29
Judge Ken Schubert	Elected, 2013	189
Judge Michael Scott	Appointed, 2018	74
Judge Catherine Shaffer	Elected, 2000	178
Judge Ketu Shah	Appointed, 2019	23
Judge Julie Spector	Appointed, 1999	206
Judge David Steiner	Appointed, 2019	20
Judge Aimee Sutton	Appointed, 2019	27
Judge Tanya Thorp	Appointed, 2014	177
Judge Sandra Widlan	Appointed, 2018	80
Judge Matthew Williams	Elected, 2017	94
Judge Melinda Young	Appointed, 2018	32

---

*Commissioners*

Comm. Mark Hillman	2007	224
Comm. Hollis Holman	1996	68
Comm. Melinda Johnson-Taylor	2014	165
Comm. Henry Judson	2014	351
Comm. Jonathan Lack	2019	62
Comm. Jennie Laird	2013	125
Comm. Leonid Ponomarchuk	1998	208
Comm. Camille Schaefer	2018	112
Comm. Nicole Wagner	2018	87

#### IV. Familiarity with Judicial Officers Evaluated

In a judicial performance evaluation, it is important to take steps to ensure that only individuals with personal, firsthand experience with a judge participate in the evaluation. Only attorneys who affirmed that they had appeared before a judge during the four years prior to the evaluation were asked to participate in the evaluation. Due to the imprecision of docket records some attorneys who did not actually appear in court before any of the judges received evaluation materials. In the survey, attorneys were asked not to evaluate a judge if they did not appear before him or her. Additionally, attorneys were asked to indicate the approximate number of times they had appeared before the judge being evaluated during the prior four years. As can be seen in Table 2, 73% of respondents reported appearing before the judge multiple times during the evaluation period.

In addition, newer judges may have had less time on the bench with a resulting lower number of potential evaluators. Finally, please note that judges and commissioners may rotate over the four year period covered by this survey between assignments with a large number of attorneys appearing (e.g., criminal calendar) and a small number of attorneys appearing (e.g., dependency calendar), which may result sometimes in higher and sometimes in lower numbers of possible evaluations.

**Table 2: Number of Appearances**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>King County Superior Court Judges</b>		
Once	1518	27.4%
2-3 times	1968	35.6%
4-10 times	1126	20.4%
More than 10 times	919	16.6%
<b>King County Superior Court Commissioners</b>		
Once	204	15%
2-3 times	439	31%
4-10 times	450	32%
More than 10 times	309	22%

## V. Respondent Characteristics

The survey asked attorneys to provide information optionally about themselves and their practice. Characteristics of the attorneys providing survey responses for each judge and commissioner are also included in the individual results reported for each. The characteristics, in aggregate, of the attorneys participating in the survey are listed in Tables 3-7. Note that while we have in past years included "Hispanic" as a choice under the racial background question (it was selected by 26 respondents in 2016), that option was inadvertently not offered as a choice in 2020. KCBA apologizes for not having this data available in 2020.

**Table 3: Primary Area of Practice**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Criminal Law	203	16.1%
General Civil Law	512	40.6%
Domestic Relations/Family Law	229	18.1%
Government Practice	128	10.1%
Other	190	15.1%

**Table 4: Years in Practice**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1-2 years	31	2.4%
3-5 years	113	8.9%
6-10 years	193	15.2%
11-20 years	356	28.1%
More than 20 years	574	45.3%

**Table 5: Size of Law Firm**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Sole Practitioner	308	24.4%
2-5 Attorneys	302	23.9%
6-10 Attorneys	140	11.1%
11-20 Attorneys	105	8.3%
More than 20 Attorneys	408	32.2%

**Table 6: Respondent Racial Background**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Caucasian/White	1063	84.5%
African American/Black	24	1.9%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	74	5.9%
Native American	10	0.8%
Other	87	6.9%

**Table 7: Respondent Gender**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	671	53.2%
Female	582	46.2%
Other	8	0.6%

## VI. Summary of Results Aggregating All Judges and Commissioners

For each performance-related question there were six possible responses to each survey question: unacceptable (score = 1), below expectations (score = 2), acceptable (score = 3), very good (score = 4), excellent (score = 5), and don't know (no score). When rating judges, more than two-thirds of attorneys (77%) rated the performance in each of the four evaluation categories as either "excellent" or "very good" (see Table 8). A similar percentage of the responses to individual questions within those areas fell into the categories "very good" and "excellent."

When rating court commissioners, more than two-thirds of attorneys (83%) rated the performance in each of the four evaluation categories as either "excellent" or "very good" (see Table 9). A similar percentage of the responses to individual questions within those areas fell into the categories "very good" and "excellent."

Table 8: Aggregate Results for Superior Court Judges

	Category Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Legal Decision Making</b>						
Capably identified and analyzed legal and factual issues	5125	3%	8%	16%	26%	46%
Capably applied rules of evidence and procedure	4956	3%	8%	17%	27%	45%
Articulated rulings & grounds for rulings in a clear concise manner	5128	3%	7%	18%	27%	45%
Was prepared for court	4987	2%	4%	15%	26%	53%
<b>Integrity and Impartiality</b>						
Avoided impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	5134	3%	5%	11%	22%	59%
Displayed a neutral presence on the bench	5020	3%	5%	10%	20%	62%
Based rulings on the facts and the law	5103	4%	9%	17%	22%	47%
Treated all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	5142	4%	7%	14%	22%	53%
<b>Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication</b>						
Treated people with courtesy and respect	5204	3%	5%	12%	20%	59%
Was attentive to proceedings	5164	1%	3%	13%	23%	61%
Acted with patience and self-control	5155	3%	6%	14%	22%	55%
Used clear oral communication while in court	5150	2%	5%	15%	25%	53%
<b>Administrative Skills</b>						
Maintained control in the courtroom	4983	1%	2%	15%	27%	55%
Appropriately maintained case management and enforced court rules and deadlines	4717	2%	4%	16%	27%	51%
Made decisions and rulings in a prompt, timely manner	4940	2%	3%	16%	27%	52%
Used the court's time efficiently	4932	2%	4%	17%	26%	51%

Table 9: Aggregate Results for Superior Court Commissioners

	Category Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Legal Decision Making</b>						
Capably identified and analyzed legal and factual issues	1352	0%	4%	12%	26%	56%
Capably applied rules of evidence and procedure	1339	2%	4%	13%	27%	54%
Articulated rulings & grounds for rulings in a clear concise manner	1346	1%	4%	13%	26%	55%
Was prepared for court	1289	1%	2%	11%	24%	61%
<b>Integrity and Impartiality</b>						
Avoided impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	1341	2%	3%	10%	21%	64%
Displayed a neutral presence on the bench	1352	2%	4%	12%	26%	56%
Based rulings on the facts and the law	1339	2%	4%	13%	27%	54%
Treated all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	1346	1%	4%	13%	26%	55%
<b>Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication</b>						
Treated people with courtesy and respect	1289	1%	2%	11%	24%	61%
Was attentive to proceedings	1341	2%	3%	10%	21%	64%
Acted with patience and self-control	1322	2%	4%	9%	21%	65%
Used clear oral communication while in court	1341	3%	5%	14%	26%	53%
<b>Administrative Skills</b>						
Maintained control in the courtroom	1351	2%	5%	12%	25%	56%
Appropriately maintained case management and enforced court rules and deadlines	1356	2%	5%	12%	21%	60%
Made decisions and rulings in a prompt, timely manner	1347	1%	2%	9%	22%	67%
Used the court's time efficiently	1349	2%	4%	13%	24%	57%

As noted above, composite indexes were also computed for the four evaluation areas. Average ratings received for each item and category are presented in Tables 10 and 11. While the results are similar to those in Table 8 and 9, the average score provides another method for members of the bar and the public to consider a judicial officer's performance. In addition, note that the overall judge average in Tables 10 and 11 (and in Appendix C) is not calculated by averaging the subcategory averages, but rather by averaging all the response weights for a judge (1 through 5). Averaging all the responses is different from averaging the subcategory averages because the number of responses for each subcategory is different (even for the same judge).

Table 10: Aggregate Average Ratings for Superior Court Judges

	Item Average	Category Average
<b>Legal Decision Making</b>		<b>4.08</b>
Capably identified and analyzed legal and factual issues	4.05	
Capably applied rules of evidence and procedure	4.03	
Articulated rulings & grounds for rulings in a clear concise manner	4.04	
Was prepared for court	4.23	
<b>Integrity and Impartiality</b>		<b>4.18</b>
Avoided impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	4.28	
Displayed a neutral presence on the bench	4.34	
Based rulings on the facts and the law	3.98	
Treated all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	4.12	
<b>Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication</b>		<b>4.27</b>
Treated people with courtesy and respect	4.27	
Was attentive to proceedings	4.39	
Acted with patience and self-control	4.22	
Used clear oral communication while in court	4.21	
<b>Administrative Skills</b>		<b>4.24</b>
Maintained control in the courtroom	4.32	
Appropriately maintained case management and enforced court rules and deadlines	4.20	
Made decisions and rulings in a prompt, timely manner	4.23	
Used the court's time efficiently	4.20	

Table 11: Aggregate Average Ratings for Superior Court Commissioners

	Item Average	Category Average
<b>Legal Decision Making</b>		<b>4.33</b>
Capably identified and analyzed legal and factual issues	4.31	
Capably applied rules of evidence and procedure	4.27	
Articulated rulings & grounds for rulings in a clear concise manner	4.30	
Was prepared for court	4.42	
<b>Integrity and Impartiality</b>		<b>4.33</b>
Avoided impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	4.42	
Displayed a neutral presence on the bench	4.43	
Based rulings on the facts and the law	4.20	
Treated all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	4.27	
<b>Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication</b>		<b>4.38</b>
Treated people with courtesy and respect	4.31	
Was attentive to proceedings	4.54	
Acted with patience and self-control	4.28	
Used clear oral communication while in court	4.36	
<b>Administrative Skills</b>		<b>4.45</b>
Maintained control in the courtroom	4.45	
Appropriately maintained case management and enforced court rules and deadlines	4.42	
Made decisions and rulings in a prompt, timely manner	4.50	
Used the court's time efficiently	4.42	

## VII. Summary of Results for Individual Judges

Tables 12-15, which appear on the following pages, present summaries of the results for the 52 judges and 9 commissioners in King County Superior Court who were evaluated. Each table provides results for one of the four areas surveyed (Legal Decision Making; Integrity and Impartiality; Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication; and Administrative Skills), including the number of valid evaluations received for each judge or commissioner and the percentage of responses to individual questions that gave the judge or commissioner a rating of

“unacceptable,” “below expectations,” “acceptable,” “very good,” and “excellent.”

No attempt has been made in this report to present evaluation results in “ranked” numerical order. The ratings for individual judges and commissioners are an indication of performance. They are not of such infallible precision as to permit one to differentiate small differences in ratings. While it is possible to calculate very precise values, this does not mean that similarly precise distinctions exist between or among judges and commissioners. An average rating for a particular question or survey area of 4.2, for example, obviously is numerically higher than an average of 4.1. The difference of 0.1 points, however, does not justify viewing the performance of the former to be significantly better than the latter.

In addition to the following tables, Appendix C provides complete detailed survey results for each of the 52 judges and 9 commissioners who were the subject of the judicial performance survey and had the minimum number of evaluations. The detailed report for each individual judge and commissioner provides results for individual questions as well as categorical averages. The reports also provide information summarizing the characteristics of the attorneys who responded to the survey for that individual judge or commissioner.

**Table 12: Results for Individual Judges and Commissioners – Legal Decision Making**

In the area **Legal Decision Making**, survey participants were asked to rate judges using each of the following four criteria:

- ☐ Capably identified and analyzed legal and factual issues
- ☐ Capably applied rules of evidence and procedure
- ☐ Articulated rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner
- ☐ Was prepared for court

<b>Table 12 Legal Decision Making</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
<i>Superior Court Judges</i>							
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan	679	1.2%	14.6%	24.7%	24.7%	34.8%	3.84
Judge Chad Allred	400	2.0%	8.0%	23.5%	25.3%	41.3%	4.00
Judge Susan Amini	557	7.2%	15.8%	26.4%	24.8%	25.9%	3.42
Judge Johanna Bender	482	1.0%	3.1%	20.3%	24.7%	50.8%	4.22
Judge Elizabeth Berns	466	3.6%	6.4%	16.5%	24.7%	48.7%	4.05
Judge Bill Bowman	512	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	19.1%	78.5%	4.71
Judge Timothy Bradshaw	453	3.3%	5.3%	17.4%	27.2%	46.8%	4.09

<b>Table 12 Legal Decision Making</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
Judge Regina Cahan	347	1.7%	2.0%	6.6%	27.1%	62.5%	4.50
Judge Samuel Chung	446	4.9%	17.3%	28.9%	28.5%	20.4%	3.39
Judge Susan Craighead	529	3.0%	6.4%	11.3%	31.2%	48.0%	4.18
Judge Andrea Darvas	447	3.1%	2.5%	13.2%	30.0%	51.2%	4.23
Judge J. Michael Diaz	157	0.0%	0.6%	16.6%	26.1%	56.7%	4.31
Judge Karen Donohue	171	1.2%	4.1%	22.8%	29.8%	42.1%	4.16
Judge Theresa Doyle	546	3.3%	7.7%	19.0%	29.5%	40.5%	3.95
Judge John Erlick	585	0.7%	1.5%	5.1%	18.6%	74.0%	4.63
Judge Marshall Ferguson	240	1.7%	9.2%	25.0%	25.4%	38.8%	3.93
Judge Julia Garratt	262	0.0%	6.5%	17.9%	24.8%	50.8%	4.17
Judge Janet Helson	458	2.0%	3.5%	11.1%	24.7%	58.7%	4.38
Judge Laura Inveen	323	0.0%	2.2%	9.6%	20.7%	67.5%	4.51
Judge David Keenan	369	1.6%	7.0%	25.2%	27.1%	39.0%	3.96
Judge Dean Lum	434	2.1%	5.5%	13.6%	26.5%	52.3%	4.21
Judge LeRoy McCullough	390	1.0%	3.3%	20.5%	32.1%	43.1%	4.14
Judge John McHale	295	0.3%	3.1%	20.7%	33.6%	42.4%	4.08
Judge Maureen McKee	151	0.0%	3.3%	17.9%	25.2%	53.6%	4.42
Judge Annette Messitt	160	2.5%	11.3%	16.3%	19.4%	50.6%	4.01
Judge Catherine Moore	324	8.0%	15.4%	19.1%	25.6%	31.8%	3.60
Judge Douglass North	321	3.1%	2.8%	15.9%	37.4%	40.8%	4.10
Judge Sean O'Donnell	748	3.7%	8.3%	22.1%	26.2%	39.7%	3.91
Judge Patrick Oishi	597	1.8%	3.9%	16.1%	26.3%	51.9%	4.22
Judge Suzanne Parisien	641	7.8%	15.3%	21.5%	20.6%	34.8%	3.60
Judge Nicole Phelps	290	2.8%	14.5%	21.0%	25.9%	35.9%	3.78
Judge Mafe Rajul	145	0.0%	3.4%	17.2%	28.3%	51.0%	4.18
Judge Judith Ramseyer	301	1.0%	3.7%	8.0%	23.3%	64.1%	4.40
Judge Kristin Richardson	355	3.7%	8.7%	16.1%	23.9%	47.6%	4.09
Judge Mary Roberts	423	3.1%	7.8%	21.0%	19.9%	48.2%	4.05
Judge Jim Rogers	504	0.8%	3.8%	11.1%	34.3%	50.0%	4.29
Judge Roger Rogoff	455	0.4%	0.7%	4.6%	28.6%	65.7%	4.58
Judge Steve Rosen	386	1.3%	3.1%	18.7%	25.9%	51.0%	4.20
Judge Averil Rothrock	196	1.0%	4.6%	13.3%	31.6%	49.5%	4.30

<b>Table 12</b>	<b>Category</b>		<b>Below</b>		<b>Very</b>		<b>Average</b>
<b>Legal Decision Making</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>(1-5 scale)</b>
Judge John Ruhl	463	2.1%	13.2%	21.1%	23.5%	39.3%	4.03
Judge Michael K. Ryan	115	7.0%	3.5%	23.5%	21.7%	44.3%	3.97
Judge Ken Schubert	698	4.3%	9.5%	22.6%	27.2%	36.4%	3.82
Judge Michael Scott	250	1.2%	8.8%	10.0%	25.2%	54.8%	4.23
Judge Catherine Shaffer	694	6.5%	8.4%	16.7%	26.9%	41.5%	3.76
Judge Ketu Shah	86	0.0%	0.0%	15.1%	32.6%	52.3%	4.23
Judge Julie Spector	767	4.4%	6.9%	13.4%	27.9%	47.3%	4.08
Judge David Steiner	71	5.6%	28.2%	25.4%	11.3%	29.6%	3.11
Judge Aimee Sutton	93	0.0%	2.2%	26.9%	43.0%	28.0%	4.03
Judge Tanya Thorp	655	1.1%	7.6%	8.9%	22.1%	60.3%	4.34
Judge Sandra Widlan	280	2.9%	2.1%	14.3%	38.2%	42.5%	4.14
Judge Matthew Williams	354	4.0%	3.7%	18.4%	22.0%	52.0%	4.16
Judge Melinda Young	115	1.7%	3.5%	13.9%	27.8%	53.0%	4.18
<i>Superior Court Commissioners</i>							
Comm. Mark Hillman	864	4.5%	5.1%	20.6%	25.6%	44.2%	4.00
Comm. Hollis Holman	225	0.0%	4.0%	26.2%	18.2%	51.6%	4.45
Comm. Melinda Johnson-Taylor	626	1.3%	3.7%	12.9%	38.5%	43.6%	4.19
Comm. Henry Judson	1327	1.0%	2.2%	6.9%	23.9%	66.0%	4.52
Comm. Jonathan Lack	239	1.7%	8.8%	13.0%	26.8%	49.8%	4.14
Comm. Jennie Laird	493	1.2%	2.2%	7.3%	28.2%	61.1%	4.46
Comm. Leonid Ponomarchuk	797	1.8%	1.9%	5.8%	18.3%	72.3%	4.57
Comm. Camille Schaefer	418	0.2%	4.5%	17.9%	23.4%	53.8%	4.26
Comm. Nicole Wagner	332	1.8%	5.4%	18.4%	32.8%	41.6%	4.07

**Table 13: Results for Individual Judges and Commissioners – Integrity and Impartiality**

In the area **Integrity and Impartiality**, survey participants were asked to rate judges using each of the following four criteria:

Avoided impropriety and the appearance of impropriety

Displayed a neutral presence on the bench

Based rulings on the facts and the law

Treated individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic

<b>Table 13 Integrity &amp; Impartiality</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
<i>Superior Court Judges</i>							
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan	711	8.2%	14.1%	18.0%	19.7%	40.1%	3.73
Judge Chad Allred	403	3.5%	9.2%	13.2%	26.8%	47.4%	4.06
Judge Susan Amini	571	3.0%	5.8%	21.5%	28.2%	41.5%	3.97
Judge Johanna Bender	493	4.7%	8.5%	18.5%	18.5%	49.9%	4.02
Judge Elizabeth Berns	486	6.6%	7.0%	16.7%	24.3%	45.5%	3.92
Judge Bill Bowman	511	0.2%	1.0%	2.3%	15.5%	81.0%	4.73
Judge Timothy Bradshaw	450	2.2%	7.1%	13.8%	22.9%	54.0%	4.20
Judge Regina Cahan	350	1.7%	2.9%	4.6%	17.1%	73.7%	4.57
Judge Samuel Chung	445	3.4%	7.6%	18.7%	25.2%	45.2%	4.01
Judge Susan Craighead	532	3.4%	5.5%	10.7%	22.9%	57.5%	4.28
Judge Andrea Darvas	441	4.1%	2.9%	13.4%	25.2%	54.4%	4.23
Judge J. Michael Diaz	164	0.0%	1.2%	16.5%	20.1%	62.2%	4.34
Judge Karen Donohue	152	5.3%	7.2%	19.1%	30.9%	37.5%	4.11
Judge Theresa Doyle	544	2.6%	4.8%	13.8%	24.4%	54.4%	4.23
Judge John Erlick	585	1.2%	0.5%	3.4%	14.4%	80.5%	4.71
Judge Marshall Ferguson	247	2.0%	8.5%	14.2%	19.0%	56.3%	4.27
Judge Julia Garratt	266	1.5%	6.4%	13.5%	24.8%	53.8%	4.17
Judge Janet Helson	468	3.6%	2.8%	7.3%	22.0%	64.3%	4.44
Judge Laura Inveen	316	0.9%	2.5%	6.0%	17.7%	72.8%	4.58
Judge David Keenan	369	2.7%	6.5%	18.4%	24.7%	47.7%	4.10
Judge Dean Lum	434	1.1%	2.2%	9.3%	20.5%	52.3%	4.51
Judge LeRoy McCullough	407	1.2%	2.0%	13.3%	23.8%	59.7%	4.39

<b>Table 13 Integrity &amp; Impartiality</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
Judge John McHale	313	0.3%	2.2%	13.4%	24.3%	59.7%	4.34
Judge Maureen McKee	159	0.0%	2.5%	11.9%	23.3%	62.3%	4.60
Judge Annette Messitt	162	0.6%	5.6%	17.9%	14.2%	61.7%	4.24
Judge Catherine Moore	318	9.7%	14.5%	11.6%	19.5%	44.7%	3.78
Judge Douglass North	325	3.1%	4.6%	12.6%	24.9%	54.8%	4.23
Judge Sean O'Donnell	765	6.8%	11.8%	21.4%	19.7%	40.3%	3.76
Judge Patrick Oishi	607	2.0%	5.4%	12.7%	23.7%	56.2%	4.27
Judge Suzanne Parisien	641	10.3%	11.2%	18.9%	16.5%	43.1%	3.71
Judge Nicole Phelps	310	2.9%	9.0%	19.0%	21.3%	47.7%	4.01
Judge Mafe Rajul	147	3.4%	2.7%	7.5%	31.3%	55.1%	4.24
Judge Judith Ramseyer	296	0.0%	2.4%	5.4%	19.3%	73.0%	4.58
Judge Kristin Richardson	364	3.6%	6.3%	14.6%	18.4%	57.1%	4.25
Judge Mary Roberts	431	3.2%	7.0%	12.5%	21.8%	55.5%	4.20
Judge Jim Rogers	499	1.6%	5.4%	9.2%	21.4%	62.3%	4.38
Judge Roger Rogoff	469	0.2%	0.9%	4.9%	25.6%	68.4%	4.62
Judge Steve Rosen	382	1.3%	7.3%	11.3%	21.7%	58.4%	4.26
Judge Averil Rothrock	200	2.0%	6.0%	9.0%	20.5%	62.5%	4.40
Judge John Ruhl	476	3.2%	5.3%	11.3%	24.6%	55.7%	4.23
Judge Michael K. Ryan	112	7.1%	13.4%	14.3%	17.0%	48.2%	3.88
Judge Ken Schubert	696	4.6%	10.5%	19.4%	22.6%	43.0%	3.89
Judge Michael Scott	254	2.4%	7.5%	5.1%	23.2%	61.8%	4.36
Judge Catherine Shaffer	665	12.0%	12.0%	15.2%	18.2%	42.6%	3.67
Judge Ketu Shah	91	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	18.7%	69.2%	4.49
Judge Julie Spector	766	5.5%	9.7%	11.6%	18.7%	54.6%	4.08
Judge David Steiner	72	2.8%	16.7%	34.7%	13.9%	31.9%	3.54
Judge Aimee Sutton	99	0.0%	6.1%	16.2%	45.5%	32.3%	4.04
Judge Tanya Thorp	656	2.7%	5.8%	7.5%	17.4%	66.6%	4.40
Judge Sandra Widlan	275	1.8%	2.5%	13.8%	22.2%	59.6%	4.31
Judge Matthew Williams	359	4.7%	10.3%	14.5%	16.4%	54.0%	4.09
Judge Melinda Young	114	5.3%	3.5%	14.0%	22.8%	54.4%	4.15

<b>Table 13</b> <b>Integrity &amp; Impartiality</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
<i>Superior Court Commissioners</i>							
Comm. Mark Hillman	869	6.3%	8.9%	19.4%	22.6%	42.8%	3.87
Comm. Hollis Holman	224	0.0%	8.0%	17.9%	21.9%	52.2%	4.41
Comm. Melinda Johnson-Taylor	628	1.8%	4.1%	10.8%	26.0%	57.3%	4.33
Comm. Henry Judson	1336	0.6%	1.3%	4.6%	19.8%	73.6%	4.64
Comm. Jonathan Lack	234	2.1%	3.4%	16.7%	23.1%	54.7%	4.25
Comm. Jennie Laird	496	2.0%	3.0%	10.3%	22.0%	62.7%	4.40
Comm. Leonid Ponomarchuk	804	2.4%	3.9%	9.1%	23.3%	61.4%	4.38
Comm. Camille Schaefer	419	0.5%	6.2%	12.2%	25.8%	55.4%	4.29
Comm. Nicole Wagner	329	0.9%	3.0%	15.5%	28.6%	52.0%	4.28

**Table 14: Results for Individual Judges and Commissioners for Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication**

In the area **Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication**, survey participants were asked to rate judges using each of the following four criteria:

- Treated people with courtesy and respect
- Was attentive to proceedings
- Acted with patience and self-control
- Used clear oral communication while in court

<b>Table 14</b> <b>Demeanor, Temperament, Communication</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
<i>Superior Court Judges</i>							
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan	714	9.8%	13.4%	18.9%	18.5%	39.4%	3.69
Judge Chad Allred	408	1.5%	4.7%	17.4%	23.5%	52.9%	4.22
Judge Susan Amini	591	1.5%	5.6%	20.8%	29.3%	42.8%	4.04
Judge Johanna Bender	478	0.6%	2.7%	19.2%	24.3%	53.1%	4.46
Judge Elizabeth Berns	487	1.2%	3.7%	15.0%	26.1%	54.0%	4.25
Judge Bill Bowman	515	0.0%	0.2%	1.6%	12.6%	85.6%	4.80

**Table 14**

<b>Demeanor, Temperament, Communication</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
Judge Timothy Bradshaw	473	0.8%	6.8%	14.8%	23.9%	53.7%	4.23
Judge Regina Cahan	349	0.3%	2.3%	3.2%	17.5%	76.8%	4.66
Judge Samuel Chung	454	1.8%	5.1%	19.6%	31.5%	42.1%	4.08
Judge Susan Craighead	530	1.3%	2.8%	11.5%	20.9%	63.4%	4.45
Judge Andrea Darvas	453	1.5%	2.4%	10.6%	32.9%	52.5%	4.32
Judge J. Michael Diaz	164	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	22.0%	67.7%	4.46
Judge Karen Donohue	176	3.4%	5.1%	14.2%	24.4%	52.8%	4.27
Judge Theresa Doyle	555	0.7%	4.0%	15.7%	20.5%	59.1%	4.33
Judge John Erlick	591	0.0%	0.8%	3.9%	14.0%	81.2%	4.73
Judge Marshall Ferguson	243	0.8%	2.5%	15.6%	18.1%	63.0%	4.48
Judge Julia Garratt	272	1.5%	1.5%	15.1%	20.6%	61.4%	4.33
Judge Janet Helson	471	1.3%	2.1%	5.9%	24.4%	66.2%	4.55
Judge Laura Inveen	319	0.6%	0.6%	8.2%	20.1%	70.5%	4.60
Judge David Keenan	374	1.1%	4.0%	15.8%	27.8%	51.3%	4.25
Judge Dean Lum	453	1.1%	2.2%	9.3%	20.5%	66.9%	4.48
Judge LeRoy McCullough	401	0.2%	2.2%	13.7%	21.9%	61.8%	4.44
Judge John McHale	319	0.0%	0.9%	7.2%	22.6%	69.3%	4.54
Judge Maureen McKee	164	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%	26.2%	68.3%	4.76
Judge Annette Messitt	164	0.6%	0.6%	16.5%	14.6%	67.7%	4.46
Judge Catherine Moore	328	3.7%	6.7%	24.1%	24.7%	40.9%	3.96
Judge Douglass North	330	1.2%	3.0%	13.9%	27.3%	54.5%	4.30
Judge Sean O'Donnell	769	3.5%	10.4%	20.9%	22.1%	43.0%	3.91
Judge Patrick Oishi	608	0.7%	4.9%	14.3%	27.1%	53.0%	4.26
Judge Suzanne Parisien	654	6.6%	8.9%	23.1%	19.3%	42.2%	3.81
Judge Nicole Phelps	309	1.0%	8.4%	18.4%	21.0%	51.1%	4.13
Judge Mafe Rajul	148	0.0%	1.4%	6.8%	33.1%	58.8%	4.43
Judge Judith Ramseyer	300	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	16.3%	79.7%	4.67
Judge Kristin Richardson	368	2.7%	3.5%	12.2%	23.6%	57.9%	4.41
Judge Mary Roberts	430	0.9%	7.0%	15.6%	18.6%	57.9%	4.25
Judge Jim Rogers	508	0.4%	2.6%	10.0%	22.6%	64.4%	4.48
Judge Roger Rogoff	469	0.0%	1.1%	6.8%	20.5%	71.6%	4.64

**Table 14**

<b>Demeanor, Temperament, Communication</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
Judge Steve Rosen	392	0.0%	4.1%	13.3%	23.0%	59.7%	4.36
Judge Averil Rothrock	208	0.0%	1.9%	6.3%	17.3%	74.5%	4.68
Judge John Ruhl	477	1.5%	4.2%	13.0%	27.7%	53.7%	4.27
Judge Michael K. Ryan	114	6.1%	6.1%	20.2%	18.4%	49.1%	3.99
Judge Ken Schubert	719	4.0%	9.7%	17.0%	27.8%	41.4%	3.92
Judge Michael Scott	266	0.8%	4.1%	10.2%	19.2%	65.8%	4.48
Judge Catherine Shaffer	668	8.5%	10.2%	16.5%	22.0%	42.8%	3.81
Judge Ketu Shah	92	0.0%	1.1%	10.9%	15.2%	72.8%	4.50
Judge Julie Spector	777	5.0%	7.3%	15.6%	19.8%	52.3%	4.08
Judge David Steiner	76	5.3%	13.2%	35.5%	11.8%	34.2%	3.55
Judge Aimee Sutton	104	0.0%	3.8%	16.3%	47.1%	32.7%	4.09
Judge Tanya Thorp	658	1.8%	5.3%	11.7%	21.4%	59.7%	4.32
Judge Sandra Widlan	285	1.1%	1.8%	9.5%	22.8%	64.9%	4.49
Judge Matthew Williams	367	4.6%	7.9%	13.4%	14.2%	59.9%	4.18
Judge Melinda Young	112	4.5%	0.0%	8.9%	23.2%	63.4%	4.47
<i>Superior Court Commissioners</i>							
Comm. Mark Hillman	884	5.1%	8.7%	23.3%	23.6%	39.3%	3.83
Comm. Hollis Holman	226	0.0%	4.4%	21.2%	23.9%	50.4%	4.43
Comm. Melinda Johnson-Taylor	629	0.3%	2.4%	7.9%	26.9%	62.5%	4.49
Comm. Henry Judson	1349	0.3%	1.0%	3.9%	18.7%	76.2%	4.70
Comm. Jonathan Lack	238	0.0%	7.1%	11.8%	22.7%	58.4%	4.32
Comm. Jennie Laird	496	0.4%	2.6%	5.6%	23.4%	67.9%	4.56
Comm. Leonid Ponomarchuk	808	2.8%	4.3%	13.1%	22.8%	56.9%	4.27
Comm. Camille Schaefer	421	0.2%	1.2%	10.9%	21.9%	65.8%	4.52
Comm. Nicole Wagner	327	0.3%	2.4%	14.1%	29.1%	54.1%	4.34

**Table 15: Results for Individual Judges and Commissioners– Administrative Skills**

In the area **Administrative Skills**, survey participants were asked to rate judges using each of the following four criteria:

- Maintained control in the courtroom
- Appropriately enforced court rules and deadlines
- Made decisions and rulings in a prompt, timely manner
- Used the court’s time efficiently

<b>Table 15 Administrative Skills</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
<i>Superior Court Judges</i>							
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan	664	2.7%	4.4%	22.4%	27.3%	43.2%	4.08
Judge Chad Allred	404	1.7%	5.7%	15.6%	32.7%	44.3%	4.12
Judge Susan Amini	547	5.1%	11.0%	26.3%	29.6%	28.0%	3.63
Judge Johanna Bender	469	0.6%	2.1%	19.0%	26.7%	51.6%	4.27
Judge Elizabeth Berns	469	0.9%	1.5%	18.8%	28.8%	50.1%	4.23
Judge Bill Bowman	501	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	21.6%	75.0%	4.67
Judge Timothy Bradshaw	417	1.4%	1.4%	18.0%	24.2%	54.9%	4.31
Judge Regina Cahan	333	0.9%	0.6%	7.5%	23.1%	67.9%	4.55
Judge Samuel Chung	425	4.7%	8.9%	24.0%	31.1%	31.3%	3.74
Judge Susan Craighead	521	2.9%	4.2%	12.5%	32.2%	48.2%	4.24
Judge Andrea Darvas	433	1.8%	2.1%	16.9%	34.6%	44.6%	4.16
Judge J. Michael Diaz	156	0.0%	0.6%	21.2%	28.2%	50.0%	4.10
Judge Karen Donohue	162	2.5%	0.0%	18.5%	29.0%	50.0%	4.32
Judge Theresa Doyle	532	0.6%	3.6%	19.2%	26.9%	49.8%	4.22
Judge John Erlick	565	0.7%	0.5%	6.0%	19.5%	73.3%	4.62
Judge Marshall Ferguson	224	0.4%	5.8%	25.0%	14.7%	54.0%	4.22
Judge Julia Garratt	258	2.3%	1.9%	15.5%	22.1%	58.1%	4.28
Judge Janet Helson	453	1.1%	0.7%	13.2%	28.3%	56.7%	4.42
Judge Laura Inveen	311	0.0%	1.0%	5.8%	25.7%	67.5%	4.59
Judge David Keenan	355	0.0%	3.4%	16.9%	30.1%	49.6%	4.27
Judge Dean Lum	424	0.0%	2.1%	13.9%	27.8%	56.1%	4.36
Judge LeRoy McCullough	388	2.6%	6.7%	20.4%	25.3%	45.1%	4.03

<b>Table 15 Administrative Skills</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
Judge John McHale	290	0.7%	3.8%	18.3%	30.0%	47.2%	4.15
Judge Maureen McKee	147	0.0%	1.4%	7.5%	27.9%	63.3%	4.68
Judge Annette Messitt	160	0.6%	1.3%	24.4%	19.4%	54.4%	4.24
Judge Catherine Moore	293	4.1%	3.1%	31.1%	25.6%	36.2%	3.93
Judge Douglass North	315	0.0%	1.3%	14.6%	31.4%	52.7%	4.36
Judge Sean O'Donnell	755	5.6%	9.1%	21.9%	26.1%	37.4%	3.82
Judge Patrick Oishi	581	0.5%	3.3%	13.8%	27.5%	54.9%	4.33
Judge Suzanne Parisien	623	1.6%	6.7%	27.8%	23.3%	40.6%	3.93
Judge Nicole Phelps	284	2.1%	11.3%	27.8%	21.1%	37.7%	3.83
Judge Mafe Rajul	147	0.7%	1.4%	12.9%	36.1%	49.0%	4.24
Judge Judith Ramseyer	277	0.0%	1.8%	7.6%	19.9%	70.8%	4.51
Judge Kristin Richardson	353	2.8%	4.2%	13.0%	25.5%	54.4%	4.31
Judge Mary Roberts	414	1.7%	5.1%	16.7%	24.4%	52.2%	4.23
Judge Jim Rogers	488	0.6%	2.0%	13.3%	30.7%	53.3%	4.34
Judge Roger Rogoff	432	0.0%	0.2%	5.6%	26.6%	67.6%	4.63
Judge Steve Rosen	369	0.3%	1.6%	13.0%	25.5%	59.6%	4.40
Judge Averil Rothrock	188	0.0%	0.5%	8.5%	39.9%	51.1%	4.43
Judge John Ruhl	469	3.8%	3.4%	21.1%	25.8%	38.8%	4.06
Judge Michael K. Ryan	107	1.9%	2.8%	26.2%	15.0%	54.2%	4.20
Judge Ken Schubert	672	2.7%	3.1%	15.5%	32.3%	46.4%	4.17
Judge Michael Scott	231	0.9%	3.0%	9.5%	26.0%	60.6%	4.44
Judge Catherine Shaffer	642	2.2%	4.2%	17.8%	24.1%	51.7%	4.19
Judge Ketu Shah	90	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	32.2%	62.2%	4.41
Judge Julie Spector	731	1.6%	2.2%	14.1%	25.3%	56.8%	4.35
Judge David Steiner	70	0.0%	7.1%	35.7%	17.1%	40.0%	3.66
Judge Aimee Sutton	87	0.0%	0.0%	25.3%	49.4%	25.3%	4.14
Judge Tanya Thorp	631	0.8%	2.2%	7.1%	20.9%	68.9%	4.54
Judge Sandra Widlan	252	0.0%	2.0%	11.1%	35.3%	51.6%	4.38
Judge Matthew Williams	355	2.8%	2.5%	16.1%	20.3%	58.3%	4.31
Judge Melinda Young	104	3.8%	0.0%	9.6%	18.3%	68.3%	4.43

<b>Table 15 Administrative Skills</b>	<b>Category Responses</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Average (1-5 scale)</b>
<i>Superior Court Commissioners</i>							
Comm. Mark Hillman	838	0.8%	2.4%	13.6%	30.7%	52.5%	4.32
Comm. Hollis Holman	226	0.0%	0.4%	17.3%	25.2%	57.1%	4.69
Comm. Melinda Johnson-Taylor	616	0.5%	1.6%	14.4%	30.7%	52.8%	4.34
Comm. Henry Judson	1283	0.2%	1.0%	5.7%	24.2%	69.0%	4.61
Comm. Jonathan Lack	215	0.9%	1.4%	16.7%	22.3%	58.6%	4.36
Comm. Jennie Laird	483	0.6%	1.4%	9.9%	28.6%	59.4%	4.45
Comm. Leonid Ponomarchuk	788	1.1%	1.0%	6.3%	16.5%	75.0%	4.63
Comm. Camille Schaefer	408	0.0%	2.2%	12.0%	29.7%	56.1%	4.40
Comm. Nicole Wagner	319	1.9%	3.8%	15.0%	32.0%	47.3%	4.19

## VIII. Comments

The 2020 Judicial Survey allowed responding attorneys an opportunity to include comments with their responses. Attorneys provided 1,472 such comments. Comments provide attorneys with the opportunity to provide specific feedback to a judge or commissioner. More importantly, whether the feedback is positive or negative, such information may be helpful to each judge or commissioner as they review their evaluations and potential areas for growth. The Association shares these comments only with the individual judge and commissioner and does not release comments publicly.

## IX. Conclusion

While not tested for scientific validity, the results of the 2020 Judicial Officer Survey nonetheless represent the opinions of over 1,000 attorneys who chose to respond, a significant expression of opinion by the legal community about judicial officer performance. The Association does recommend that these results not be considered as a sole measure of performance, but instead strongly urges the bar, bench, and public to also take into account judicial candidate evaluation ratings by KCBA and other bar associations for those judges in contested election campaigns and public debate forums during election years to form a full opinion about judicial performance.