KING COUNTY BAR
ASSOCIATION

2023-2024

Judicial Officer Survey

for

King County Superior Court

Published May 2024

I. Introduction

The King County Bar Association (KCBA) has conducted and published surveys and evaluations of judicial officers since 1948. The survey results are a summary of practicing attorneys' personal assessments of the judicial officers who hear and decide their cases. The survey provides important information to the public, the legal community, and the bench about attorneys' evaluations of the local judicial branch.

Every four years, this survey is conducted of attorneys practicing in King County Superior Court. The last survey of the Superior Court was conducted in 2019, with results published in 2020. 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 conducted in 2021, with results published in 2022.

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.

It is important not to 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. These opinions have value, but they must be considered along with KCBA judicial candidate ratings, debates, and other efforts the legal community makes to offer as complete a picture of judicial performance as it can.

Dan Weiskopf is currently serving as the Chair of the Judicial Officer Survey Committee. Staff support was provided by KCBA Executive Director Christina Coad. A full roster of committee members is included in Appendix A to this report.

Finally, to maintain objectivity, KCBA contracted with Information Insights, Inc., a business and management consulting firm, to administer the survey. Information Insights is a Small Business Administration-certified Women-Owned Small Business. The firm has 27 years of experience providing research-based consulting, planning, and business services to clients throughout Alaska and beyond. KCBA has worked with Information Insights for over 10 years, and Information Insights continues to be responsible for all aspects of the online survey set-up, distribution, and data collection.

II. Survey Methodology

The 2023-2024 Judicial Officer Survey was conducted for sixty judicial officers (fifty-one judges and nine court commissioners) serving in King County Superior Court. The survey does not include the three judges who joined the bench during 2023 (Judge William Dixon, Judge Rania Rampersad, and Judge Paul Crisalli), or Commissioner Shannon Gould, who is a term-limited temporary (TLT) commissioner. The survey was conducted in December 2023 and January 2024. The survey invited attorneys to evaluate the judicial officers they recall appearing before between October 2019 and August 2023.

The survey was developed in 2007, and its current online format was adopted in 2017. The survey is administered using the software platform Qualtrics. The survey uses data provided by the Court, which enables the survey to pre-select the judicial officers that attorneys appeared before.

Several other significant changes to survey questions occurred in 2021, when the survey (i) added an evaluation category for virtual and remote appearances, (ii) added two questions in the integrity and impartiality category,[1] and (iii) updated response options for racial/ethnic identity and gender to make the questions more inclusive.

Survey Participants

An important component of a judicial evaluation program is to obtain information from individuals who have observed the judicial officers being evaluated during the relevant time frame. 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 sixty judicial officers up for evaluation on this survey were invited to participate (the "Participants"). Judicial officers were pre-selected for Participants based on court records, and Participants were instructed to only evaluate those judicial officers before whom they had appeared at least once between October 2019 and August 2023.

To identify Participants, King County Superior Court provided a report of all attorneys and their appearances at trials, hearings, or other in-court proceedings during the previous four years. Any attorney who had subsequently become a judicial officer in King County

---

[1] The two questions added to the integrity and impartiality category were: 1) "Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination" and 2) "Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally-competent and trauma-responsive manner (e.g., utilizing remote appearances, flexibility on hearing times, identifying and resolving language and communication barriers, providing resources for obtaining legal help, accommodating participants with physical or cognitive disabilities)."

Superior Court was eliminated from the distribution list. The invitation list was checked for duplicates before invitations were sent.

Distribution Dates

Initial invitations to complete the survey were distributed to Participants via email on December 1, 2023. Email addresses that were undeliverable were shared with KCBA, and Participants for whom an alternate email address could be found were sent another invitation to the updated address. Reminder emails were sent regularly, starting weekly, with an increase in reminders as the deadline approached. Notice of the survey was also published in the KCBA Bar Bulletin. Data collection was originally scheduled to end on January 15, 2024. However, to gather additional responses, data collection was extended to January 29, 2024.

Survey Questionnaire

As with the 2019 and 2021 surveys, each Participant received one emailed invitation that included a unique link to their online survey. The online survey provided each Participant with evaluation questions for a list of pre-selected judges based on court appearance records, as well as a list of court commissioners that the attorney could select from.

Following the American Bar Association's Guidelines for Judicial Performance Evaluation, the KCBA Judicial Officer Survey focused on behavior-based measures. To do this, Participants who appeared before a judicial officer were asked to evaluate the judicial officers regarding specific criteria that are widely acknowledged to be qualities that judicial officers are expected to possess. Specifically, Participants were asked to consider four to five individual criteria in each of the five areas:

Virtual Appearances [4]
- Understands the issues before them to provide a clear ruling consistent with the facts and law
- Treats all individuals equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic
- Pays attention to the proceedings
- Maintains control over the courtroom

Legal Decision Making [5]
- Preparedness for court
- Ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues
- Ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure
- Ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner
- Ability to base their rulings on the facts and the law

Integrity and Impartiality [5]
- Displays a neutral presence on the bench
- Avoids impropriety and the appearance of impropriety
- Treats all people equally without bias based on race, gender, or any other extralegal personal characteristic
- Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination
- Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally competent and trauma-responsive manner (e.g., utilizing remote appearances, flexibility on hearing times, identifying and resolving language and communication barriers, providing resources for obtaining legal help, accommodating participants with physical or cognitive disabilities)

Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication [4]
- Treats people with courtesy and respect
- Pays attention to the proceedings
- Acts with patience and self-control
- Uses clear and logical communication while in court

Administrative Skills [4]
- Maintains control over the courtroom
- Appropriately maintains case management and enforces court rules and deadlines
- Is prompt and timely in making decisions and rulings
- Uses the court's time efficiently

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

Participants were required to answer the following certification question in the affirmative for their evaluation to be included. "I certify that I will answer this survey truthfully and only evaluate judicial officers whom I have appeared before between October 2019 and August 2023. **Note:** If you check 'No,' your survey will **not** be included in the analysis." If "No" was selected, those Participants were unable to proceed with an evaluation. Six responding Participants answered "No" to the certification question. Participants that answered "Yes" to the certification question were permitted to complete the survey.

Data Analysis
Responses to the questions in each of the five areas were added together to form a composite index for each of the five areas. This method of evaluation and tabulation of

results provides a more detailed set of information 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 five areas.

Limitations

As described above, the survey does not purport to be a scientific or mathematically rigorous study. The numbers provided are averages of subjective responses by the Participants, who all have different approaches to responding, different backgrounds, and different biases. The survey does not control many factors that could impact the scores. For example:

- There is no analysis of which Participants are more likely to evaluate a judicial officer. (E.g., are Participants who won or lost more likely to evaluate judicial officers and could that impact scores?)
- There is no analysis of whether the rotations of the judicial officer impacts scores. (E.g., are judges on civil rotations rated consistently with judges on criminal rotations?)
- There is no analysis of the impact of race or gender on the scores.
- The number of responding Participants for each individual judicial officer may not be high enough to draw statistical conclusions.

These are examples of the many complex issues that could impact responses. Moreover, when there are small numbers of responding Participants, any single response can impact a score. Thus, all the results should be viewed in the context of the number of responding Participants for a given judicial officer.

With these many issues not controlled for or analyzed, the survey should not be mistaken for a ranking or rigorous poll. For these reasons, the KCBA has not attempted to make any mathematical conclusions, such as deriving an "overall score" for any individual judicial officer. Moreover, KCBA understands that the five areas surveyed are not necessarily equal in importance and individuals will have their own opinion on the relative importance of each attribute.

For these reasons, the results are summarized only for the five different areas, following the way the survey was administered.

Data Security

Confidentiality of survey data is a paramount concern to the KCBA. Because data collected through the Judicial Officer Survey is sensitive, 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 is maintained on a secure server. No data is ever maintained on the hard drives of individual desktop or laptop computers.

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

III. Survey Reliability and Response Rates

There were 7,396 Participants invited to participate in the online survey, and there were 1,063 recorded responses, including 927 completed surveys and 136 partial responses. Partial responses are considered surveys that a respondent opened and did not complete, and that housed at least one data point for analysis. The completed response rate for this survey is 12.53%. Including partial submissions, the response rate is 14.37%. The analysis was conducted with 1,057 recorded responses since six of the Participants answered "No" to the certification question.

Any partial response that did not house data (no survey questions answered) was removed, and this year's survey received 211 such responses that are not reflected in the recorded totals. Considering these responses, as well as the number of bounced emails (483) and opt-outs (297), the overall engagement rate for this survey is 27.77%.

A goal of every survey is to ensure the reliability of the results obtained. Generally, reliability of a survey increases with greater numbers of responses; however, there is no bright-line statistical rule that dictates how many responses are sufficient for a reliable survey. Thus, in consultation with the survey contractor, the Judicial Officer Survey Committee was required to make a subjective choice about the number of responses for a judicial officer that would be required before data about that judicial officer would be released. As in the past, the committee chose not to provide individual results for any judicial officer with less than twenty survey responses.

This decision was based on balancing a number of factors and circumstances. On the one hand, there are downsides to releasing survey data if a judicial officer was reviewed by only a handful of Participants. A small number of Participants from a small subset of the judicial officer's cases may not provide a reliable metric for the judicial officer's performance, and such results may be susceptible to being skewed by outliers. It would not be fair to the judicial officers or helpful to the public to provide such unreliable data.

On the other hand, requiring too many responses before releasing data also has downsides. If the committee required one hundred responses before releasing survey results about an officer, there would be very few survey results to share.

The committee was required to find a middle ground balancing these and other factors. Note, however, that Table 1 shows the number of responding Participants for these judicial officers, the number of comments each judicial officer received, the number of attorneys who appeared before each judicial officer in the previous four years according to court records received, and the percentage of attorneys who appeared before the judicial officer who evaluated each judicial officer.

The number of responses per judicial officer ranged from a low of eight to a high of 209. Fifty-eight judicial officers were evaluated by at least twenty Participants, and twelve of those were evaluated by at least one hundred Participants. The average and median number of responses per judicial officer (among those with twenty or more responding Participants) were seventy-two and sixty-four, respectively. The mean number of attorneys who appeared between October 2019 and August 2023 was 659 with a low of ninety-two attorneys and a high of 1309 attorneys.

Table 1 identifies the judicial officers who received less than twenty evaluations with an asterisk (*). Their results are not included in the individual results (Tables 10-14) but are reflected in the aggregate results.

Table 1: Number of Evaluations and Attorneys Appearing

Name	Number of Evaluations	Attorneys Appearing Before	% Appearing Who Evaluated
Superior Court Judges			
Allred, Chad	84	661	12.71%
Amini, Susan	61	541	11.28%
Ballinger, Kristin	39	263	14.83%
Bender, Johanna	116	1084	10.70%
Berns, Elizabeth	59	553	10.67%
Campagna, Joe	25	217	11.52%
Chung, Samuel	115	1102	10.44%
Darvas, Andrea	76	757	10.04%
Donohue, Karen	40	427	9.37%
Ferguson, Marshall	75	730	10.27%
Flevaris, Taki	31	128	24.22%
Gaines-Phelps, Nicole	77	972	7.92%

Name	Number of Evaluations	Attorneys Appearing Before	% Appearing Who Evaluated
Superior Court Judges (cont)			
Galván, Veronica	77	649	11.86%
Hawk, Jaime	26	262	9.92%
Helson, Janet	121	1072	11.29%
Holloway, Jason	42	176	23.86%
Keenan, David	104	835	12.46%
Lapin, Matthew	63	463	13.61%
Larranaga, Mark*	8	92	8.70%
Lee, Nelson	41	591	6.94%
Madsen, Hillary	64	457	14.00%
McCoy, Adrienne	40	546	7.33%
McCullough, Leroy	71	707	10.04%
McDonald, Brian	51	966	5.28%
McHale, John	59	664	8.89%
McKee, Maureen	66	780	8.46%
Messitt, Annette	41	530	7.74%
O'Donnell, Sean	164	1309	12.53%
Oishi, Patrick	47	368	12.77%
Parisien, Suzanne	98	1084	9.04%
Port, Cindi	55	775	7.10%
Poydras, Jason	57	592	9.63%
Richardson, Kristin	64	1002	6.39%
Roberts, Mary	48	618	7.77%
Robertson, Andrea	44	503	8.75%
Rogers, Jim	65	572	11.36%
Rothrock, Averil	42	578	7.27%
Ryan, Michael	82	829	9.89%
Schubert, Ken	114	915	12.46%
Scott, Michael	100	1123	8.18%
Segal, Matthew	33	515	6.41%
Shah, Ketu	63	670	9.40%
Sutton, Aimee	64	786	8.14%
Thorp, Tanya	100	1003	9.97%
Vargas, Haydee	35	289	12.11%
Whedbee, David	92	807	11.40%
Widlan, Sandra	87	941	9.25%
Wiggs, Josephine	84	835	10.06%
Wilson, Coreen*	11	146	7.53%
Yip, Wyman	21	190	11.05%
Young, Melinda	52	837	6.21%

Name	Number of Evaluations	Attorneys Appearing Before	% Appearing Who Evaluated
Superior Court Commissioners			
Cary, Monica	50	N/A	N/A
Goheen, Lindsey	55	N/A	N/A
Hillman, Mark	161	N/A	N/A
Holman, Hollis	34	N/A	N/A
Judson, Henry	209	N/A	N/A
Lack, Jonathan	137	N/A	N/A
Laird, Jennie	92	N/A	N/A
Moore, Bradford	138	N/A	N/A
Perry, Jamie	49	N/A	N/A

*Excluded from individual analysis due to receiving fewer than twenty evaluations

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 judicial officer participate in the evaluation. Due to the imprecision of docket records, some attorneys who did not actually appear in court before a particular judicial officer received evaluation materials for that judicial officer. To guard against evaluations by attorneys who lacked firsthand knowledge, in the invitation to complete the survey, and in the survey itself, Participants were asked not to evaluate a judicial officer if they did not appear before them. Thus, only Participants who affirmed that they had appeared before a judicial officer during the four years prior to the evaluation were asked to participate in the evaluation. Additionally, Participants were asked to indicate the approximate number of times they had appeared before the judicial officer being evaluated during the prior four years. As can be seen in Table 2, 69.6% of responding Participants reported appearing before the judge multiple times during the evaluation period, and 80.3% of responding Participants reported appearing before the commissioner multiple times during the evaluation period.

Table 2: Number of Appearances

Superior Court Judges	Number	Percent
Once	837	25.4%
2-3 times	1178	35.8%
4-10 times	613	18.6%
More than 10 times	501	15.2%
Don't Remember	165	5.0%
Totals	**3294**	**100%**

Superior Court Commissioners	Number	Percent
Once	136	14.7%
2-3 times	302	32.6%
4-10 times	259	28.0%
More than 10 times	182	19.7%
Don't Remember	46	5.0%
Totals	**925**	**100%**

V. *Participant Characteristics*

The survey asked Participants to provide information about themselves and their practice. Characteristics of the Participants providing survey responses for each judicial officer are also included in the individual results reported for those judicial officers that follow. The characteristics, in aggregate, of the Participants who responded are listed in Tables 3-7.

Table 3: Primary Area of Practice

	Number	Percent
Criminal Law	165	15.5%
Domestic Relations / Family Law	201	18.9%
General Civil	449	42.2%
Government Practice	111	10.5%
Other	137	12.9%
Totals	**1063**	**100%**

Table 4: Years in Practice

	Number	Percent
1 to 2 years	26	2.4%
3 to 5 years	86	8.1%
6 to 10 years	166	15.6%
11 to 20 years	259	24.4%
More than 20 years	526	49.5%
Totals	**1063**	**100%**

Table 5: Size of Law Firm

	Number	Percent
Sole Practitioner	278	26.2%
2 to 5 Attorneys	234	22.1%
6 to 10 Attorneys	97	9.1%
11 to 20 Attorneys	107	10.1%
More than 20 Attorneys	345	32.5%
Totals	**1061**	**100%**

Table 6: Participant Racial/Ethnic Background[2]

	Number	Percent
African American / Black	32	2.9%
Asian / Pacific Islander	71	6.4%
Caucasian / White	785	70.7%
Native American / Alaska Native	13	1.2%
Hispanic / Latinx	39	3.5%
Multiracial / Biracial	28	2.5%
A Race or Ethnicity Not Listed Here	18	1.6%
Prefer Not to Answer	124	11.2%
Totals	**1110**	**100%**

---

[2] We are committed to continuing to improve our data, including racial, ethnic and community identity descriptors. We appreciate your feedback.

Table 7: Participant Gender

	Number	Percent
Cisgender Woman	436	41.3%
Cisgender Man	418	39.6%
Transgender Woman	3	0.3%
Transgender Man	3	0.3%
Non-Binary / Non-Conforming	4	0.4%
A Gender Not Listed Here	16	1.5%
Prefer Not to Answer	176	16.6%
Totals	**1056**	**100%**

VI. Summary of Results Aggregating All Judicial Officers

For each performance-related question, there were six possible responses: unacceptable (score=1), below expectations (score=2), acceptable (score=3), very good (score=4), excellent (score=5), and don't know (no score). The "don't know" responses were included in the overall number of responses but not included in the percentage breakdown of "unacceptable" to "excellent" responses.

When rating judges, more than three-quarters of the responses were "very good" or "excellent" for each of the five evaluation categories—80.80%, 75.58%, 79.02%, 80.40%, and 78.95% respectively. Overall, across all five evaluation categories, an average of 92.53% of responses were "acceptable" or above (see Table 8).

When rating court commissioners, more than three-quarters of the responses were either "very good" or "excellent" for each of the five evaluation categories—80.30%, 75.64%, 79.00%, 78.75%, and 78.75% respectively. Overall, across all five evaluation categories, an average of 91.91% of responses were "acceptable" or above (see Table 9).

Table 8: Aggregate Results for Superior Court Judges

Virtual Appearances	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Understands the issues before them to provide a clear ruling consistent with the facts and law	3006	2.9%	7.7%	14.7%	24.0%	50.7%
Treats all individuals equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic	2881	2.7%	4.2%	12.4%	18.1%	62.6%
Pays attention to the proceedings	3026	1.4%	2.7%	12.0%	20.3%	63.6%
Maintains control over the courtroom	2978	1.2%	3.1%	11.9%	22.4%	61.5%
Legal Decision Making	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Preparedness for court	3160	1.9%	4.5%	13.9%	23.9%	55.9%
Ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues	3142	3.3%	8.1%	13.7%	23.4%	51.4%
Ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure	3023	3.6%	6.4%	14.0%	22.2%	53.7%
Ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner	3141	3.4%	6.3%	15.2%	22.7%	52.4%
Ability to base their rulings on the facts and the law	3137	5.1%	7.8%	14.8%	20.9%	51.4%
Integrity and Impartiality	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Displays a neutral presence on the bench	3157	3.2%	6.5%	14.5%	20.5%	55.3%
Avoids impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	3110	2.6%	4.0%	14.1%	18.5%	60.8%
Treats all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	2841	3.1%	4.7%	11.7%	16.8%	63.8%
Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination	2450	3.6%	5.4%	12.2%	15.0%	63.9%
Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally competent and trauma-responsive manner	2142	3.1%	5.3%	11.1%	16.2%	64.3%
Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Treats people with courtesy and respect	3170	2.8%	4.9%	13.0%	20.2%	59.1%
Pays attention to the proceedings	3154	1.5%	2.8%	12.2%	20.6%	62.8%
Acts with patience and self-control	3145	2.8%	4.7%	13.3%	20.1%	59.10%
Uses clear and logical communication while in court	3148	2.0%	4.7%	13.6%	21.7%	58.0%
Administrative Skills	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Maintains control in the courtroom	3039	1.2%	2.4%	14.8%	23.5%	58.2%
Appropriately maintains case management and enforces court rules and deadlines	2991	2.5%	3.6%	16.2%	22.4%	55.2%
Is prompt and timely in making decisions and rulings	3078	2.2%	3.4%	16.4%	21.2%	56.7%
Uses the court's time efficiently	3062	1.5%	3.6%	16.3%	21.8%	56.8%

Table 9: Aggregate Results for Superior Court Commissioners

Virtual Appearances	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Understands the issues before them to provide a clear ruling consistent with the facts and law	903	3.7%	6.3%	13.4%	19.7%	56.9%
Treats all individuals equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic	854	3.5%	5.0%	11.2%	15.8%	64.4%
Pays attention to the proceedings	899	2.2%	3.1%	13.0%	18.7%	63.0%
Maintains control over the courtroom	892	1.1%	2.5%	13.7%	20.7%	62.0%
Legal Decision Making	**Responses**	**Unacceptable**	**Below Expectations**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Preparedness for court	911	2.6%	4.7%	15.6%	18.9%	58.2%
Ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues	909	3.6%	6.9%	13.2%	18.3%	58.0%
Ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure	905	3.1%	5.9%	15.9%	17.5%	57.7%
Ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner	909	3.3%	6.7%	14.1%	19.8%	56.1%
Ability to base their rulings on the facts and the law	913	4.6%	8.4%	13.3%	18.5%	55.2%
Integrity and Impartiality	**Responses**	**Unacceptable**	**Below Expectations**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Displays a neutral presence on the bench	909	4.5%	5.8%	14.6%	16.3%	58.7%
Avoids impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	888	3.0%	4.8%	14.4%	14.4%	63.3%
Treats all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	813	2.8%	4.8%	12.2%	15.0%	65.2%
Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination	707	3.8%	4.7%	11.5%	14.1%	65.9%
Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally competent and trauma-responsive manner	660	3.5%	3.0%	11.4%	14.8%	67.3%
Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication	**Responses**	**Unacceptable**	**Below Expectations**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Treats people with courtesy and respect	912	4.9%	6.5%	11.7%	16.6%	60.3%
Pays attention to the proceedings	907	2.1%	3.3%	12.0%	19.1%	63.5%
Acts with patience and self-control	909	4.3%	6.4%	13.0%	17.4%	59.0%
Uses clear and logical communication while in court	909	2.9%	5.5%	12.5%	17.5%	61.6%
Administrative Skills	**Responses**	**Unacceptable**	**Below Expectations**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Maintains control in the courtroom	894	0.9%	2.9%	15.9%	19.1%	61.2%
Appropriately maintains case management and enforces court rules and deadlines	888	3.2%	4.8%	14.8%	18.8%	58.4%
Is prompt and timely in making decisions and rulings	899	2.7%	2.9%	15.2%	18.4%	60.8%
Uses the court's time efficiently	895	3.1%	3.6%	15.0%	17.9%	60.4%

As noted above, composite indexes were also computed for the five areas of evaluation.

The average ratings received for each item and category are presented in Tables 10 and 11. While the results are similar to those presented in Tables 8 and 9, the average score

provides another method for members of the legal community and the public to evaluate a judicial officer's performance on the bench. In addition, note that the overall category 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
Virtual Appearances		**4.32**
Understands the issues before them to provide a clear ruling consistent with the facts and law	4.12	
Treats all individuals equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic	4.34	
Pays attention to the proceedings	4.42	
Maintained control over the courtroom	4.40	
Legal Decision Making		**4.15**
Preparedness for court	4.27	
Ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues	4.11	
Ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure	4.16	
Ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner	4.14	
Ability to base their rulings on the facts and the law	4.06	
Integrity and Impartiality		**4.29**
Displays a neutral presence on the bench	4.18	
Avoids impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	4.31	
Treats all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	4.34	
Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination	4.30	
Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally competent and trauma-responsive manner	4.33	
Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication		**4.31**
Treats people with courtesy and respect	4.28	
Pays attention to the proceedings	4.40	
Acts with patience and self-control	4.28	
Uses clear and logical communication while in court	4.29	
Administrative Skills		**4.29**
Maintains control in the courtroom	4.35	
Appropriately maintains case management and enforces court rules and deadlines	4.24	
Is prompt and timely in making decisions and rulings	4.27	
Uses the court's time efficiently	4.29	

Table 11: Aggregate Average Ratings for Superior Court Commissioners

	Item Average	Category Average
Virtual Appearances		**4.32**
Understands the issues before them to provide a clear ruling consistent with the facts and law	4.20	
Treats all individuals equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic	4.33	
Pays attention to the proceedings	4.37	
Maintained control over the courtroom	4.40	
Legal Decision Making		**4.19**
Preparedness for court	4.25	
Ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues	4.20	
Ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure	4.21	
Ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner	4.19	
Ability to base their rulings on the facts and the law	4.11	
Integrity and Impartiality		**4.31**
Displays a neutral presence on the bench	4.19	
Avoids impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	4.30	
Treats all individuals equally and without bias based on race, gender, economic status, or any other extralegal personal characteristic	4.35	
Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination	4.34	
Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally competent and trauma-responsive manner	4.39	
Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication		**4.27**
Treats people with courtesy and respect	4.21	
Pays attention to the proceedings	4.39	
Acts with patience and self-control	4.20	
Uses clear and logical communication while in court	4.29	
Administrative Skills		**4.31**
Maintains control in the courtroom	4.37	
Appropriately maintains case management and enforces court rules and deadlines	4.25	
Is prompt and timely in making decisions and rulings	4.32	
Uses the court's time efficiently	4.29	

VII. Summary of Results for Individual Judicial Officers

Tables 12-16, which appear on the following pages, present summaries of the results for the judicial officers in King County Superior Court who were evaluated by twenty or more Participants. Each table provides results for one of the five areas surveyed (Virtual Appearances; Legal Decision Making; Integrity and Impartiality; Demeanor, Temperament,

and Communication; and Administrative Skills), including the number of valid evaluations received for each judicial officer and the percentage of responses to individual questions that gave the judicial officer 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 judicial officers are listed in alphabetical order. As described above, the ratings for individual judicial officers are one possible indicator of performance. But the survey results are not intended to be treated like scientific data or rankings, nor do they permit comparisons between judicial officers, who may have had many circumstances, not controlled by the survey, that would impact ratings. Given the lack of scientific rigor, slight differences between numbers should not be taken as statistically significant differences. Rather, all numbers must be viewed holistically and with a full understanding of the methods that have been employed.

In addition to the following tables, Appendix C provides complete, detailed survey results for each of the individual judicial officers who were evaluated by 20 or more Participants in the judicial performance survey. The detailed report for each individual judicial officer provides results for individual questions as well as categorical averages. The reports also provide information summarizing the characteristics of the Participants who responded to the survey for that individual judicial officer.

Table 12: Results for Individual Judicial Officers – Virtual Appearances

In the area **Virtual Appearances**, survey participants were asked to rate judicial officers using each of the following four criteria:

- Understands the issues before them to provide a clear ruling consistent with the facts and law
- Treats all individuals equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic
- Pays attention to the proceedings
- Maintains control over the courtroom

RATING SCALE: Unacceptable (1); Below Expectations (2); Acceptable (3); Very Good (4); Excellent (5)

Table 12: Virtual Appearances	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges							
Allred, Chad	282	0.70%	3.50%	9.90%	19.90%	66.00%	4.47
Amini, Susan	235	3.40%	11.10%	17.90%	19.60%	48.10%	3.98
Ballinger, Kristin	156	3.80%	11.50%	8.30%	22.40%	53.80%	4.11

Table 12: Virtual Appearances	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges (cont)							
Bender, Johanna	432	0.70%	3.50%	14.80%	25.90%	55.10%	4.31
Berns, Elizabeth	195	5.10%	2.60%	14.40%	14.90%	63.10%	4.28
Campagna, Joe	90	0.00%	1.10%	13.30%	23.30%	62.20%	4.47
Chung, Samuel	410	5.60%	6.80%	18.50%	21.70%	47.30%	3.98
Darvas, Andrea	298	0.30%	3.00%	13.40%	25.50%	57.70%	4.37
Donohue, Karen	147	2.70%	6.80%	12.90%	32.70%	44.90%	4.10
Ferguson, Marshall	260	1.20%	3.50%	6.90%	18.10%	70.40%	4.53
Flevaris, Taki	121	3.30%	3.30%	15.70%	23.10%	54.50%	4.22
Gaines-Phelps, Nicole	273	2.60%	4.00%	13.90%	22.70%	56.80%	4.27
Galván, Veronica	285	4.90%	2.50%	15.40%	16.50%	60.70%	4.26
Hawk, Jaime	99	4.00%	5.10%	16.20%	18.20%	56.60%	4.18
Helson, Janet	448	1.60%	2.50%	8.50%	24.60%	62.90%	4.45
Holloway, Jason	159	4.40%	13.20%	11.30%	20.80%	50.30%	3.99
Keenan, David	396	2.50%	5.10%	7.60%	20.50%	64.40%	4.39
Lapin, Matthew	236	0.40%	2.10%	7.20%	21.20%	69.10%	4.56
Lee, Nelson	150	0.70%	0.70%	11.30%	14.00%	73.30%	4.59
Madsen, Hillary	235	4.70%	7.70%	14.90%	13.60%	59.10%	4.15
McCoy, Adrienne	133	2.30%	4.50%	20.30%	22.60%	50.40%	4.14
McCullough, Leroy	258	0.80%	3.10%	6.60%	24.80%	64.70%	4.50
McDonald, Brian	162	0.00%	2.50%	10.50%	26.50%	60.50%	4.45
McHale, John	213	0.90%	2.30%	11.30%	18.30%	67.10%	4.48
McKee, Maureen	238	5.00%	1.30%	8.40%	16.80%	68.50%	4.42
Messitt, Annette	141	0.00%	2.80%	18.40%	27.70%	51.10%	4.27
O'Donnell, Sean	603	0.20%	1.70%	10.60%	23.70%	63.80%	4.49
Oishi, Patrick	164	2.40%	4.30%	10.40%	22.60%	60.40%	4.34
Parisien, Suzanne	364	4.40%	9.60%	18.10%	21.20%	46.70%	3.96
Port, Cindi	199	6.00%	7.50%	11.10%	21.60%	53.80%	4.10
Poydras, Jason	206	0.50%	3.40%	14.60%	19.90%	61.70%	4.39
Richardson, Kristin	213	0.00%	7.00%	16.00%	26.30%	50.70%	4.21
Roberts, Mary	156	1.30%	0.60%	13.50%	17.90%	66.70%	4.48
Robertson, Andrea	152	0.70%	5.90%	11.20%	13.20%	69.10%	4.44
Rogers, Jim	243	1.20%	5.30%	12.80%	18.10%	62.60%	4.35
Rothrock, Averil	127	0.00%	2.40%	10.20%	19.70%	67.70%	4.53
Ryan, Michael	298	1.70%	1.30%	7.70%	23.50%	65.80%	4.50
Schubert, Ken	414	2.20%	5.30%	12.80%	26.10%	53.60%	4.24
Scott, Michael	350	1.10%	4.30%	18.30%	21.70%	54.60%	4.24
Segal, Matthew	122	0.80%	3.30%	10.70%	21.30%	63.90%	4.44
Shah, Ketu	229	1.70%	2.60%	20.10%	24.00%	51.50%	4.21

Table 12: Virtual Appearances	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Sutton, Aimee	231	0.00%	3.50%	9.10%	26.00%	61.50%	4.45
Thorp, Tanya	375	5.10%	5.30%	16.50%	20.00%	53.10%	4.11
Vargas, Haydee	138	0.00%	1.40%	13.00%	15.20%	70.30%	4.54
Whedbee, David	342	1.80%	5.80%	8.80%	16.70%	67.00%	4.41
Widlan, Sandra	305	0.30%	5.60%	16.40%	23.30%	54.40%	4.26
Wiggs, Josephine	305	1.30%	7.50%	13.10%	12.80%	65.20%	4.33
Yip, Wyman	78	0.00%	2.60%	9.00%	11.50%	76.90%	4.63
Young, Melinda	165	0.60%	1.80%	15.80%	20.60%	61.20%	4.40
Superior Court Commissioners							
Cary, Monica	197	1.5%	3.0%	15.7%	23.4%	56.3%	4.30
Goheen, Lindsey	217	1.8%	3.2%	19.8%	22.1%	53.0%	4.21
Hillman, Mark	612	3.6%	7.5%	17.5%	19.9%	51.5%	4.08
Holman, Hollis	132	0.0%	3.8%	13.6%	25.0%	57.6%	4.36
Judson, Henry	797	1.4%	2.0%	6.5%	17.6%	72.5%	4.58
Lack, Jonathan	517	7.7%	9.9%	21.9%	18.0%	42.6%	3.78
Laird, Jennie	358	1.4%	2.0%	5.3%	14.8%	76.5%	4.63
Moore, Bradford	531	1.3%	1.9%	9.8%	12.6%	74.4%	4.57
Perry, Jamie	187	0.5%	1.1%	11.2%	34.2%	52.9%	4.38

Table 13: Results for Individual Judicial Officers – Legal Decision Making

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

- Preparedness for court
- Ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues
- Ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure
- Ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner
- Ability to base their rulings on the facts and the law

RATING SCALE: Unacceptable (1); Below Expectations (2); Acceptable (3); Very Good (4); Excellent (5)

Table 13: Legal Decision Making	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges							
Allred, Chad	317	3.80%	7.30%	11.70%	28.10%	49.20%	4.10
Amini, Susan	231	9.50%	13.90%	19.50%	22.10%	35.10%	3.57
Ballinger, Kristin	144	2.10%	10.40%	10.40%	18.80%	58.30%	4.12
Bender, Johanna	450	0.00%	4.70%	21.10%	25.30%	48.90%	4.14
Berns, Elizabeth	220	4.10%	4.50%	17.30%	25.90%	48.20%	4.06
Campagna, Joe	94	0.00%	1.10%	10.60%	36.20%	52.10%	4.38
Chung, Samuel	431	7.40%	10.00%	26.70%	19.00%	36.90%	3.67
Darvas, Andrea	289	1.00%	4.20%	14.50%	24.90%	55.40%	4.27
Donohue, Karen	149	3.40%	9.40%	16.80%	29.50%	40.90%	3.92
Ferguson, Marshall	285	2.50%	3.90%	8.40%	18.90%	66.30%	4.41
Flevaris, Taki	118	2.50%	6.80%	17.80%	18.60%	54.20%	4.13
Gaines-Phelps, Nicole	285	6.00%	8.40%	17.20%	20.00%	48.40%	3.94
Galván, Veronica	290	7.20%	7.90%	14.80%	18.30%	51.70%	3.97
Hawk, Jaime	100	6.00%	10.00%	16.00%	24.00%	44.00%	3.88
Helson, Janet	469	2.10%	1.50%	8.50%	24.30%	63.50%	4.45
Holloway, Jason	156	5.10%	16.70%	10.90%	17.30%	50.00%	3.88
Keenan, David	412	2.40%	5.30%	11.90%	23.30%	57.00%	4.24
Lapin, Matthew	240	2.10%	0.40%	8.30%	22.50%	66.70%	4.51
Lee, Nelson	153	0.00%	0.00%	9.80%	20.90%	69.30%	4.58
Madsen, Hillary	240	7.90%	13.30%	10.00%	15.00%	53.80%	3.90
McCoy, Adrienne	142	2.10%	7.00%	25.40%	28.20%	37.30%	3.89
McCullough, Leroy	276	1.80%	5.10%	13.40%	24.30%	55.40%	4.27
McDonald, Brian	181	0.00%	2.20%	11.60%	28.70%	57.50%	4.39
McHale, John	234	3.80%	2.60%	13.70%	20.90%	59.00%	4.26
McKee, Maureen	251	6.00%	2.40%	10.00%	22.30%	59.40%	4.29
Messitt, Annette	150	3.30%	4.70%	22.70%	26.00%	43.30%	3.98
O'Donnell, Sean	615	0.70%	2.10%	14.30%	25.00%	57.90%	4.36
Oishi, Patrick	180	5.00%	5.60%	12.80%	23.30%	53.30%	4.13
Parisien, Suzanne	371	7.50%	12.70%	18.10%	21.60%	40.20%	3.70
Port, Cindi	212	4.70%	7.10%	14.60%	17.50%	56.10%	4.10
Poydras, Jason	204	0.50%	8.30%	14.20%	16.70%	60.30%	4.27
Richardson, Kristin	235	1.30%	10.60%	18.70%	28.90%	40.40%	3.94
Roberts, Mary	171	1.20%	0.60%	13.50%	21.60%	63.20%	4.44
Robertson, Andrea	162	0.60%	8.60%	7.40%	18.50%	64.80%	4.34
Rogers, Jim	254	2.00%	8.30%	11.40%	19.30%	59.10%	4.20
Rothrock, Averil	148	0.70%	2.00%	7.40%	19.60%	70.30%	4.55
Ryan, Michael	309	1.60%	2.60%	8.10%	27.20%	60.50%	4.41

Table 13: Legal Decision Making	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges (cont)							
Schubert, Ken	432	3.00%	7.20%	11.30%	30.30%	48.10%	4.11
Scott, Michael	383	2.60%	10.70%	17.80%	21.90%	47.00%	3.97
Segal, Matthew	125	2.40%	5.60%	10.40%	17.60%	64.00%	4.32
Shah, Ketu	239	3.80%	7.50%	17.20%	32.20%	39.30%	3.94
Sutton, Aimee	243	0.00%	4.50%	9.50%	27.20%	58.80%	4.39
Thorp, Tanya	388	5.70%	7.20%	15.20%	22.40%	49.50%	4.00
Vargas, Haydee	139	0.00%	5.00%	10.10%	19.40%	65.50%	4.42
Whedbee, David	358	1.10%	6.70%	6.70%	20.90%	64.50%	4.38
Widlan, Sandra	330	1.80%	7.00%	19.10%	23.00%	49.10%	4.09
Wiggs, Josephine	327	2.40%	10.40%	18.70%	24.20%	44.30%	3.93
Yip, Wyman	75	0.00%	9.30%	12.00%	8.00%	70.70%	4.38
Young, Melinda	191	1.00%	1.60%	19.40%	17.30%	60.70%	4.34
Superior Court Commissioners							
Cary, Monica	199	0.50%	5.50%	17.10%	24.60%	52.30%	4.21
Goheen, Lindsey	220	1.80%	7.70%	21.80%	22.30%	46.40%	4.01
Hillman, Mark	632	4.30%	10.80%	19.10%	17.70%	48.10%	3.92
Holman, Hollis	132	0.00%	6.80%	15.90%	18.20%	59.10%	4.28
Judson, Henry	826	1.90%	2.50%	8.10%	18.80%	68.60%	4.48
Lack, Jonathan	535	8.20%	12.50%	24.30%	18.10%	36.80%	3.60
Laird, Jennie	356	1.70%	2.50%	5.90%	12.60%	77.20%	4.60
Moore, Bradford	542	2.60%	2.20%	11.40%	13.70%	70.10%	4.45
Perry, Jamie	192	1.6%	3.1%	15.6%	37.0%	42.7%	4.14

Table 14: Results for Individual Judicial Officers – Integrity and Impartiality

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

- Displays a neutral presence on the bench
- Avoids impropriety and the appearance of impropriety
- Treats all people equally without bias based on race, gender, or any other extralegal personal characteristic
- Displays sensitivity towards the individuals before them who are members of communities that have historically faced discrimination

- Improves access to justice and works to eliminate bias within their courtroom for persons of all backgrounds and life experiences in a culturally competent and trauma-responsive manner (e.g., utilizing remote appearances, flexibility on hearing times, identifying and resolving language and communication barriers, providing resources for obtaining legal help, accommodating participants with physical or cognitive disabilities)

RATING SCALE: Unacceptable (1); Below Expectations (2); Acceptable (3); Very Good (4); Excellent (5)

Table 14: Integrity & Impartiality	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges							
Allred, Chad	280	1.10%	5.40%	17.50%	21.40%	54.60%	4.17
Amini, Susan	209	2.90%	3.30%	18.70%	23.40%	51.70%	4.18
Ballinger, Kristin	148	9.50%	15.50%	8.10%	14.20%	52.70%	3.83
Bender, Johanna	419	3.80%	7.60%	18.90%	21.20%	48.40%	4.05
Berns, Elizabeth	217	4.60%	7.80%	13.40%	17.50%	56.70%	4.10
Campagna, Joe	81	1.20%	2.50%	9.90%	22.20%	64.20%	4.47
Chung, Samuel	403	5.50%	4.00%	21.80%	13.40%	55.30%	4.12
Darvas, Andrea	274	0.40%	5.10%	12.80%	20.40%	61.30%	4.41
Donohue, Karen	143	4.90%	6.30%	18.90%	23.10%	46.90%	4.00
Ferguson, Marshall	271	1.80%	4.10%	7.00%	10.30%	76.80%	4.55
Flevaris, Taki	109	2.80%	0.90%	12.80%	21.10%	62.40%	4.37
Gaines-Phelps, Nicole	266	3.00%	2.60%	9.00%	19.50%	65.80%	4.46
Galván, Veronica	274	5.10%	3.30%	17.50%	16.80%	57.30%	4.22
Hawk, Jaime	90	2.20%	2.20%	12.20%	12.20%	71.10%	4.46
Helson, Janet	425	1.40%	3.80%	12.00%	16.50%	66.40%	4.41
Holloway, Jason	148	6.80%	10.10%	17.60%	10.10%	55.40%	3.99
Keenan, David	385	5.70%	3.60%	9.90%	16.10%	64.70%	4.31
Lapin, Matthew	219	0.50%	2.30%	12.30%	13.70%	71.20%	4.54
Lee, Nelson	155	2.60%	3.90%	3.20%	9.70%	80.60%	4.60
Madsen, Hillary	221	8.60%	5.40%	11.30%	10.90%	63.80%	4.18
McCoy, Adrienne	129	2.30%	16.30%	17.10%	14.00%	50.40%	3.97
McCullough, Leroy	262	0.00%	3.10%	8.80%	23.30%	64.90%	4.49
McDonald, Brian	162	0.00%	3.10%	11.70%	19.80%	65.40%	4.46
McHale, John	211	0.00%	4.70%	14.20%	18.50%	62.60%	4.39
McKee, Maureen	245	4.90%	0.40%	5.70%	13.50%	75.50%	4.56
Messitt, Annette	144	0.00%	10.40%	16.70%	18.80%	54.20%	4.15
O'Donnell, Sean	570	0.90%	1.80%	12.60%	21.80%	63.00%	4.46
Oishi, Patrick	169	3.60%	5.90%	12.40%	20.70%	57.40%	4.23
Parisien, Suzanne	326	8.90%	10.70%	15.30%	16.90%	48.20%	3.87
Port, Cindi	207	7.70%	8.20%	14.00%	16.90%	53.10%	3.97
Poydras, Jason	193	0.00%	2.60%	9.30%	15.50%	72.50%	4.57
Richardson, Kristin	208	2.90%	9.60%	16.30%	21.60%	49.50%	4.05

Table 14: Integrity & Impartiality	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges (cont)							
Roberts, Mary	166	0.00%	2.40%	14.50%	19.30%	63.90%	4.45
Robertson, Andrea	154	1.90%	6.50%	9.70%	15.60%	66.20%	4.38
Rogers, Jim	229	0.40%	9.60%	8.70%	14.80%	66.40%	4.37
Rothrock, Averil	144	0.00%	0.00%	9.00%	16.00%	75.00%	4.67
Ryan, Michael	297	4.40%	4.70%	7.10%	22.20%	61.60%	4.34
Schubert, Ken	379	6.10%	6.30%	14.80%	25.30%	47.50%	4.02
Scott, Michael	344	2.60%	7.30%	17.40%	21.50%	51.20%	4.11
Segal, Matthew	106	0.00%	1.90%	15.10%	14.20%	68.90%	4.50
Shah, Ketu	226	4.00%	7.10%	17.70%	17.30%	54.00%	4.08
Sutton, Aimee	218	0.00%	0.90%	7.80%	22.50%	68.80%	4.60
Thorp, Tanya	342	7.60%	5.00%	20.80%	15.80%	50.90%	4.03
Vargas, Haydee	132	0.00%	2.30%	14.40%	19.70%	63.60%	4.48
Whedbee, David	332	2.40%	6.00%	6.30%	17.80%	67.50%	4.46
Widlan, Sandra	302	1.00%	3.30%	18.50%	15.90%	61.30%	4.34
Wiggs, Josephine	307	2.00%	7.50%	12.10%	13.70%	64.80%	4.36
Yip, Wyman	68	0.00%	1.50%	1.50%	10.30%	86.80%	4.83
Young, Melinda	174	1.10%	6.90%	14.90%	14.90%	62.10%	4.33
Superior Court Commissioners							
Cary, Monica	182	2.70%	2.70%	9.90%	21.40%	63.20%	4.39
Goheen, Lindsey	211	0.50%	4.30%	20.40%	15.20%	59.70%	4.33
Hillman, Mark	564	6.20%	11.30%	17.60%	14.70%	50.20%	3.93
Holman, Hollis	128	0.00%	7.80%	24.20%	14.80%	53.10%	4.15
Judson, Henry	748	1.60%	0.90%	8.20%	14.60%	74.70%	4.61
Lack, Jonathan	484	10.10%	9.50%	22.90%	14.70%	42.80%	3.75
Laird, Jennie	341	1.80%	3.80%	5.60%	13.80%	75.10%	4.57
Moore, Bradford	486	2.10%	2.70%	8.40%	9.50%	77.40%	4.58
Perry, Jamie	173	0.00%	0.60%	10.40%	30.10%	59.00%	4.48

Table 15: Results for Individual Judicial Officers for Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication

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

- Treats people with courtesy and respect
- Pays attention to the proceedings
- Acts with patience and self-control
- Uses clear and logical communication while in court

RATING SCALE: Unacceptable (1); Below Expectations (2); Acceptable (3); Very Good (4); Excellent (5)

Table 15: Demeanor, Temperament, & Communication	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges							
Allred, Chad	308	1.00%	1.30%	13.30%	27.30%	57.10%	4.38
Amini, Susan	225	3.60%	7.60%	14.70%	26.20%	48.00%	4.08
Ballinger, Kristin	148	2.00%	10.10%	17.60%	19.60%	50.70%	4.07
Bender, Johanna	441	2.30%	8.40%	15.90%	21.30%	52.20%	4.13
Berns, Elizabeth	227	2.20%	5.30%	13.70%	21.10%	57.70%	4.27
Campagna, Joe	96	0.00%	0.00%	14.60%	25.00%	60.40%	4.46
Chung, Samuel	433	4.40%	6.90%	16.90%	21.50%	50.30%	4.06
Darvas, Andrea	287	0.70%	2.40%	10.50%	21.60%	64.80%	4.47
Donohue, Karen	153	2.00%	5.20%	19.60%	23.50%	49.70%	4.14
Ferguson, Marshall	280	2.10%	1.80%	5.70%	16.40%	73.90%	4.58
Flevaris, Taki	120	0.80%	4.20%	18.30%	20.80%	55.80%	4.27
Gaines-Phelps, Nicole	296	2.00%	5.40%	15.50%	20.30%	56.80%	4.24
Galván, Veronica	292	3.80%	8.60%	19.90%	19.20%	48.60%	4.00
Hawk, Jaime	99	3.00%	1.00%	17.20%	19.20%	59.60%	4.31
Helson, Janet	464	1.30%	1.10%	12.10%	19.20%	66.40%	4.48
Holloway, Jason	160	5.00%	9.40%	15.60%	18.10%	51.90%	4.03
Keenan, David	411	2.70%	4.40%	10.90%	18.20%	63.70%	4.36
Lapin, Matthew	243	0.00%	1.20%	9.50%	12.80%	76.50%	4.65
Lee, Nelson	156	0.60%	0.60%	3.20%	16.70%	78.80%	4.72
Madsen, Hillary	251	3.60%	6.40%	17.10%	6.80%	66.10%	4.25
McCoy, Adrienne	152	1.30%	6.60%	22.40%	25.00%	44.70%	4.05
McCullough, Leroy	280	1.10%	3.60%	7.10%	26.10%	62.10%	4.45
McDonald, Brian	189	0.00%	0.50%	9.00%	25.90%	64.60%	4.54
McHale, John	235	0.40%	0.90%	12.80%	19.10%	66.80%	4.51
McKee, Maureen	257	4.30%	1.20%	5.10%	18.30%	71.20%	4.51
Messitt, Annette	154	0.00%	1.30%	21.40%	22.70%	54.50%	4.31
O'Donnell, Sean	624	0.30%	2.10%	9.60%	20.50%	67.50%	4.53
Oishi, Patrick	180	3.90%	5.00%	11.70%	23.30%	56.10%	4.23
Parisien, Suzanne	366	7.70%	10.10%	20.50%	16.70%	45.10%	3.81
Port, Cindi	216	4.60%	7.40%	15.30%	16.20%	56.50%	4.12
Poydras, Jason	219	0.00%	1.80%	10.00%	20.50%	67.60%	4.54
Richardson, Kristin	228	2.20%	8.80%	14.00%	25.40%	49.60%	4.11
Roberts, Mary	180	1.10%	0.60%	13.90%	20.00%	64.40%	4.46
Robertson, Andrea	164	0.60%	5.50%	11.00%	17.70%	65.20%	4.41
Rogers, Jim	255	0.40%	4.70%	12.50%	13.70%	68.60%	4.45
Rothrock, Averil	156	0.60%	0.00%	7.10%	16.00%	76.30%	4.67

Table 15: Demeanor, Temperament, & Communication	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges (cont)							
Ryan, Michael	324	6.20%	1.90%	8.00%	22.80%	61.10%	4.31
Schubert, Ken	437	4.80%	6.20%	14.00%	27.90%	47.10%	4.06
Scott, Michael	388	1.80%	5.70%	18.80%	23.20%	50.50%	4.15
Segal, Matthew	122	0.80%	2.50%	15.60%	18.00%	63.10%	4.40
Shah, Ketu	247	3.60%	4.50%	17.40%	21.90%	52.60%	4.15
Sutton, Aimee	247	0.00%	0.40%	6.90%	26.30%	66.40%	4.59
Thorp, Tanya	385	6.50%	9.60%	14.30%	22.10%	47.50%	3.95
Vargas, Haydee	140	0.00%	2.10%	9.30%	17.10%	71.40%	4.58
Whedbee, David	360	1.10%	3.30%	7.80%	20.60%	67.20%	4.49
Widlan, Sandra	336	0.30%	1.50%	15.50%	22.30%	60.40%	4.41
Wiggs, Josephine	335	1.20%	7.20%	14.00%	19.40%	58.20%	4.26
Yip, Wyman	79	0.00%	0.00%	6.30%	19.00%	74.70%	4.68
Young, Melinda	196	0.00%	1.00%	11.70%	21.90%	65.30%	4.52
Superior Court Commissioners							
Cary, Monica	196	2.00%	3.60%	11.70%	27.00%	55.60%	4.31
Goheen, Lindsey	220	1.40%	1.80%	17.30%	21.40%	58.20%	4.33
Hillman, Mark	627	5.70%	12.40%	20.30%	17.50%	44.00%	3.82
Holman, Hollis	131	3.10%	3.80%	22.90%	18.30%	51.90%	4.12
Judson, Henry	824	1.20%	1.20%	5.80%	17.10%	74.60%	4.63
Lack, Jonathan	535	11.60%	13.60%	18.10%	15.30%	41.30%	3.61
Laird, Jennie	364	1.10%	2.50%	4.70%	18.10%	73.60%	4.61
Moore, Bradford	548	1.10%	1.80%	8.90%	11.50%	76.60%	4.61
Perry, Jamie	192	0.00%	0.50%	9.90%	28.60%	60.90%	4.50

Table 16: Results for Individual Judicial Officers – Administrative Skills

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

- Maintains control over the courtroom
- Appropriately maintains case management and enforces court rules and deadlines
- Is prompt and timely in making decisions and rulings
- Uses the court's time efficiently

RATING SCALE: Unacceptable (1); Below Expectations (2); Acceptable (3); Very Good (4); Excellent (5)

Table 16: Administrative Skills	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges							
Allred, Chad	304	0.30%	1.30%	14.80%	34.50%	49.00%	4.31
Amini, Susan	216	8.80%	4.60%	29.60%	21.80%	35.20%	3.70
Ballinger, Kristin	142	0.00%	4.20%	17.60%	23.20%	54.90%	4.29
Bender, Johanna	415	0.70%	3.60%	18.80%	24.80%	52.00%	4.24
Berns, Elizabeth	215	1.90%	0.00%	18.10%	28.40%	51.60%	4.28
Campagna, Joe	89	0.00%	0.00%	13.50%	27.00%	59.60%	4.46
Chung, Samuel	417	4.30%	6.00%	23.30%	22.30%	44.10%	3.96
Darvas, Andrea	275	0.40%	4.00%	13.50%	25.80%	56.40%	4.34
Donohue, Karen	151	0.00%	3.30%	16.60%	29.80%	50.30%	4.27
Ferguson, Marshall	278	1.10%	0.70%	14.40%	18.00%	65.80%	4.47
Flevaris, Taki	117	4.30%	9.40%	19.70%	17.90%	48.70%	3.97
Gaines-Phelps, Nicole	282	1.40%	4.30%	18.10%	22.70%	53.50%	4.23
Galván, Veronica	275	2.90%	4.00%	14.50%	20.40%	58.20%	4.27
Hawk, Jaime	98	3.10%	3.10%	21.40%	19.40%	53.10%	4.16
Helson, Janet	447	1.30%	3.80%	16.60%	17.20%	61.10%	4.33
Holloway, Jason	155	2.60%	9.70%	18.70%	18.10%	51.00%	4.05
Keenan, David	405	1.20%	0.70%	13.60%	18.50%	65.90%	4.47
Lapin, Matthew	241	0.80%	0.80%	10.00%	14.50%	73.90%	4.60
Lee, Nelson	153	0.00%	0.00%	17.00%	15.00%	68.00%	4.51
Madsen, Hillary	240	3.80%	8.70%	18.30%	12.50%	56.70%	4.10
McCoy, Adrienne	142	0.00%	4.90%	26.10%	23.20%	45.80%	4.10
McCullough, Leroy	271	5.20%	6.60%	10.00%	27.30%	50.90%	4.12
McDonald, Brian	167	1.20%	3.00%	9.00%	18.00%	68.90%	4.50
McHale, John	226	0.00%	2.20%	15.00%	28.30%	54.40%	4.35
McKee, Maureen	242	4.50%	2.10%	10.30%	19.80%	63.20%	4.35
Messitt, Annette	153	0.70%	2.00%	22.20%	26.10%	49.00%	4.21
O'Donnell, Sean	611	0.20%	1.10%	11.80%	21.10%	65.80%	4.51
Oishi, Patrick	176	0.60%	3.40%	15.30%	18.80%	61.90%	4.38
Parisien, Suzanne	348	6.00%	4.60%	21.60%	20.10%	47.70%	3.99
Port, Cindi	209	3.30%	1.40%	22.50%	24.90%	47.80%	4.12
Poydras, Jason	208	4.30%	7.70%	18.30%	14.90%	54.80%	4.08
Richardson, Kristin	228	0.40%	4.40%	22.80%	26.30%	46.10%	4.13
Roberts, Mary	172	2.90%	2.30%	12.20%	22.70%	59.90%	4.34
Robertson, Andrea	159	0.00%	9.40%	10.10%	14.50%	66.00%	4.37
Rogers, Jim	240	0.00%	4.60%	15.80%	20.80%	58.80%	4.34
Rothrock, Averil	146	0.00%	1.40%	5.50%	24.00%	69.20%	4.61
Ryan, Michael	305	0.30%	0.70%	6.60%	28.50%	63.90%	4.55

Table 16: Administrative Skills	Responses	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent	Average (1-5 scale)
Superior Court Judges (cont)							
Schubert, Ken	408	1.50%	2.90%	14.70%	29.70%	51.20%	4.26
Scott, Michael	376	0.00%	0.50%	20.20%	24.50%	54.80%	4.34
Segal, Matthew	121	0.80%	3.30%	16.50%	17.40%	62.00%	4.36
Shah, Ketu	240	4.60%	2.90%	20.00%	23.30%	49.20%	4.10
Sutton, Aimee	244	1.20%	1.60%	7.40%	24.60%	65.20%	4.51
Thorp, Tanya	372	4.00%	2.40%	19.40%	20.40%	53.80%	4.17
Vargas, Haydee	140	0.00%	0.70%	7.90%	22.90%	68.60%	4.59
Whedbee, David	357	1.10%	2.20%	9.20%	24.10%	63.30%	4.46
Widlan, Sandra	325	0.60%	2.20%	18.50%	21.20%	57.50%	4.33
Wiggs, Josephine	326	4.60%	9.20%	19.00%	20.20%	46.90%	3.96
Yip, Wyman	78	0.00%	2.60%	5.10%	17.90%	74.40%	4.64
Young, Melinda	192	0.00%	0.00%	18.20%	20.30%	61.50%	4.43
Superior Court Commissioners							
Cary, Monica	190	0.00%	2.60%	16.30%	24.20%	56.80%	4.35
Goheen, Lindsey	219	1.80%	1.40%	26.50%	21.50%	48.90%	4.14
Hillman, Mark	618	3.60%	3.10%	20.90%	18.60%	53.90%	4.16
Holman, Hollis	131	0.00%	0.80%	23.70%	15.30%	60.30%	4.35
Judson, Henry	817	1.80%	2.70%	7.00%	19.50%	69.00%	4.51
Lack, Jonathan	522	7.30%	9.40%	22.40%	17.00%	43.90%	3.81
Laird, Jennie	355	0.60%	3.40%	10.40%	15.20%	70.40%	4.52
Moore, Bradford	532	1.30%	2.40%	11.70%	13.70%	70.90%	4.50
Perry, Jamie	192	0.00%	1.60%	11.50%	31.20%	55.70%	4.41

VIII. Comments

The 2023-2024 Judicial Officer Survey allowed Participants an opportunity to include written comments with their responses. Participants provided 962 such comments. These comments provide attorneys with the opportunity to list specific feedback to a judicial officer. More importantly, whether the feedback is positive or negative, such information may be helpful to each judicial officer as they review their evaluations and potential areas for growth. The KCBA shares these written comments with only the individual judicial officer and does not release these comments publicly.

IX. Conclusion

The results of the 2023-2024 Judicial Officer Survey present a qualitative assessment of the judicial officers in King County Superior Court.