

10-1-2001

Evaluating the Judges in Baton Rouge

Susan E. Howell
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uno.edu/src_pubs



Part of the [Judges Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Howell, Susan E., "Evaluating the Judges in Baton Rouge" (2001). *Survey Research Center Publications*. Paper 20.
http://scholarworks.uno.edu/src_pubs/20

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Survey Research Center (UNO Poll) at ScholarWorks@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Survey Research Center Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

Evaluating the Judges in Baton Rouge

Confidential Report to
The Baton Rouge Bar Association
from
University of New Orleans
Survey Research Center

October 31, 2001

Dr. Susan E. Howell, Director
Research Assistants:
Monica T. Farris
Manabu Saeki
Matthew Vile

Purpose

- The Baton Rouge Bar Association seeks to provide the public, lawyers, and the judges with some sort of evaluation of the judges in the Baton Rouge area. Since it is difficult for the public to obtain information on judges, the Bar Association relied on its own members and the members of the Louis Martinet Society to evaluate all judges, including city, state, and federal courts.
- Hopefully, the results will be useful to the public, the lawyers, and especially to the judges. Most judges can take satisfaction in the high regard with which they are held by the hundreds of lawyers who responded to the survey. A few will see areas where they might choose to improve.
- The Bar Association recognizes that there are differing opinions as to what constitutes a “good” judge. Therefore the lawyers were asked to rate the judges on twenty-seven specific characteristics that are grouped into five general areas: judicial temperament, integrity, impartiality, professional competence, and work ethic.
- For each of the twenty-seven characteristics, the judges are categorized into four “tiers”. Tier I are the judges who were rated positively by 85% or more of the lawyers. Tier II are judges who were rated positively by 70-84% of the lawyers. Tier III are judges who were rated positively by 55-69%, and Tier IV are judges who were rated positively by less than 55% of the lawyers. These fifteen–point intervals were created to provide a rough categorization scheme. You will notice that judges at the top of Tier III, for example, are not very differently evaluated than judges at the bottom of Tier II.
- Any judge that appears consistently in Tiers I or II is evaluated **very positively** by the lawyers.
- If you are interested in the full range of responses for any particular judge or characteristic, please refer to the two appendices.
- It should be emphasized that these results represent the perceptions of the lawyers who chose to respond to the survey. They are not objective measures of the quality of any of the judges.

The Survey

- In the spring of 2001 the Baton Rouge Bar Association mailed short surveys to all members of their Association and to members of the Louis Martinet Society. A total of 1,933 questionnaires were mailed.
- After three mailings a total of 570 usable questionnaires were returned. There were approximately one hundred unusable questionnaires, most of which were simply returned blank. The 29% return rate is adequate for this type of survey. The best way to assess representativeness is to examine characteristics of the sample and compare them to the associations.
- The sample is predominantly white and two-thirds male, which approximates the membership of the Baton Rouge Bar Association and the Louis Martinet Society combined. About half of the lawyers who responded are under forty-five years of age and half are older.
- There is a wide range of experience among these lawyers, in terms of number of years practicing law, type of law practiced, and type of court practiced in. There is, of course, a shortage of prosecutors because there are so few of them in the two associations.

Judicial Temperament

- There are no real guidelines as to what constitutes a “good” judge, therefore, there is no agreement as to specific indicators one can use to identify a “good” judge. However, there is a general consensus that judges should maintain a certain level of decorum in the courtroom, which includes treating litigants and lawyers courteously, being decisive, and having control of the proceedings. This can be labeled judicial temperament.
- We have chosen five characteristics to represent judicial temperament: courteousness, demeanor, courtroom control, attentiveness and decisiveness. While these characteristics are important, they should probably have less weight than other factors, such as objectivity and prudence, in the overall evaluation of a judge.
- **The judges in Baton Rouge are rated consistently high across all characteristics of judicial temperament**, with over seventy percent of the judges falling into Tiers I and II on each characteristic. This means that they were rated as “good” or “very good” by 70% or more of the lawyers who rated them.
- The highest ratings were achieved in the category “Courteous”. In fact, the ratings on courteousness were the highest in the entire survey. Over half of the judges are ranked in Tier I, meaning that at least 85% of lawyers said they were “good” or “very good”.
- Within the area of judicial temperament, judges were least likely to be ranked in Tier I on “Decisiveness”. This perception could be a result of judges not always ruling completely in favor of one side or the other.
- Judges Caldwell, Daniel, Ponder, Reidlinger, Richey, and Wall received consistently high scores across all characteristics of judicial temperament.

Courteous

(percent)

Judge

**Very
Good**

Good

VG + G

Tier I: 85 and above

Luse	71.3	23.3	94.6
Reidlinger	71.5	22.7	94.2
Wall	73.4	20.7	94.1
Richey	68.9	22.6	91.5
Daniel	66.3	24.7	91.0
Tyson	67.7	23.2	90.9
Welch	62.0	28.6	90.6
Morgan	63.2	26.3	89.5
Brady	55.2	33.3	88.5
Davis	54.8	33.0	87.8
Anderson	54.5	32.9	87.4
Ponder	66.5	20.2	86.7
Calloway	56.3	30.3	86.6
Caldwell	63.3	23.2	86.5
Bates	49.1	37.3	86.4
McDonald	59.9	26.5	86.4
Alexander	59.6	26.3	85.9
Higginbotham	63.1	22.5	85.6
Morvant	66.3	18.8	85.1

Tier II: 70-84

White	56.6	27.4	84.0
Dalby	49.1	34.5	83.6
Noland	54.0	28.0	82.0
Jackson	48.0	33.6	81.6
Engelsman	46.9	32.7	79.6
Lassalle	49.7	27.5	77.2
Erwin	43.8	32.7	76.5

Tier III: 55-69

Myles	39.5	28.9	68.4
Kelley	40.1	26.8	66.9
Johnson, D.R.	35.1	29.9	65.0
Parker	32.5	29.1	61.6
Clark	35.3	24.9	60.2
LaVergne	33.1	24.8	57.9
Polozola	27.1	28.3	55.4

Tier IV: Below 55

Johnson, P.T.	24.1	29.1	53.2
Phillips	36.6	13.8	50.4
Bergeron	32.6	17.4	50.0

Maintains Control of the Proceedings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Daniel	68.9	25.5	94.4
Wall	67.7	25.7	93.4
Caldwell	61.7	29.9	91.6
Ponder	68.5	22.7	91.2
Reidlinger	65.7	25.4	91.1
McDonald	54.5	35.0	89.5
Richey	63.8	25.7	89.5
Parker	67.3	21.9	89.2
Welch	51.6	37.3	88.9
Polozola	70.2	18.6	88.8
Brady	55.2	33.3	88.5
Tyson	62.5	25.7	88.2
Jackson	57.3	30.7	88.0
LaVergne	54.2	32.9	87.1
Lassalle	52.4	33.1	85.5
Tier II: 70-84			
Morvant	60.7	24.0	84.7
Kelley	47.9	35.6	83.5
Erwin	48.1	35.3	83.4
Engelsman	50.0	32.6	82.6
Anderson	45.3	36.5	81.8
Luse	51.4	30.4	81.8
Dalby	47.7	33.9	81.6
Morgan	44.3	36.4	80.7
Phillips	57.6	17.8	75.4
Myles	44.4	30.6	75.0
Clark	40.7	33.2	73.9
White	45.0	28.8	73.8
Davis	41.1	31.3	72.4
Alexander	39.5	32.3	71.8
Calloway	33.8	36.8	70.6
Tier III: 55-69			
Johnson, D.R.	36.1	32.7	68.8
Noland	35.4	33.3	68.7
Bates	29.5	38.8	68.3
Higginbotham	35.4	32.9	68.3
Johnson, P.T.	27.3	37.7	65.0
Bergeron	29.1	31.4	60.5
Tier IV: Below 55			
None			

Attentive during Proceedings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Caldwell	68.0	28.9	96.9
Richey	71.4	23.8	95.2
Daniel	75.9	19.1	95.0
Reidlinger	69.7	24.4	94.1
Wall	64.9	26.8	91.7
Ponder	69.8	20.9	90.7
Tyson	64.8	25.4	90.2
Jackson	59.3	30.7	90.0
Morvant	62.8	25.7	88.5
Brady	55.1	32.7	87.8
McDonald	52.8	35.0	87.8
Polozola	63.5	23.2	86.7
Dalby	55.9	30.6	86.5
Morgan	50.6	35.6	86.2
Kelley	51.7	34.1	85.8
Welch	47.8	37.9	85.7
Davis	52.3	33.3	85.6
Tier II: 70-84			
Engelsman	42.2	42.2	84.4
Luse	58.8	25.0	83.8
White	48.6	35.1	83.7
Parker	51.8	31.3	83.1
Anderson	48.4	33.3	81.7
Noland	49.5	32.0	81.5
Lassalle	52.1	28.1	80.2
LaVergne	44.5	33.5	78.0
Higginbotham	45.1	32.1	77.2
Erwin	36.1	38.7	74.8
Alexander	40.7	32.9	73.6
Phillips	50.4	23.1	73.5
Myles	37.8	35.1	72.9
Tier III: 55-69			
Clark	37.2	32.0	69.2
Calloway	29.2	38.4	67.6
Johnson, D.R.	33.8	32.4	66.2
Bates	29.0	36.7	65.7
Johnson, P.T.	29.9	29.9	59.8
Bergeron	32.9	22.4	55.3
Tier IV: Below 55			
None			

Maintains Dignified and Respectable Demeanor

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Daniel	75.2	19.9	95.1
Wall	67.1	26.9	94.0
Caldwell	68.6	24.8	93.4
Richey	64.8	27.6	92.4
Ponder	69.4	22.7	92.1
Reidlinger	71.3	20.8	92.1
Brady	59.2	31.6	90.8
Tyson	70.4	20.4	90.8
McDonald	59.4	30.7	90.1
Luse	66.9	22.3	89.2
Jackson	56.7	32.0	88.7
Welch	52.6	35.5	88.1
Anderson	54.3	33.3	87.6
Morvant	64.2	22.5	86.7
Dalby	59.6	26.6	86.2
Morgan	52.8	32.6	85.4
Tier II: 70-84			
Noland	50.0	34.0	84.0
Engelsman	44.4	37.8	82.2
Davis	53.2	28.8	82.0
Parker	56.1	25.8	81.9
Calloway	47.3	33.7	81.0
White	53.6	27.3	80.9
LaVergne	46.8	33.3	80.1
Kelley	52.2	26.5	78.7
Higginbotham	50.0	28.4	78.4
Alexander	47.9	29.3	77.2
Polozola	51.2	25.6	76.8
Lassalle	46.6	27.4	74.0
Erwin	35.4	34.8	70.2
Tier III+B69: 55-69			
Bates	32.0	37.0	69.0
Myles	36.4	30.3	66.7
Clark	30.8	29.0	59.8
Johnson, P.T.	28.2	26.9	55.1
Phillips	36.7	18.3	55.0
Tier IV: Below 55			
Johnson, D.R.	26.4	27.7	54.1
Bergeron	30.3	21.3	51.6

Decisive (percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Wall	63.8	31.3	95.1
Daniel	64.8	25.2	90.0
Caldwell	57.9	31.5	89.4
Richey	66.3	23.1	89.4
Reidlinger	62.4	26.2	88.6
Ponder	61.5	26.3	87.8
Jackson	57.7	29.5	87.2
Polozola	64.6	20.7	85.3
Tier II: 70-84			
Morvant	58.5	25.9	84.4
Tyson	58.2	26.2	84.4
Kelley	51.0	33.1	84.1
McDonald	45.0	38.5	83.5
Dalby	45.9	37.6	83.5
Welch	44.6	38.7	83.3
Erwin	52.9	30.3	83.2
Brady	48.5	32.0	80.5
Parker	57.2	22.2	79.4
Anderson	43.3	35.0	78.3
Engelsman	43.5	34.8	78.3
Morgan	40.7	37.2	77.9
Lassalle	51.0	26.2	77.2
Luse	48.6	27.4	76.0
Phillips	55.0	20.8	75.8
LaVergne	43.8	30.7	74.5
Myles	34.3	40.0	74.3
Davis	30.9	39.1	70.0
Tier III: 55-69			
White	39.4	29.4	68.8
Clark	36.1	29.5	65.6
Alexander	39.6	24.4	64.0
Noland	34.7	29.0	63.7
Johnson, D.R.	33.3	28.6	61.9
Johnson, P.T.	30.3	27.6	57.9
Higginbotham	30.0	26.3	56.3
Bates	23.3	32.7	56.0
Tier IV: Below 55			
Bergeron	29.1	24.4	53.5
Calloway	19.9	28.4	48.3

Integrity

- In the Integrity section, lawyers were asked to evaluate the judges as to how much their decisions are influenced by factors such as political beliefs, personal beliefs, public opinion and political contributions.
- There is no “objective” answer to the question of how much decisions should or should not be influenced by political or personal beliefs. This question is expressed in legal research as the legal model versus the attitudinal model of judicial decision making – do judges base their decisions on case facts with regards to precedent, statutes and the Constitution or do they base decisions on case facts in light of their own values and ideological predispositions?
- **Overall, most judges receive positive ratings from the lawyers on the influence of these “non-legal” factors.**
- According to the lawyers, resistance to influence by the media and public characterizes most of the Baton Rouge judges. A majority (64%) were rated in Tiers I and II on this item.
- The judges are also generally considered to be resistant to the influence of political contributions. Among the elected judges, a majority (60%) were rated in the top two Tiers on this characteristic. This runs counter to public and media perception that elected judges are unduly influenced by political contributions. Such is not the perception of the lawyers who answered this survey.
- Decisions influenced by personal or political beliefs are more common according to the lawyers. It is probably unavoidable that personal and political beliefs enter into judicial decision making. The survey simply gives an estimate of the degree of influence as perceived by lawyers. Forty percent of the judges ranked in the top Tiers I and II – that is, at least seventy percent of respondents said these judges are not influenced by these factors.
- Judges Luse, Richey and Wall stand out as consistently ranked in Tier I across all characteristics within this category.

Outcomes not Influenced by Political Beliefs

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	54.7	35.8	90.5
Wall	53.5	33.1	86.6
Luse	56.0	30.5	86.5
Tier II: 70-84			
Dalby	50.0	34.9	84.9
Caldwell	51.4	32.9	84.3
Reidlinger	57.7	26.3	84.0
Noland	43.3	38.0	81.3
Tyson	51.4	29.3	80.7
Ponder	48.8	30.9	79.7
Morvant	47.7	30.2	77.9
Morgan	49.4	27.7	77.1
Brady	38.5	38.5	77.0
Daniel	53.1	23.8	76.9
Jackson	37.2	35.8	73.0
Erwin	37.3	35.3	72.6
Tier III: 55-69			
Phillips	51.8	17.9	69.7
White	34.3	35.2	69.5
Engelsman	30.4	39.1	69.5
Davis	37.4	31.8	69.2
Welch	30.1	38.9	69.0
McDonald	35.0	33.5	68.5
Lassalle	36.0	30.9	66.9
Alexander	31.9	34.4	66.3
Anderson	40.8	24.2	65.0
Bergeron	32.5	28.8	61.3
Parker	42.0	19.1	61.1
LaVergne	27.4	31.5	58.9
Calloway	26.1	32.6	58.7
Higginbotham	31.4	26.8	58.2
Polozola	34.3	23.9	58.2
Kelley	26.6	29.3	55.9
Tier IV: Below 55			
Bates	19.7	33.5	53.2
Myles	27.3	24.2	51.5
Johnson, P.T.	23.4	19.5	42.9
Johnson, D.R.	14.1	20.8	34.9
Clark	15.4	11.7	27.1

Outcomes not Influenced by Personal Beliefs

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	52.4	34.3	86.7
Wall	52.6	34.0	86.6
Luse	49.3	37.0	86.3
Tier II: 70-84			
Caldwell	46.5	36.5	83.0
Dalby	45.7	37.1	82.8
Reidlinger	53.9	25.4	79.3
Tyson	44.9	34.1	79.0
Brady	36.7	42.2	78.9
Ponder	47.1	30.6	77.7
Morvant	45.5	31.0	76.5
Noland	39.6	36.9	76.5
Daniel	47.6	25.0	72.6
Davis	34.0	37.7	71.7
Engelsman	26.7	44.4	71.1
Morgan	39.5	30.9	70.4
Tier III: 55-69			
McDonald	34.3	35.5	69.8
Welch	31.4	37.5	68.9
Jackson	32.0	35.4	67.4
Erwin	32.7	34.6	67.3
Anderson	37.3	29.7	67.0
Alexander	29.6	34.0	63.6
White	33.6	29.9	63.5
Parker	34.0	25.0	59.0
Phillips	42.0	16.1	58.1
Calloway	23.6	34.3	57.9
Lassalle	25.2	30.9	56.1
Tier IV: Below 55			
Kelley	27.0	27.4	54.4
Polozola	27.7	25.5	53.2
Bergeron	27.8	24.1	51.9
Myles	24.2	27.3	51.5
LaVergne	19.2	32.2	51.4
Bates	17.6	33.5	51.1
Higginbotham	21.7	27.0	48.7
Johnson, P.T.	19.7	21.1	40.8
Johnson, D.R.	14.9	17.6	32.5
Clark	15.6	11.4	27.0

Outcomes not Influenced by Media Exposure or Public Opinion

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	61.0	30.5	91.5
Luse	55.8	32.6	88.4
Reidlinger	59.6	28.7	88.3
Wall	57.8	29.9	87.7
Dalby	55.8	30.8	86.6
Caldwell	52.3	34.1	86.4
Tier II: 70-84			
Brady	48.3	35.6	83.9
Noland	48.1	35.1	83.2
Tyson	53.6	29.0	82.6
Ponder	54.0	27.2	81.2
Engelsman	37.0	43.5	80.5
Erwin	40.1	39.5	79.6
Jackson	40.5	38.5	79.0
Davis	41.7	36.9	78.6
Daniel	50.3	28.0	78.3
Parker	52.4	25.1	77.5
Morvant	46.5	29.6	76.1
Morgan	49.4	25.9	75.3
White	41.3	33.7	75.0
McDonald	41.7	33.1	74.8
Phillips	57.0	17.8	74.8
Welch	33.5	39.4	72.9
Alexander	37.5	34.9	72.4
Tier III: 55-69			
Lassalle	38.7	29.9	68.6
Anderson	42.8	25.0	67.8
LaVergne	29.9	37.5	67.4
Kelley	34.0	30.1	64.1
Polozola	43.4	20.2	63.6
Calloway	26.5	36.6	63.1
Higginbotham	32.2	30.9	63.1
Bergeron	35.1	24.7	59.8
Bates	21.9	35.0	56.9
Tier IV: Below 55			
Myles	21.2	33.3	54.5
Johnson, P.T.	27.0	20.3	47.3
Johnson, D.R.	18.4	21.1	39.5
Clark	21.1	12.6	33.7

Outcomes not Influenced by Political Contributions

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	62.1	28.2	90.3
Daniel	62.9	25.8	88.7
Luse	59.0	28.4	87.4
Caldwell	53.7	32.7	86.4
Wall	55.3	30.3	85.6
Morvant	55.7	29.3	85.0
Tier II: 70-84			
Ponder	54.5	26.0	80.5
Anderson	51.6	26.8	78.4
Jackson	44.8	33.6	78.4
Erwin	43.0	33.8	76.8
Engelsman	35.6	40.0	75.6
White	40.8	34.0	74.8
Davis	39.8	34.0	73.8
McDonald	40.1	32.9	73.0
Welch	35.7	35.4	71.1
LaVergne	34.8	35.5	70.3
Tier III: 55-69			
Alexander	37.9	31.4	69.3
Kelley	43.4	24.6	68.0
Calloway	28.6	37.3	65.9
Lassalle	38.8	26.9	65.7
Higginbotham	35.0	25.9	60.9
Myles	25.8	32.3	58.1
Tier IV: Below 55			
Johnson, P.T.	27.8	26.4	54.2
Bates	23.7	28.0	51.7
Johnson, D.R.	19.0	20.4	39.4
Clark	19.9	12.0	31.9
Not Applicable			
Bergeron			
Morgan			
Brady			
Parker			
Polozola			
Tyson			
Dalby			
Noland			
Reidlinger			
Phillips			

Impartiality

- The Constitution of the United States guarantees all U.S. citizens equal protection of the laws. To help achieve this, judges must conduct themselves in an impartial manner.
- In this section, lawyers evaluated judges' decision making without perceived biases towards certain litigants or lawyers, and their overall fairness in the courtroom.
- **The judges in Baton Rouge receive very high marks with regard to ruling without racial, ethnic or gender bias.** In fact, an overwhelming majority (80%) were ranked in the Tiers I and II on both items.
- On the issue of favoritism toward certain litigants and/or lawyers, fewer rank in the top two tiers (55% and 58%). Since lawyers and judges are members of the same professional community, relationships that may have formed even prior to a lawyer becoming a judge may be perceived as influential. This may be especially true in a small city such as Baton Rouge.
- Judges Richey, Wall and Tyson are ranked in the highest tier across all categories of Impartiality.

Avoids Favoritism toward Particular Lawyers or Firms

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	57.3	32.0	89.3
Wall	53.8	32.9	86.7
Brady	44.3	42.0	86.3
Tyson	52.2	33.3	85.5
Reidlinger	59.0	26.2	85.2
Tier II: 70-84			
Caldwell	51.0	33.5	84.5
Dalby	49.0	34.6	83.6
Morgan	41.0	41.0	82.0
Daniel	53.5	28.3	81.8
Noland	47.1	33.2	80.3
Ponder	55.0	24.4	79.4
Luse	47.9	30.6	78.5
Morvant	46.5	31.9	78.4
Jackson	41.9	33.8	75.7
Johnson, D.R.	41.9	33.8	75.7
McDonald	41.4	33.6	75.0
Anderson	44.6	28.0	72.6
Davis	36.8	35.8	72.6
Welch	32.1	38.8	70.9
White	37.5	32.7	70.2
Engelsman	38.3	31.9	70.2
Tier III: 55-69			
Parker	41.1	27.9	69.0
Alexander	35.6	31.9	67.5
Erwin	33.1	32.5	65.6
Polozola	38.3	27.2	65.5
Calloway	29.4	35.6	65.0
Kelley	27.7	35.5	63.2
Higginbotham	34.8	26.5	61.3
Bergeron	30.4	30.4	60.8
LaVergne	32.4	28.4	60.8
Myles	30.3	27.3	57.6
Phillips	43.2	12.6	55.8
Tier IV: Below 55			
Lassalle	29.8	22.7	52.5
Johnson, P.T.	24.0	25.3	49.3
Bates	20.9	26.2	47.1
Clark	16.7	14.9	31.6

Fair and Consistent Practices and Rulings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Wall	60.8	31.0	91.8
Richey	62.5	27.9	90.4
Caldwell	52.6	35.2	87.8
Daniel	59.1	27.0	86.1
Tyson	49.6	36.5	86.1
Tier II: 70-84			
Reidlinger	57.2	27.3	84.5
Morgan	45.8	37.3	83.1
Ponder	54.1	28.7	82.8
Dalby	44.2	37.5	81.7
Luse	47.6	33.6	81.2
Jackson	42.9	37.4	80.3
Morvant	53.1	25.9	79.0
Brady	42.2	35.6	77.8
Davis	37.4	40.2	77.6
McDonald	43.4	33.0	76.4
Noland	41.1	35.1	76.2
Anderson	44.2	31.4	75.6
Erwin	36.6	38.6	75.2
Engelsman	31.3	43.8	75.1
Welch	34.9	39.8	74.7
White	39.0	34.3	73.3
Tier III: 55-69			
Alexander	32.3	34.8	67.1
Myles	30.3	36.4	66.7
Parker	39.1	26.6	65.7
Kelley	32.0	33.2	65.2
Phillips	48.6	16.2	64.8
Polozola	38.0	26.1	64.1
Higginbotham	29.7	32.9	62.6
Lassalle	29.3	30.7	60.0
LaVergne	27.0	31.1	58.1
Tier IV: Below 55			
Calloway	22.9	31.3	54.2
Bergeron	27.8	24.1	51.9
Bates	21.5	28.0	49.5
Johnson, P.T.	23.4	26.0	49.4
Johnson, D.R.	19.9	27.4	47.3
Clark	18.5	17.7	36.2

Avoids Favoritism toward Particular Litigants

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	59.6	29.8	89.4
Wall	58.5	30.8	89.3
Tyson	51.1	37.4	88.5
Caldwell	51.3	34.4	85.7
Tier II: 70-84			
Reidlinger	58.0	26.9	84.9
Luse	54.6	29.8	84.4
Dalby	49.0	34.6	83.6
Brady	45.6	36.7	82.3
Daniel	54.9	26.5	81.4
Ponder	52.2	28.5	80.7
Noland	44.1	36.0	80.1
Morgan	42.9	36.9	79.8
McDonald	43.5	34.9	78.4
Morvant	52.5	25.5	78.0
Jackson	39.9	37.8	77.7
Davis	38.5	36.7	75.2
Erwin	40.1	34.4	74.5
Engelsman	37.0	37.0	74.0
Anderson	43.5	28.6	72.1
Welch	36.5	35.3	71.8
Tier III: 55-69			
Alexander	36.1	32.9	69.0
White	33.3	35.2	68.5
Parker	40.2	28.0	68.2
Polozola	39.7	26.5	66.2
Kelley	31.6	32.0	63.6
Higginbotham	38.3	24.7	63.0
Myles	31.3	31.3	62.6
Phillips	45.9	16.5	62.4
Calloway	26.4	35.1	61.5
LaVergne	30.3	30.3	60.6
Lassalle	36.7	23.7	60.4
Bergeron	32.9	22.8	55.7
Tier IV: Below 55			
Bates	22.7	26.5	49.2
Johnson, P.T.	22.1	24.7	46.8
Johnson, D.R.	17.8	24.0	41.8
Clark	17.9	14.7	32.6

Rules without Racial or Ethnic Bias

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	66.3	27.9	94.2
Wall	63.7	29.3	93.0
Reidlinger	67.7	23.4	91.1
Brady	57.3	33.7	91.0
Caldwell	61.9	28.7	90.6
Luse	63.6	26.4	90.0
Daniel	68.1	20.0	88.1
Noland	56.5	31.5	88.0
Tyson	61.9	25.9	87.8
Dalby	58.3	28.2	86.5
Morvant	60.7	25.0	85.7
Ponder	61.5	23.9	85.4
Welch	50.5	34.8	85.3
Tier II: 70-84			
Davis	49.1	35.2	84.3
Lassalle	51.8	31.4	83.2
Morgan	48.2	34.1	82.3
Erwin	50.3	31.6	81.9
McDonald	50.9	31.0	81.9
Jackson	44.6	35.1	79.7
Anderson	52.6	26.9	79.5
Higginbotham	51.7	27.8	79.5
Parker	55.9	22.9	78.8
Polozola	53.7	24.9	78.6
Bates	41.6	36.1	77.7
White	43.3	33.7	77.0
LaVergne	40.6	35.7	76.3
Phillips	56.1	18.7	74.8
Engelsman	45.7	28.3	74.0
Alexander	42.8	30.8	73.6
Tier III: 55-69			
Kelley	40.9	28.0	68.9
Bergeron	38.0	29.1	67.1
Myles	36.4	30.3	66.7
Calloway	34.6	31.5	66.1
Tier IV: Below 55			
Johnson, P.T.	29.9	19.5	49.4
Johnson, D.R.	20.8	24.2	45.0
Clark	21.9	11.9	33.8

Rules without Gender Bias

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Wall	66.9	28.0	94.9
Richey	68.9	24.3	93.2
Caldwell	62.6	28.9	91.5
Tyson	63.6	27.9	91.5
Reidlinger	68.2	22.9	91.1
Daniel	68.5	21.6	90.1
Brady	59.8	29.9	89.7
Morvant	63.0	24.6	87.6
Luse	62.0	25.4	87.4
Davis	52.3	34.9	87.2
Welch	51.5	35.6	87.1
Ponder	64.1	22.8	86.9
McDonald	52.8	33.0	85.8
Dalby	60.6	25.0	85.6
Noland	53.8	31.3	85.1
Tier II: 70-84			
Morgan	52.4	32.1	84.5
Jackson	50.0	32.4	82.4
Anderson	54.5	27.6	82.1
Polozola	56.6	23.7	80.3
White	50.5	29.5	80.0
Parker	56.1	23.5	79.6
Erwin	52.6	26.6	79.2
Engelsman	45.7	32.6	78.3
Alexander	45.6	31.9	77.5
Calloway	39.9	36.2	76.1
Kelley	44.6	30.7	75.3
Bates	37.4	37.1	74.5
Phillips	57.5	17.0	74.5
Lassalle	46.8	23.7	70.5
Tier III: 55-69			
Myles	46.9	21.9	68.8
LaVergne	42.5	25.3	67.8
Higginbotham	48.1	18.8	66.9
Bergeron	41.0	25.6	66.6
Johnson, P.T.	34.2	27.6	61.8
Johnson, D.R.	33.6	25.2	58.8
Tier IV: Below 55			
Clark	27.2	23.3	50.5

Professional Competence

- Many would agree that it is essential that a judge be knowledgeable and able to interpret and apply legal rules and precedents in a consistent manner.
- This section includes evaluations of the judges' knowledge and understanding of appropriate rules and recent legal developments as well as the adequacy of jury instructions and rulings.
- **Judges in Baton Rouge are considered highly knowledgeable.** Over 60% of the judges were ranked in the most positive Tiers I and II in “knowledge of recent legal developments”, “knowledge and application of rules of evidence”, and “knowledge and application of rules or procedure”.
- **Judges in Baton Rouge are also rated very highly on their ability to clearly instruct jurors and on the clarity of their written rulings.**
- However, fewer judges (50%) received very high scores in understanding complex legal issues. In fact, with the exception of “outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs”, more judges fell into the lowest Tier IV on this item than on any other item in the survey. These lower scores could be a result of the large caseload along with the increasingly complicated issues with which these judges are confronted.
- Judges Caldwell, Daniel, Jackson, Morvant, Richey and Wall received the highest evaluations when considering all characteristics in this category.

Knowledge of Recent Legal Developments

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Daniel	63.8	30.2	94.0
Richey	67.3	26.0	93.3
Caldwell	52.6	39.3	91.9
Phillips	72.5	17.4	89.9
Reidlinger	63.2	26.4	89.6
Jackson	48.2	40.9	89.1
Polozola	63.9	24.5	88.4
Wall	50.0	38.2	88.2
McDonald	40.8	46.9	87.7
Morvant	57.4	30.2	87.6
Tier II: 70-84			
Morgan	47.6	35.7	83.3
Tyson	51.0	32.2	83.2
Lassalle	45.1	38.0	83.1
Parker	54.7	28.1	82.8
Luse	46.3	34.6	80.9
Ponder	47.1	33.8	80.9
Dalby	41.8	37.3	79.1
Engelsman	31.0	47.6	78.6
Brady	43.0	35.5	78.5
Welch	32.8	45.5	78.3
Kelley	33.3	38.8	72.1
Erwin	29.3	41.3	70.6
Anderson	33.8	36.6	70.4
Tier III: 55-69			
Myles	21.2	48.5	69.7
LaVergne	31.1	35.8	66.9
Noland	28.6	34.9	63.5
Davis	21.0	41.9	62.9
Higginbotham	27.1	35.5	62.6
White	19.6	39.2	58.8
Tier IV: Below 55			
Clark	23.9	29.8	53.7
Alexander	24.2	28.0	52.2
Bates	17.3	34	51.3
Johnson, D.R.	18.7	32.1	50.8
Bergeron	18.3	28.0	46.3
Johnson, P.T.	28.6	16.9	45.5
Calloway	11.8	26.7	38.5

Knowledge and Application of Rules of Evidence

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	62.1	31.1	93.2
Daniel	59.7	32.9	92.6
Wall	52.7	39.3	92.0
Caldwell	51.7	38.4	90.1
Jackson	45.7	42.8	88.5
Morvant	54.7	32.8	87.5
Polozola	61.9	25.4	87.3
Reidlinger	59.7	27.0	86.7
McDonald	42.9	43.8	86.7
Tier II: 70-84			
Parker	54.7	30.0	84.7
Luse	43.0	39.3	82.3
Ponder	48.5	33.5	82.0
Tyson	52.5	29.1	81.6
Morgan	41.6	39.0	80.6
Phillips	58.2	21.8	80.0
Dalby	42.7	36.9	79.6
Engelsman	27.9	51.2	79.1
Brady	38.1	41.0	79.1
Welch	37.6	41.3	78.9
Erwin	34.9	39.6	74.5
Lassalle	36.0	38.1	74.1
Kelley	33.9	36.4	70.3
Tier III: 55-69			
Myles	24.2	45.5	69.7
Anderson	36.9	30.5	67.4
LaVergne	30.6	34.7	65.3
Noland	27.7	37.5	65.2
White	20.6	38.2	58.8
Higginbotham	20.4	37.5	57.9
Bates	20.6	35.8	56.4
Alexander	25.3	31.0	56.3
Davis	20.6	34.6	55.2
Tier IV: Below 55			
Johnson, D.R.	16.4	35.1	51.5
Johnson, P.T.	25.0	23.7	48.7
Clark	22.1	24.8	46.9
Bergeron	18.4	25.0	43.4
Calloway	10.8	31.0	41.8

Knowledge and Application of Rules of Procedure

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	61.8	30.4	92.2
Wall	51.7	40.4	92.1
Caldwell	53.7	38.2	91.9
Daniel	58.7	32.7	91.4
Jackson	47.5	43.9	91.4
Morvant	55.5	34.4	89.9
McDonald	45.7	44.0	89.7
Reidlinger	61.5	26.7	88.2
Polozola	64.8	23.3	88.1
Tier II: 70-84			
Parker	59.9	24.5	84.4
Luse	42.2	41.5	83.7
Tyson	50.0	33.6	83.6
Ponder	48.8	34.1	82.9
Morgan	43.2	38.3	81.5
Dalby	46.1	35.3	81.4
Brady	39.6	41.5	81.1
Phillips	56.5	24.1	80.6
Welch	39.3	41.1	80.4
Engelsman	21.4	54.8	76.2
Erwin	32.9	42.3	75.2
Lassalle	35.5	39.1	74.6
Anderson	39.2	33.6	72.8
Kelley	34.9	36.6	71.5
Tier III: 55-69			
Noland	31.1	38.8	69.9
Myles	24.2	45.5	69.7
LaVergne	32.2	32.9	65.1
Bates	22.0	36.3	58.3
White	20.6	37.3	57.9
Alexander	24.2	32.9	57.1
Davis	18.9	37.7	56.6
Tier IV: Below 55			
Higginbotham	20.9	33.3	54.2
Johnson, D.R.	15.3	33.6	48.9
Clark	22.7	25.9	48.6
Bergeron	17.9	29.5	47.4
Johnson, P.T.	23.0	23.0	46.0
Calloway	13.1	30.3	43.4

Clarity and Completeness of Written Rulings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Richey	62.9	25.8	88.7
Morvant	51.9	36.1	88.0
Caldwell	46.7	40.7	87.4
Daniel	48.4	38.9	87.3
Reidlinger	59.3	26.8	86.1
Jackson	42.9	42.9	85.8
Wall	48.8	36.4	85.2
Tier II: 70-84			
Morgan	41.1	42.5	83.6
Polozola	48.3	34.6	82.9
McDonald	41.4	40.7	82.1
Ponder	45.6	36.1	81.7
Tyson	46.3	33.8	80.1
Dalby	41.9	37.1	79.0
Parker	46.8	30.6	77.4
Brady	37.5	39.6	77.1
Welch	34.7	42.2	76.9
Luse	43.2	33.6	76.8
Phillips	49.0	25.5	74.5
Engelsman	21.6	51.4	73.0
Kelley	37.5	35.2	72.7
Lassalle	34.1	37.3	71.4
Myles	25.8	45.2	71.0
Erwin	33.9	37.0	70.9
Tier III: 55-69			
Davis	22.0	45.1	67.1
Noland	29.0	35.5	64.5
Anderson	30.9	33.3	64.2
Higginbotham	26.8	33.3	60.1
White	26.7	31.1	57.8
LaVergne	23.8	33.8	57.6
Alexander	23.7	31.9	55.6
Tier IV: Below 55			
Bates	18.5	32.1	50.6
Johnson, D.R.	17.7	28.3	46.0
Bergeron	18.3	26.8	45.1
Clark	19.8	24.6	44.4
Johnson, P.T.	25.0	16.2	41.2
Calloway	11.7	23.9	35.6

Adequacy and Clarity of Instructions to Jurors

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Daniel	51.3	38.3	89.6
Caldwell	47.7	41.3	89.0
Morvant	51.6	36.8	88.4
Jackson	52.2	34.5	86.7
McDonald	43.6	42.0	85.6
Tier II: 70-84			
Welch	40.5	43.5	84.0
Brady	44.1	39.7	83.8
Tyson	51.9	31.1	83.0
Reidlinger	58.5	24.4	82.9
Phillips	64.2	17.0	81.2
Polozola	51.2	28.5	79.7
Dalby	43.8	35.9	79.7
Parker	48.6	30.0	78.6
Kelley	37.0	40.5	77.5
Erwin	32.8	43.7	76.5
Anderson	33.6	38.1	71.7
Tier III: 55-69			
Noland	31.6	34.2	65.8
Bates	22.7	37.7	60.4
Tier IV: Below 55			
Clark	27.7	26.6	54.3
Johnson, D.R.	21.2	27.9	49.1
Calloway	15.0	33.5	48.5
Not Applicable			
Bergeron			
Morgan			
Higginbotham			
Lassalle			
LaVergne			
Luse			
Richey			
Johnson, P.T.			
Alexander			
Davis			
Ponder			
Wall			
White			
Engelsman			
Myles			

Understanding of Complex Legal Issues

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Daniel	60.8	31.8	92.6
Richey	69.7	22.2	91.9
Caldwell	51.3	36.7	88.0
Morvant	56.5	31.5	88.0
Jackson	48.9	38.0	86.9
Reidlinger	58.2	28.6	86.8
Wall	51.0	35.4	86.4
Phillips	61.1	24.1	85.2
Polozola	59.0	26.1	85.1
Tier II: 70-84			
McDonald	42.3	39.9	82.2
Parker	52.4	28.3	80.7
Tyson	48.9	31.7	80.6
Luse	42.5	37.8	80.3
Morgan	42.7	37.3	80.0
Ponder	44.2	34.0	78.2
Brady	36.9	39.8	76.7
Dalby	38.1	38.1	76.2
Welch	31.0	40.2	71.2
Tier III: 55-69			
Lassalle	37.1	32.6	69.7
Kelley	37.8	30.7	68.5
Erwin	31.7	35.9	67.6
Engelsman	27.9	37.2	65.1
Anderson	35.1	29.9	65.0
Myles	25.0	37.5	62.5
Davis	17.5	40.8	58.3
LaVergne	21.7	35.5	57.2
Noland	22.1	34.2	56.3
Tier IV: Below 55			
White	23.5	30.6	54.1
Alexander	21.9	30.5	52.4
Higginbotham	19.2	31.8	51.0
Bergeron	15.6	35.1	50.7
Bates	16.6	28.8	45.4
Clark	20.8	24.6	45.4
Johnson, P.T.	25.0	16.7	41.7
Johnson, D.R.	16.3	25.2	41.5
Calloway	9.4	17.9	27.3

Work Ethic

- Considering the dramatically increasing caseloads with which they are faced, it is important to consider a judge's work ethic including his ability to efficiently manage his/her courtroom. The inability to make rulings in a timely manner could prove costly to the people involved and ultimately to the taxpayers. Moreover, the public's level of confidence in the courts may also be affected by long delays in the process.
- The judges of Baton Rouge are rated quite positively in the area of work ethic. A majority of the judges fell into the top two Tiers on all "Work Ethic" characteristics, and eighty percent fell into the top three tiers.
- To the credit of the Baton Rouge judges, within this work ethic area, the highest ratings occurred in the areas of "level of preparation for proceedings" and "resourceful and industrious work ethic". A majority of the judges fell into the top two Tiers on these characteristics.
- On the other hand, six judges were placed in Tier IV on "efficiency in managing caseload". Apparently, this is the most difficult of these traits to exhibit – not a surprise given the heavy caseloads.
- Judges Caldwell, Daniel, Reidlinger and Wall were consistently ranked in Tier I across all characteristics within this work ethic category.

Starts Proceedings on Time

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier 1: 85 and above			
Reidlinger	71.9	21.9	93.8
Caldwell	59.3	34.0	93.3
Daniel	68.9	22.5	91.4
Brady	53.4	36.9	90.3
Wall	54.2	34.6	88.8
Ponder	61.7	26.8	88.5
Parker	64.7	23.5	88.2
Polozola	59.1	28.9	88.0
Dalby	58.5	29.2	87.7
Tyson	61.7	24.1	85.8
Tier II: 70-84			
Luse	43.2	41.7	84.9
Morgan	51.3	33.3	84.6
Kelley	46.0	37.7	83.7
Noland	50.5	33.0	83.5
Morvant	54.3	29.1	83.4
Davis	41.6	41.6	83.2
Welch	42.9	39.5	82.4
McDonald	35.6	45.0	80.6
Engelsman	42.2	35.6	77.8
Lassalle	38.7	34.3	73.0
Phillips	40.2	32.7	72.9
Johnson, D.R.	50.0	21.5	71.5
Tier III: 55-69			
Anderson	34.5	33.8	68.3
LaVergne	37.3	31.0	68.3
Higginbotham	28.3	38.2	66.5
Myles	25.0	40.6	65.6
Calloway	29.1	34.9	64.0
White	27.6	33.3	60.9
Bergeron	30.8	29.5	60.3
Richey	34.0	26.2	60.2
Erwin	26.6	32.9	59.5
Jackson	32.2	27.3	59.5
Tier IV: Below 55			
Johnson, P.T.	30.7	24.0	54.7
Clark	18.2	20.9	39.1
Bates	13.6	21.1	34.7
Alexander	13.4	19.5	32.9

Level of Preparation for Proceedings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Caldwell	57.6	34.7	92.3
Reidlinger	67.5	24.4	91.9
Richey	62.1	28.2	90.3
Daniel	60.1	30.1	90.2
Morvant	57.7	32.3	90.0
Polozola	59.6	29.4	89.0
Wall	52.7	36.0	88.7
McDonald	42.2	45.2	87.4
Morgan	43.6	42.3	85.9
Ponder	55.6	30.2	85.8
Dalby	51.9	33.7	85.6
Tier II: 70-84			
Brady	52.4	32.0	84.4
Parker	52.4	31.9	84.3
Kelley	42.7	40.6	83.3
Tyson	52.9	30.4	83.3
Jackson	39.7	42.6	82.3
Phillips	58.7	22.1	80.8
Luse	39.2	41.5	80.7
Welch	39.0	38.7	77.7
Engelsman	36.4	38.6	75.0
Davis	32.1	42.0	74.1
Noland	36.4	35.8	72.2
Lassalle	30.6	41.0	71.6
Anderson	36.2	34.0	70.2
Tier III: 55-69			
LaVergne	27.5	38.4	65.9
Higginbotham	21.7	42.1	63.8
Myles	25.0	37.5	62.5
White	27.5	31.4	58.9
Erwin	27.7	30.5	58.2
Johnson, D.R.	20.2	38.0	58.2
Tier IV: Below 55			
Calloway	19.4	34.5	53.9
Bergeron	18.2	32.5	50.7
Alexander	21.3	28.8	50.1
Johnson, P.T.	20.0	29.3	49.3
Clark	21.1	25.7	46.8
Bates	17.1	28.7	45.8

Avoids Keeping Cases under Advisement for Too Long

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier 1: 85 and above			
Morvant	54.4	35.1	89.5
Caldwell	52.6	36.8	89.4
Daniel	54.7	33.8	88.5
Wall	49.6	37.6	87.2
Reidlinger	56.7	29.4	86.1
Jackson	39.8	46.1	85.9
Engelsman	35.7	50.0	85.7
Ponder	53.5	31.6	85.1
Tier II: 70-84			
Davis	35.6	48.5	84.1
Welch	39.2	44.0	83.2
Richey	56.6	26.3	82.9
Kelley	38.8	43.5	82.3
Morgan	38.9	43.1	82.0
Luse	41.6	39.2	80.8
Brady	41.6	35.6	77.2
Erwin	33.3	43.9	77.2
Anderson	39.5	37.2	76.7
McDonald	35.4	40.4	75.8
Dalby	45.1	29.4	74.5
Myles	30.3	42.4	72.7
Lassalle	35.8	35.8	71.6
Tier III: 55-69			
Parker	39.7	30.2	69.9
Polozola	40.1	26.4	66.5
Johnson, D.R.	24.6	41.5	66.1
LaVergne	29.5	36.4	65.9
Tyson	44.4	21.5	65.9
White	33.3	32.3	65.6
Alexander	26.6	37.4	64.0
Noland	33.0	30.2	63.2
Higginbotham	25.2	37.4	62.6
Phillips	41.2	20.6	61.8
Calloway	19.4	35.9	55.3
Tier IV: Below 55			
Bergeron	21.6	32.4	54.0
Johnson, P.T.	21.4	27.1	48.5
Bates	14.0	26.4	40.4
Clark	18.4	20.2	38.6

Promptness in Making Rulings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Caldwell	54.4	35.2	89.6
Wall	50.7	38.4	89.1
Daniel	57.7	31.0	88.7
Reidlinger	57.3	29.2	86.5
Jackson	44.1	41.9	86.0
Ponder	55.3	30.7	86.0
Morvant	55.6	30.2	85.8
Richey	56.0	29.0	85.0
Tier II: 70-84			
Morgan	40.8	43.4	84.2
Welch	42.1	41.4	83.5
Kelley	42.2	40.4	82.6
Luse	42.6	38.8	81.4
Davis	33.7	47.1	80.8
Erwin	38.4	41.3	79.7
McDonald	36.9	42.6	79.5
Anderson	43.2	36.0	79.2
Engelsman	39.5	39.5	79.0
Brady	43.7	35.0	78.7
Lassalle	39.2	36.2	75.4
LaVergne	31.9	39.3	71.2
Dalby	45.2	25.0	70.2
Tier III: 55-69			
Parker	38.7	30.1	68.8
Myles	26.5	41.2	67.7
Tyson	45.8	20.8	66.6
Polozola	41.2	25.3	66.5
Johnson, D.R.	26.2	39.3	65.5
White	31.6	33.7	65.3
Phillips	44.3	19.8	64.1
Noland	33.2	30.4	63.6
Alexander	26.7	35.3	62.0
Higginbotham	27.0	34.5	61.5
Calloway	23.2	36.5	59.7
Tier IV: Below 55			
Bergeron	24.7	28.6	53.3
Johnson, P.T.	23.9	26.8	50.7
Bates	15.4	28.2	43.6
Clark	20.3	21.4	41.7

Efficiency in Managing Caseload

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Caldwell	49.2	41.8	91.0
Daniel	61.1	29.2	90.3
Reidlinger	59.9	29.7	89.6
Wall	51.0	37.6	88.6
Ponder	59.6	27.8	87.4
Luse	42.6	43.4	86.0
Tier II: 70-84			
Morvant	55.0	28.7	83.7
Welch	42.7	39.5	82.2
McDonald	37.9	43.7	81.6
Richey	46.6	35.0	81.6
Jackson	36.0	44.6	80.6
Morgan	37.3	42.7	80.0
Dalby	51.0	28.4	79.4
Kelley	38.1	40.3	78.4
Brady	43.3	35.1	78.4
Engelsman	43.2	34.1	77.3
Davis	33.6	42.1	75.7
Lassalle	34.6	39.8	74.4
Anderson	38.1	34.5	72.6
Erwin	42.3	30.3	72.6
Tyson	43.2	28.8	72.0
Noland	37.8	32.2	70.0
Tier III: 55-69			
Parker	44.9	24.7	69.6
Phillips	46.2	23.1	69.3
Myles	25.0	43.8	68.8
LaVergne	29.9	37.2	67.1
Polozola	40.6	26.2	66.8
White	32.0	31.1	63.1
Higginbotham	28.1	34.2	62.3
Johnson, D.R.	25.2	33.9	59.1
Tier IV: Below 55			
Alexander	25.3	29.2	54.5
Bergeron	16.2	33.8	50.0
Johnson, P.T.	23.6	25.0	48.6
Clark	21.8	21.3	43.1
Calloway	15.9	26.9	42.8
Bates	12.8	26	38.8

Accessible and Present During Working Hours

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Caldwell	52.7	36.5	89.2
Wall	50.7	38.4	89.1
Daniel	58.2	30.8	89.0
Reidlinger	61.8	26.3	88.1
Morgan	56.4	29.5	85.9
Welch	46.3	39.4	85.7
Tier II: 70-84			
McDonald	47.5	36.3	83.8
Ponder	55.1	28.3	83.4
Morvant	53.1	28.5	81.6
Luse	41.7	39.4	81.1
Richey	51.0	28.4	79.4
Brady	36.5	41.7	78.2
Dalby	48.5	28.7	77.2
Anderson	51.4	25.4	76.8
Jackson	37.9	38.6	76.5
Kelley	36.1	38.7	74.8
Davis	33.6	39.3	72.9
Noland	37.0	34.8	71.8
Engelsman	34.1	36.4	70.5
Tier III: 55-69			
Higginbotham	38.3	30.9	69.2
Tyson	42.1	25.6	67.7
Myles	21.2	45.5	66.7
LaVergne	34.8	30.5	65.3
Polozola	35.8	28.4	64.2
Erwin	37.5	25.7	63.2
Calloway	26.2	36.8	63.0
Parker	34.1	27.2	61.3
White	32.0	29.0	61.0
Bergeron	29.3	30.7	60.0
Lassalle	29.1	29.9	59.0
Phillips	42.0	17.0	59.0
Johnson, D.R.	23.2	32.8	56.0
Tier IV: Below 55			
Clark	25.5	22.2	47.7
Alexander	19.6	27.5	47.1
Bates	17.6	28.6	46.2
Johnson, P.T.	22.4	22.4	44.8

Resourceful and Industrious Work Ethic

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	VG + G
Tier I: 85 and above			
Caldwell	56.6	35.2	91.8
Daniel	66.0	25.3	91.3
Reidlinger	67.4	21.4	88.8
Richey	62.5	26.0	88.5
Wall	55.8	31.3	87.1
Ponder	60.0	26.0	86.0
McDonald	47.5	37.9	85.4
Morvant	62.0	23.3	85.3
Tier II: 70-84			
Polozola	56.2	26.1	82.3
Dalby	53.5	28.7	82.2
Welch	44.4	37.8	82.2
Tyson	53.2	28.1	81.3
Luse	43.8	36.9	80.7
Brady	45.9	34.7	80.6
Morgan	58.5	22.0	80.5
Jackson	41.0	38.1	79.1
Kelley	40.6	38.5	79.1
Davis	38.5	37.6	76.1
Anderson	50.0	24.6	74.6
Phillips	50.9	21.7	72.6
Parker	45.9	25.4	71.3
LaVergne	35.7	35.0	70.7
Noland	34.8	35.9	70.7
Engelsman	29.5	40.9	70.4
Higginbotham	37.4	32.7	70.1
Tier III: 55-69			
White	32.3	30.3	62.6
Lassalle	33.8	27.8	61.6
Myles	24.2	36.4	60.6
Calloway	23.5	36.7	60.2
Clark	27.1	29.1	56.2
Tier IV: Below 55			
Erwin	28.5	25.7	54.2
Johnson, D.R.	23.6	29.1	52.7
Alexander	20.8	31.2	52.0
Johnson, P.T.	24.0	24.0	48.0
Bergeron	22.1	23.4	45.5
Bates	14.0	24.5	38.5

Focus on the African American Judges


- African American judges disproportionately appear in the lowest tier across many characteristics¹. This naturally raises the question of racial differences in the ratings of black lawyers vs. white lawyers. Since at least 84% of the lawyers responding to the survey indicated that they were white, the low rankings of some black judges could be produced by the fact that white lawyers dominate the sample. Are the ratings of black lawyers different?
- Only thirty-nine lawyers who answered the survey indicated that they were black, so we must be cautious in drawing conclusions. However, **compared to white lawyers, black lawyers have much more positive evaluations of the black judges who consistently appear in the lowest tier.**
- The graphs on the next pages illustrate the different responses of white and black lawyers. The particular characteristics were chosen to represent the areas of the survey, not because they demonstrated more or less racial differences.
- It appears that that the ranking of the black judges in Tier IV across many characteristics is a function of low ratings by the white lawyers.
- **It is important to emphasize that this does not mean that one group of lawyers is right and another group is wrong. These are simply different perceptions and should be viewed in that light. The perceptions may reflect different expectations that black lawyers and white lawyers have of the judicial system.**
- There is no pattern of racial differences in the rating of white judges. However, black lawyers do tend to rate black judges slightly more positively than they rate white judges.

¹ To measure the disproportionality, one can take all the placements of white judges and ask, what percent are in the lowest tier? Then compute the same percent for placements of black judges. The results are:


Black judges in lowest tier – 44%

White judges in lowest tier – 5%


Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Attentiveness during Proceedings




Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Outcomes not being Influenced by Personal Beliefs




Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Outcomes not being Influenced by Political Contributions




Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Ruling without Racial Bias




Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Knowledge of Recent Legal Developments




Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Knowledge and Application of the Rules of Evidence




Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Understanding of Complex Legal Issues



Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Efficiency in Managing Case Load



Percentage of Respondents Rating Black Judges "Good" or "Very Good" on Level of Preparation for Proceedings



Explanation of Items in the Appendices

- The numbers under Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, and Very Poor indicate the percentage of respondents who gave a judge that particular rating for the specified characteristic.
- (N) = the number of lawyers who provided a response for a particular judge for the specified characteristic.
- VG + G = the sum of the percentage of Very Good ratings plus the percentage of Good ratings.
- Avg. = the average of the ratings given to each judge by the respondents for the specified characteristic. The scale ranges from 5=Very Good to 1=Very Poor.

Appendix 1

Characteristics

**Courteous
(percent)**

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	54.5	32.9	8.4	2.4	1.8	167	87.4	4.4
Bates	49.1	37.3	8.4	3.2	2.0	346	86.4	4.3
Caldwell	63.3	23.2	10.4	1.8	1.2	327	86.5	4.5
Calloway	56.3	30.3	9.3	1.7	2.3	227	86.6	4.4
Clark	35.3	24.9	19.8	11.9	8.1	394	60.2	3.7
Daniel	66.3	24.7	7.8	1.2	0.0	166	91.0	4.6
Erwin	43.8	32.7	15.4	6.2	1.9	162	76.5	4.1
Jackson	48.0	33.6	11.2	5.9	1.3	152	81.6	4.2
Johnson, D.R.	35.1	29.9	20.1	9.7	5.2	154	65.0	3.8
Kelley	40.1	26.8	16.5	7.0	9.6	272	66.9	3.8
McDonald	59.9	26.5	9.7	2.2	1.7	359	86.4	4.4
Morvant	66.3	18.8	10.6	1.3	3.1	160	85.1	4.4
Welch	62.0	28.6	7.1	1.4	0.9	350	90.6	4.5
Bergeron	32.6	17.4	28.3	9.8	12.0	92	50.0	3.5
Morgan	63.2	26.3	5.3	3.2	2.1	95	89.5	4.5
Higginbotham	63.1	22.5	8.1	3.1	3.1	160	85.6	4.4
Lassalle	49.7	27.5	14.1	4.0	4.7	149	77.2	4.1
LaVergne	33.1	24.8	22.3	13.4	6.4	157	57.9	3.6
Luse	71.3	23.3	2.7	0.0	2.7	150	94.6	4.6
Richey	68.9	22.6	5.7	0.0	2.8	106	91.5	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	24.1	29.1	21.5	10.1	15.2	79	53.2	3.4
Alexander	59.6	26.3	8.8	2.9	2.3	171	85.9	4.4
Davis	54.8	33.0	8.7	1.7	1.7	115	87.8	4.4
Ponder	66.5	20.2	6.4	5.0	1.8	218	86.7	4.4
Wall	73.4	20.7	4.7	0.6	0.6	169	94.1	4.7
White	56.6	27.4	10.6	1.8	3.5	113	84.0	4.3
Engelsman	46.9	32.7	12.2	6.1	2.0	49	79.6	4.2
Myles	39.5	28.9	13.2	7.9	10.5	38	68.4	3.8
Brady	55.2	33.3	10.5	1.0	0.0	105	88.5	4.4
Parker	32.5	29.1	22.2	11.3	4.9	203	61.6	3.7
Polozola	27.1	28.3	21.5	12.1	10.9	247	55.4	3.5
Tyson	67.7	23.2	7.1	1.9	0.0	155	90.9	4.6
Dalby	49.1	34.5	12.1	0.9	3.4	116	83.6	4.3
Noland	54.0	28.0	12.0	2.5	3.5	200	82.0	4.3
Reidlinger	71.5	22.7	2.9	0.5	2.4	207	94.2	4.6
Phillips	36.6	13.8	13.8	14.6	21.1	123	50.4	3.3

Maintains Control of the Proceedings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	45.3	36.5	11.3	4.4	2.5	159	81.8	4.2
Bates	29.5	38.8	23.0	6.2	2.9	339	68.3	3.9
Caldwell	61.7	29.9	6.9	0.6	0.9	321	91.6	4.5
Calloway	33.8	36.8	22.5	3.9	3.0	334	70.6	3.9
Clark	40.7	33.2	15.2	6.2	4.6	388	73.9	4.0
Daniel	68.9	25.5	5.0	0.6	0.0	161	94.4	4.6
Erwin	48.1	35.3	14.1	2.6	0.0	156	83.4	4.3
Jackson	57.3	30.7	9.3	2.7	0.0	150	88.0	4.4
Johnson, D.R.	36.1	32.7	12.2	15.0	4.1	147	68.8	3.8
Kelley	47.9	35.6	10.9	3.0	2.6	267	83.5	4.2
McDonald	54.5	35.0	7.9	1.1	1.4	354	89.5	4.4
Morvant	60.7	24.0	11.3	2.7	1.3	150	84.7	4.4
Welch	51.6	37.3	7.9	2.0	1.2	343	88.9	4.4
Bergeron	29.1	31.4	26.7	7.0	5.8	86	60.5	3.7
Morgan	44.3	36.4	14.8	0.0	4.5	88	80.7	4.2
Higginbotham	35.4	32.9	18.0	8.7	5.0	161	68.3	3.9
Lassalle	52.4	33.1	11.7	1.4	1.4	145	85.5	4.3
LaVergne	54.2	32.9	10.3	1.3	1.3	155	87.1	4.4
Luse	51.4	30.4	12.2	2.7	3.4	148	81.8	4.2
Richey	63.8	25.7	9.5	0.0	1.0	105	89.5	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	27.3	37.7	18.2	3.9	13.0	77	65.0	3.6
Alexander	39.5	32.3	15.6	8.4	4.2	167	71.8	3.9
Davis	41.1	31.3	21.4	3.6	2.7	112	72.4	4.0
Ponder	68.5	22.7	6.9	0.9	0.9	216	91.2	4.6
Wall	67.7	25.7	6.0	0.6	0.0	167	93.4	4.6
White	45.0	28.8	18.9	3.6	3.6	111	73.8	4.1
Engelsman	50.0	32.6	13.0	2.2	2.2	46	82.6	4.3
Myles	44.4	30.6	8.3	8.3	8.3	36	75.0	3.9
Brady	55.2	33.3	10.5	1.0	0.0	105	88.5	4.4
Parker	67.3	21.9	7.7	2.0	1.0	196	89.2	4.5
Polozola	70.2	18.6	6.6	2.5	2.1	242	88.8	4.5
Tyson	62.5	25.7	11.1	0.7	0.0	144	88.2	4.5
Dalby	47.7	33.9	14.7	2.8	0.9	109	81.6	4.2
Noland	35.4	33.3	22.4	5.7	3.1	192	68.7	3.9
Reidlinger	65.7	25.4	8.0	0.0	1.0	201	91.1	4.6
Phillips	57.6	17.8	15.3	4.2	5.1	118	75.4	4.2

Attentive During Proceedings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	48.4	33.3	11.3	3.8	3.1	159	81.7	4.2
Bates	29.0	36.7	22.5	8.9	3.0	338	65.7	3.8
Caldwell	68.0	28.9	5.9	0.3	0.9	322	96.9	4.7
Calloway	29.2	38.4	22.0	6.5	3.9	336	67.6	3.8
Clark	37.2	32.0	15.5	9.0	6.2	387	69.2	3.8
Daniel	75.9	19.1	4.3	0.6	0.0	162	95.0	4.7
Erwin	36.1	38.7	15.5	6.5	3.2	155	74.8	4.0
Jackson	59.3	30.7	6.0	3.3	0.7	150	90.0	4.4
Johnson, D.R.	33.8	32.4	15.5	11.5	6.8	148	66.2	3.7
Kelley	51.7	34.1	7.5	3.4	3.4	267	85.8	4.3
McDonald	52.8	35.0	9.6	1.1	1.4	354	87.8	4.4
Morvant	62.8	25.7	9.5	1.4	0.7	148	88.5	4.5
Welch	47.8	37.9	9.6	2.9	1.7	343	85.7	4.3
Bergeron	32.9	22.4	31.8	8.2	4.7	85	55.3	3.7
Morgan	50.6	35.6	11.5	0.0	2.3	87	86.2	4.3
Higginbotham	45.1	32.1	15.4	4.3	3.1	162	77.2	4.1
Lassalle	52.1	28.1	14.4	2.1	3.4	146	80.2	4.2
LaVergne	44.5	33.5	13.5	4.5	3.9	155	78.0	4.1
Luse	58.8	25.0	10.1	2.7	3.4	148	83.8	4.3
Richey	71.4	23.8	1.9	1.9	1.0	105	95.2	4.6
Johnson, P.T.	29.9	29.9	26.0	3.9	10.4	77	59.8	3.7
Alexander	40.7	32.9	15.6	7.2	3.6	167	73.6	4.0
Davis	52.3	33.3	9.9	2.7	1.8	111	85.6	4.3
Ponder	69.8	20.9	6.5	1.9	0.9	215	90.7	4.6
Wall	64.9	26.8	5.4	2.4	0.6	168	91.7	4.5
White	48.6	35.1	7.2	5.4	3.6	111	83.7	4.2
Engelsman	42.2	42.2	11.1	2.2	2.2	45	84.4	4.2
Myles	37.8	35.1	13.5	2.7	10.8	37	72.9	3.9
Brady	55.1	32.7	11.2	1.0	0.0	98	87.8	4.4
Parker	51.8	31.3	13.3	2.1	1.5	195	83.1	4.3
Polozola	63.5	23.2	10.4	1.2	1.7	241	86.7	4.5
Tyson	64.8	25.4	7.0	2.1	0.7	142	90.2	4.5
Dalby	55.9	30.6	10.8	1.8	0.9	111	86.5	4.4
Noland	49.5	32.0	14.9	2.6	1.0	194	81.5	4.3
Reidlinger	69.7	24.4	5.0	0.0	1.0	201	94.1	4.6
Phillips	50.4	23.1	13.7	7.7	5.1	117	73.5	4.1

Maintains Dignified and Respectable Demeanor

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	54.3	33.3	8.6	1.9	1.9	162	87.6	4.4
Bates	32.0	37.0	18.6	6.8	5.6	338	69.0	3.8
Caldwell	68.6	24.8	5.6	0.0	0.9	322	93.4	4.6
Calloway	47.3	33.7	12.7	4.4	1.8	338	81.0	4.2
Clark	30.8	29.0	20.3	10.3	9.5	389	59.8	3.6
Daniel	75.2	19.9	3.7	1.2	0.0	161	95.1	4.7
Erwin	35.4	34.8	16.5	9.5	3.8	158	70.2	3.9
Jackson	56.7	32.0	8.7	2.0	0.7	150	88.7	4.4
Johnson, D.R.	26.4	27.7	17.6	16.9	11.5	148	54.1	3.4
Kelley	52.2	26.5	11.6	5.2	4.5	268	78.7	4.2
McDonald	59.4	30.7	5.6	2.8	1.4	355	90.1	4.4
Morvant	64.2	22.5	8.6	1.3	3.3	151	86.7	4.4
Welch	52.6	35.5	9.0	2.0	0.9	344	88.1	4.4
Bergeron	30.3	21.3	22.5	14.6	11.2	89	51.6	3.4
Morgan	52.8	32.6	11.2	0.0	3.4	89	85.4	4.3
Higginbotham	50.0	28.4	13.0	4.9	3.7	162	78.4	4.2
Lassalle	46.6	27.4	13.7	8.2	4.1	146	74.0	4.0
LaVergne	46.8	33.3	12.8	3.8	3.2	156	80.1	4.2
Luse	66.9	22.3	8.1	0.0	2.7	148	89.2	4.5
Richey	64.8	27.6	3.8	1.0	2.9	105	92.4	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	28.2	26.9	17.9	12.8	14.1	78	55.1	3.4
Alexander	47.9	29.3	12.6	4.8	5.4	167	77.2	4.1
Davis	53.2	28.8	12.6	2.7	2.7	111	82.0	4.3
Ponder	69.4	22.7	5.6	0.9	1.4	216	92.1	4.6
Wall	67.1	26.9	5.4	0.6	0.0	167	94.0	4.6
White	53.6	27.3	10.9	4.5	3.6	110	80.9	4.2
Engelsman	44.4	37.8	13.3	2.2	2.2	45	82.2	4.2
Myles	36.4	30.3	21.2	6.1	6.1	33	66.7	3.9
Brady	59.2	31.6	9.2	0.0	0.0	98	90.8	4.5
Parker	56.1	25.8	13.1	2.5	2.5	198	81.9	4.3
Polozola	51.2	25.6	11.6	5.8	5.8	242	76.8	4.1
Tyson	70.4	20.4	7.7	1.4	0.0	142	90.8	4.6
Dalby	59.6	26.6	8.3	4.6	0.9	109	86.2	4.4
Noland	50.0	34.0	10.8	2.1	3.1	194	84.0	4.3
Reidlinger	71.3	20.8	6.4	0.5	1.0	202	92.1	4.6
Phillips	36.7	18.3	14.2	12.5	18.3	120	55.0	3.4

**Decisive
(percent)**

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	43.3	35.0	12.7	5.7	3.2	157	78.3	4.1
Bates	23.3	32.7	23.6	11.2	9.1	339	56.0	3.5
Caldwell	57.9	31.5	8.4	0.9	1.2	321	89.4	4.4
Calloway	19.9	28.4	34.1	11.5	6.0	331	48.3	3.4
Clark	36.1	29.5	18.2	9.7	6.6	380	65.6	3.8
Daniel	64.8	25.2	8.2	1.9	0.0	159	90.0	4.5
Erwin	52.9	30.3	11.0	5.2	0.6	155	83.2	4.3
Jackson	57.7	29.5	10.1	2.0	0.7	149	87.2	4.4
Johnson, D.R.	33.3	28.6	16.3	15.6	6.1	149	61.9	3.7
Kelley	51.0	33.1	10.3	1.5	4.2	263	84.1	4.3
McDonald	45.0	38.5	11.3	2.8	2.3	353	83.5	4.2
Morvant	58.5	25.9	12.9	1.4	1.4	147	84.4	4.4
Welch	44.6	38.7	12.3	2.3	2.1	341	83.3	4.2
Bergeron	29.1	24.4	22.1	12.8	11.6	86	53.5	3.5
Morgan	40.7	37.2	12.8	4.7	4.7	86	77.9	4.0
Higginbotham	30.0	26.3	23.8	11.3	8.8	160	56.3	3.6
Lassalle	51.0	26.2	14.6	7.6	0.7	145	77.2	4.2
LaVergne	43.8	30.7	18.3	4.6	2.6	153	74.5	4.1
Luse	48.6	27.4	16.4	2.1	5.5	146	76.0	4.1
Richey	66.3	23.1	8.7	1.0	1.0	104	89.4	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	30.3	27.6	21.1	6.6	14.5	76	57.9	3.5
Alexander	39.6	24.4	19.5	9.8	6.7	164	64.0	3.8
Davis	30.9	39.1	19.1	6.4	4.5	110	70.0	3.9
Ponder	61.5	26.3	8.5	1.9	1.9	213	87.8	4.4
Wall	63.8	31.3	4.3	0.6	0.0	163	95.1	4.6
White	39.4	29.4	19.3	7.3	4.6	109	68.8	3.9
Engelsman	43.5	34.8	17.4	0.0	4.3	46	78.3	4.1
Myles	34.3	40.0	11.4	8.6	5.7	35	74.3	3.9
Brady	48.5	32.0	17.5	1.0	1.0	97	80.5	4.3
Parker	57.2	22.2	14.9	3.6	2.1	194	79.4	4.3
Polozola	64.6	20.7	9.7	1.3	3.8	237	85.3	4.4
Tyson	58.2	26.2	12.1	1.4	2.1	141	84.4	4.4
Dalby	45.9	37.6	10.1	3.7	2.8	109	83.5	4.2
Noland	34.7	29.0	25.9	5.7	4.7	193	63.7	3.8
Reidlinger	62.4	26.2	10.4	0.0	1.0	202	88.6	4.5
Phillips	55.0	20.8	10.8	5.8	7.5	120	75.8	4.1

Outcomes Not Influenced By Political Beliefs

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	40.8	24.2	20.4	4.5	10.2	157	65.0	3.8
Bates	19.7	33.5	24.5	12.2	10.0	319	53.2	3.4
Caldwell	51.4	32.9	10.2	2.9	2.6	313	84.3	4.3
Calloway	26.1	32.6	29.5	5.9	5.9	322	58.7	3.7
Clark	15.4	11.7	19.9	22.1	30.9	376	27.1	2.6
Daniel	53.1	23.8	15.6	6.9	0.6	160	76.9	4.2
Erwin	37.3	35.3	20.3	4.6	2.6	153	72.6	4.0
Jackson	37.2	35.8	16.9	7.4	2.7	148	73.0	4.0
Johnson, D.R.	14.1	20.8	22.8	16.1	26.2	149	34.9	2.8
Kelley	26.6	29.3	23.2	10.0	10.8	259	55.9	3.5
McDonald	35.0	33.5	19.5	6.4	5.5	343	68.5	3.9
Morvant	47.7	30.2	14.8	3.4	4.0	149	77.9	4.1
Welch	30.1	38.9	21.3	6.4	3.3	329	69.0	3.9
Bergeron	32.5	28.8	28.8	5.0	5.0	80	61.3	3.8
Morgan	49.4	27.7	14.5	4.8	3.6	83	77.1	4.1
Higginbotham	31.4	26.8	22.2	9.2	10.5	153	58.2	3.6
Lassalle	36.0	30.9	21.6	7.2	4.3	139	66.9	3.9
LaVergne	27.4	31.5	23.3	8.2	9.6	146	58.9	3.6
Luse	56.0	30.5	8.5	2.1	2.8	141	86.5	4.3
Richey	54.7	35.8	4.7	1.9	2.8	106	90.5	4.4
Johnson, P.T.	23.4	19.5	23.4	6.5	27.3	77	42.9	3.1
Alexander	31.9	34.4	21.9	5.6	6.3	160	66.3	3.8
Davis	37.4	31.8	19.6	3.7	7.5	107	69.2	3.9
Ponder	48.8	30.9	12.6	5.3	2.4	207	79.7	4.2
Wall	53.5	33.1	8.9	1.9	2.5	157	86.6	4.3
White	34.3	35.2	14.8	7.4	8.3	108	69.5	3.8
Engelsman	30.4	39.1	21.7	6.5	2.2	46	69.5	3.9
Myles	27.3	24.2	27.3	9.1	12.1	33	51.5	3.5
Brady	38.5	38.5	19.8	2.2	1.1	91	77.0	4.1
Parker	42.0	19.1	18.1	11.2	9.6	188	61.1	3.7
Polozola	34.3	23.9	20.0	9.1	12.6	230	58.2	3.6
Tyson	51.4	29.3	15.7	3.6	0.0	140	80.7	4.3
Dalby	50.0	34.9	10.4	3.8	0.9	106	84.9	4.3
Noland	43.3	38.0	10.7	4.3	3.7	187	81.3	4.1
Reidlinger	57.7	26.3	8.2	4.1	3.6	194	84.0	4.3
Phillips	51.8	17.9	11.6	7.1	11.6	112	69.7	3.9

Outcomes Not Influenced By Personal Beliefs

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	37.3	29.7	20.3	5.7	7.0	158	67.0	3.8
Bates	17.6	33.5	24.8	13.8	10.3	319	51.1	3.3
Caldwell	46.5	36.5	11.2	3.5	2.2	312	83.0	4.2
Calloway	23.6	34.3	27.4	8.8	6.0	318	57.9	3.6
Clark	15.6	11.4	21.5	21.2	30.2	377	27.0	2.6
Daniel	47.6	25.0	18.9	6.1	2.4	164	72.6	4.1
Erwin	32.7	34.6	20.5	7.7	4.5	156	67.3	3.8
Jackson	32.0	35.4	19.0	10.2	3.4	147	67.4	3.8
Johnson, D.R.	14.9	17.6	20.9	18.2	28.4	148	32.5	2.7
Kelley	27.0	27.4	21.2	11.2	13.1	259	54.4	3.4
McDonald	34.3	35.5	19.1	5.0	6.2	341	69.8	3.9
Morvant	45.5	31.0	14.5	4.8	4.1	145	76.5	4.1
Welch	31.4	37.5	22.6	5.2	3.4	328	68.9	3.9
Bergeron	27.8	24.1	26.6	10.1	11.4	79	51.9	3.5
Morgan	39.5	30.9	19.8	4.9	4.9	81	70.4	4.0
Higginbotham	21.7	27.0	17.8	17.1	16.4	152	48.7	3.2
Lassalle	25.2	30.9	23.0	13.7	7.2	139	56.1	3.5
LaVergne	19.2	32.2	26.1	11.0	11.6	146	51.4	3.4
Luse	49.3	37.0	8.7	1.4	3.6	138	86.3	4.3
Richey	52.4	34.3	4.8	3.8	4.8	105	86.7	4.3
Johnson, P.T.	19.7	21.1	22.4	9.2	27.6	76	40.8	3.0
Alexander	29.6	34.0	24.5	4.4	7.5	159	63.6	3.7
Davis	34.0	37.7	17.0	5.7	5.7	106	71.7	3.9
Ponder	47.1	30.6	12.1	7.3	2.9	206	77.7	4.1
Wall	52.6	34.0	8.3	3.8	1.3	156	86.6	4.3
White	33.6	29.9	20.6	7.5	8.4	107	63.5	3.7
Engelsman	26.7	44.4	22.2	4.4	2.2	45	71.1	3.9
Myles	24.2	27.3	27.3	6.1	15.2	33	51.5	3.4
Brady	36.7	42.2	17.8	2.2	1.1	90	78.9	4.1
Parker	34.0	25.0	19.1	10.6	11.2	188	59.0	3.6
Polozola	27.7	25.5	22.1	11.3	13.4	231	53.2	3.4
Tyson	44.9	34.1	15.9	5.1	0.0	138	79.0	4.2
Dalby	45.7	37.1	12.4	2.9	1.9	105	82.8	4.2
Noland	39.6	36.9	14.4	4.8	4.3	187	76.5	4.0
Reidlinger	53.9	25.4	13.0	4.7	3.1	193	79.3	4.2
Phillips	42.0	16.1	13.4	13.4	15.2	112	58.1	3.6

Outcomes Not Influenced By Media Exposure or Public Opinion

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	42.8	25.0	17.8	5.9	8.6	152	67.8	3.9
Bates	21.9	35.0	25.5	9.5	8.2	306	56.9	3.5
Caldwell	52.3	34.1	9.6	2.3	1.7	302	86.4	4.3
Calloway	26.5	36.6	24.9	5.8	6.1	309	63.1	3.7
Clark	21.1	12.6	21.6	18.1	26.6	365	33.7	2.8
Daniel	50.3	28.0	14.9	5.6	1.2	161	78.3	4.2
Erwin	40.1	39.5	13.8	5.9	0.7	152	79.6	4.1
Jackson	40.5	38.5	14.2	4.1	2.7	148	79.0	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	18.4	21.1	19.0	17.7	23.8	147	39.5	2.9
Kelley	34.0	30.1	13.7	10.9	11.3	256	64.1	3.6
McDonald	41.7	33.1	15.7	4.4	5.0	338	74.8	4.0
Morvant	46.5	29.6	15.5	4.2	4.2	142	76.1	4.1
Welch	33.5	39.4	18.6	5.6	2.8	322	72.9	3.9
Bergeron	35.1	24.7	24.7	7.8	7.8	77	59.8	3.7
Morgan	49.4	25.9	17.3	4.9	2.5	81	75.3	4.1
Higginbotham	32.2	30.9	19.5	10.7	6.7	149	63.1	3.7
Lassalle	38.7	29.9	16.1	11.7	3.6	137	68.6	3.9
LaVergne	29.9	37.5	18.1	6.9	7.6	144	67.4	3.8
Luse	55.8	32.6	8.7	0.7	2.2	138	88.4	4.4
Richey	61.0	30.5	4.8	1.9	1.9	105	91.5	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	27.0	20.3	23.0	9.5	20.3	74	47.3	3.2
Alexander	37.5	34.9	17.8	3.3	6.6	152	72.4	3.9
Davis	41.7	36.9	10.7	4.9	5.8	103	78.6	4.0
Ponder	54.0	27.2	11.4	5.0	2.5	202	81.2	4.3
Wall	57.8	29.9	10.4	0.6	1.3	154	87.7	4.4
White	41.3	33.7	11.5	8.7	4.8	104	75.0	4.0
Engelsman	37.0	43.5	15.2	2.2	2.2	46	80.5	4.1
Myles	21.2	33.3	24.2	6.1	15.2	33	54.5	3.4
Brady	48.3	35.6	11.5	3.4	1.1	87	83.9	4.3
Parker	52.4	25.1	12.3	8.0	2.1	187	77.5	4.2
Polozola	43.4	20.2	17.5	8.3	10.5	228	63.6	3.8
Tyson	53.6	29.0	15.2	1.4	0.7	138	82.6	4.3
Dalby	55.8	30.8	10.6	2.9	0.0	104	86.6	4.4
Noland	48.1	35.1	13.0	2.2	1.6	185	83.2	4.3
Reidlinger	59.6	28.7	8.0	1.6	2.1	188	88.3	4.4
Phillips	57.0	17.8	11.2	5.6	8.4	107	74.8	4.1

Outcomes Not Influenced By Political Contributions

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	51.6	26.8	13.1	2.6	5.9	153	78.4	4.2
Bates	23.7	28.0	22.7	12.2	13.5	304	51.7	3.4
Caldwell	53.7	32.7	9.0	3.0	1.7	300	86.4	4.3
Calloway	28.6	37.3	21.4	6.2	6.5	308	65.9	3.8
Clark	19.9	12.0	19.6	17.1	31.4	357	31.9	2.7
Daniel	62.9	25.8	7.5	3.1	0.6	159	88.7	4.5
Erwin	43.0	33.8	13.9	6.6	2.6	151	76.8	4.1
Jackson	44.8	33.6	13.3	5.6	2.8	143	78.4	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	19.0	20.4	16.9	15.5	28.2	142	39.4	2.9
Kelley	43.4	24.6	14.3	7.8	9.8	244	68.0	3.8
McDonald	40.1	32.9	14.4	6.3	6.3	334	73.0	3.9
Morvant	55.7	29.3	9.3	2.1	3.6	140	85.0	4.3
Welch	35.7	35.4	16.6	7.6	4.8	314	71.1	3.9
Bergeron	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morgan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Higginbotham	35.0	25.9	19.6	9.8	9.8	143	60.9	3.7
Lassalle	38.8	26.9	17.2	9.7	7.5	134	65.7	3.8
LaVergne	34.8	35.5	17.0	4.3	8.5	141	70.3	3.8
Luse	59.0	28.4	9.0	0.7	3.0	134	87.4	4.4
Richey	62.1	28.2	7.8	0.0	1.9	103	90.3	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	27.8	26.4	19.4	4.2	22.2	72	54.2	3.3
Alexander	37.9	31.4	19.6	2.6	8.5	153	69.3	3.9
Davis	39.8	34.0	12.6	5.8	7.8	103	73.8	3.9
Ponder	54.5	26.0	11.0	5.0	3.5	200	80.5	4.2
Wall	55.3	30.3	9.2	2.6	2.6	152	85.6	4.3
White	40.8	34.0	11.7	5.8	7.8	103	74.8	3.9
Engelsman	35.6	40.0	20.0	2.2	2.2	45	75.6	4.0
Myles	25.8	32.3	19.4	9.7	12.9	31	58.1	3.5
Brady	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parker	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polozola	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tyson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dalby	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Noland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reidlinger	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phillips	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Avoids Favoritism Toward Particular Lawyers or Firms

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	44.6	28.0	16.6	5.7	5.1	157	72.6	4.0
Bates	20.9	26.2	25.2	15.0	12.8	321	47.1	3.3
Caldwell	51.0	33.5	11.6	1.9	1.9	310	84.5	4.3
Calloway	29.4	35.6	21.9	8.4	4.7	320	65.0	3.8
Clark	16.7	14.9	18.3	19.4	30.8	377	31.6	2.7
Daniel	53.5	28.3	12.6	3.1	2.5	159	81.8	4.3
Erwin	33.1	32.5	19.5	11.0	3.9	154	65.6	3.8
Jackson	41.9	33.8	14.9	6.1	3.4	148	75.7	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	41.9	33.8	14.9	6.1	3.4	148	75.7	4.1
Kelley	27.7	35.5	16.0	11.3	9.4	256	63.2	3.6
McDonald	41.4	33.6	14.9	5.2	4.9	348	75.0	4.0
Morvant	46.5	31.9	9.0	6.9	5.6	144	78.4	4.1
Welch	32.1	38.8	18.8	4.8	5.5	330	70.9	3.9
Bergeron	30.4	30.4	25.3	6.3	7.6	79	60.8	3.7
Morgan	41.0	41.0	10.8	3.6	3.6	83	82.0	4.1
Higginbotham	34.8	26.5	20.6	9.0	9.0	155	61.3	3.7
Lassalle	29.8	22.7	17.7	14.2	15.6	141	52.5	3.4
LaVergne	32.4	28.4	19.6	12.8	6.8	148	60.8	3.7
Luse	47.9	30.6	11.1	6.9	3.5	144	78.5	4.1
Richey	57.3	32.0	6.8	1.9	1.9	103	89.3	4.4
Johnson, P.T.	24.0	25.3	22.7	5.3	22.7	75	49.3	3.2
Alexander	35.6	31.9	21.3	3.8	7.5	160	67.5	3.8
Davis	36.8	35.8	16.0	5.7	5.7	106	72.6	3.9
Ponder	55.0	24.4	11.5	5.3	3.8	209	79.4	4.2
Wall	53.8	32.9	8.9	1.3	3.2	158	86.7	4.3
White	37.5	32.7	21.2	2.9	5.8	104	70.2	3.9
Engelsman	38.3	31.9	21.3	4.3	4.3	47	70.2	4.0
Myles	30.3	27.3	15.2	15.2	12.1	33	57.6	3.5
Brady	44.3	42.0	9.1	1.1	3.4	88	86.3	4.2
Parker	41.1	27.9	16.3	6.8	7.9	190	69.0	3.9
Polozola	38.3	27.2	17.4	6.4	10.6	235	65.5	3.8
Tyson	52.2	33.3	13.8	0.7	0.0	138	85.5	4.4
Dalby	49.0	34.6	10.6	4.8	1.0	104	83.6	4.3
Noland	47.1	33.2	10.7	3.7	5.3	187	80.3	4.1
Reidlinger	59.0	26.2	10.3	2.1	2.6	195	85.2	4.4
Phillips	43.2	12.6	13.5	9.0	21.6	111	55.8	3.5

Fair and Consistent Practices and Rulings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	44.2	31.4	13.5	6.4	4.5	156	75.6	4.0
Bates	21.5	28.0	28.7	12.8	9.0	321	49.5	3.4
Caldwell	52.6	35.2	8.4	2.6	1.3	310	87.8	4.4
Calloway	22.9	31.3	29.8	11.3	4.7	319	54.2	3.6
Clark	18.5	17.7	18.7	20.3	24.8	379	36.2	2.8
Daniel	59.1	27.0	10.7	2.5	0.6	159	86.1	4.4
Erwin	36.6	38.6	14.4	7.8	2.6	153	75.2	4.0
Jackson	42.9	37.4	12.9	5.4	1.4	147	80.3	4.2
Johnson, D.R.	19.9	27.4	17.1	11.6	24.0	146	47.3	3.1
Kelley	32.0	33.2	17.4	8.1	9.3	259	65.2	3.7
McDonald	43.4	33.0	16.1	3.7	3.7	348	76.4	4.1
Morvant	53.1	25.9	12.9	6.1	2.0	147	79.0	4.2
Welch	34.9	39.8	17.5	4.2	3.6	332	74.7	4.0
Bergeron	27.8	24.1	31.6	6.3	10.1	79	51.9	3.5
Morgan	45.8	37.3	9.6	3.6	3.6	83	83.1	4.2
Higginbotham	29.7	32.9	21.3	7.1	9.0	155	62.6	3.7
Lassalle	29.3	30.7	18.6	10.0	11.4	140	60.0	3.6
LaVergne	27.0	31.1	21.6	10.1	10.1	148	58.1	3.5
Luse	47.6	33.6	11.2	3.5	4.2	143	81.2	4.2
Richey	62.5	27.9	4.8	2.9	1.9	104	90.4	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	23.4	26.0	16.9	11.7	22.1	77	49.4	3.2
Alexander	32.3	34.8	22.4	4.3	6.2	161	67.1	3.8
Davis	37.4	40.2	13.1	2.8	6.5	107	77.6	4.0
Ponder	54.1	28.7	9.1	4.3	3.8	209	82.8	4.3
Wall	60.8	31.0	5.1	1.3	1.9	158	91.8	4.5
White	39.0	34.3	13.3	5.7	7.6	105	73.3	3.9
Engelsman	31.3	43.8	20.8	2.1	2.1	48	75.1	4.0
Myles	30.3	36.4	18.2	3.0	12.1	33	66.7	3.7
Brady	42.2	35.6	14.4	5.6	2.2	90	77.8	4.1
Parker	39.1	26.6	19.8	7.8	6.8	192	65.7	3.8
Polozola	38.0	26.1	19.2	9.0	7.7	234	64.1	3.8
Tyson	49.6	36.5	10.9	2.9	0.0	137	86.1	4.3
Dalby	44.2	37.5	13.5	3.8	1.0	104	81.7	4.2
Noland	41.1	35.1	13.5	5.9	4.3	185	76.2	4.0
Reidlinger	57.2	27.3	8.8	3.1	3.6	194	84.5	4.3
Phillips	48.6	16.2	11.7	10.8	12.6	111	64.8	3.8

Avoids Favoritism Toward Particular Litigants

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	43.5	28.6	14.3	7.1	6.5	154	72.1	4.0
Bates	22.7	26.5	25.2	15.8	9.8	317	49.2	3.4
Caldwell	51.3	34.4	10.1	2.6	1.6	308	85.7	4.3
Calloway	26.4	35.1	23.0	9.3	6.2	322	61.5	3.7
Clark	17.9	14.7	18.2	19.8	29.4	374	32.6	2.7
Daniel	54.9	26.5	13.0	4.3	1.2	162	81.4	4.3
Erwin	40.1	34.4	14.6	8.3	2.5	157	74.5	4.0
Jackson	39.9	37.8	11.5	8.1	2.7	148	77.7	4.0
Johnson, D.R.	17.8	24.0	19.9	13.0	25.3	146	41.8	3.0
Kelley	31.6	32.0	18.0	8.2	10.2	256	63.6	3.7
McDonald	43.5	34.9	12.1	5.2	4.3	347	78.4	4.1
Morvant	52.5	25.5	12.8	5.7	3.5	141	78.0	4.2
Welch	36.5	35.3	18.8	6.1	3.3	329	71.8	4.0
Bergeron	32.9	22.8	30.4	5.1	8.9	79	55.7	3.7
Morgan	42.9	36.9	13.1	3.6	3.6	84	79.8	4.1
Higginbotham	38.3	24.7	20.1	7.8	9.1	154	63.0	3.8
Lassalle	36.7	23.7	19.4	9.4	10.8	139	60.4	3.7
LaVergne	30.3	30.3	24.1	6.2	9.0	145	60.6	3.7
Luse	54.6	29.8	8.5	2.8	4.3	141	84.4	4.3
Richey	59.6	29.8	6.7	1.0	2.9	104	89.4	4.4
Johnson, P.T.	22.1	24.7	26.0	3.9	23.4	77	46.8	3.2
Alexander	36.1	32.9	18.4	5.1	7.6	158	69.0	3.9
Davis	38.5	36.7	12.8	3.7	8.3	109	75.2	3.9
Ponder	52.2	28.5	11.1	4.8	3.4	207	80.7	4.2
Wall	58.5	30.8	7.5	1.3	1.9	159	89.3	4.4
White	33.3	35.2	19.0	4.8	7.6	105	68.5	3.8
Engelsman	37.0	37.0	17.4	4.3	4.3	46	74.0	4.0
Myles	31.3	31.3	18.8	6.3	12.5	32	62.6	3.6
Brady	45.6	36.7	11.1	2.2	4.4	90	82.3	4.2
Parker	40.2	28.0	15.9	8.5	7.4	189	68.2	3.9
Polozola	39.7	26.5	14.1	7.7	12.0	234	66.2	3.7
Tyson	51.1	37.4	9.4	1.4	0.7	139	88.5	4.4
Dalby	49.0	34.6	11.5	4.8	0.0	104	83.6	4.3
Noland	44.1	36.0	10.8	3.2	5.9	186	80.1	4.1
Reidlinger	58.0	26.9	8.8	3.1	3.1	193	84.9	4.3
Phillips	45.9	16.5	10.1	11.0	16.5	109	62.4	3.6

Rules without Racial or Ethnic Bias

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	52.6	26.9	12.8	4.5	3.2	156	79.5	4.2
Bates	41.6	36.1	17.1	2.3	2.9	310	77.7	4.1
Caldwell	61.9	28.7	6.5	1.3	1.6	307	90.6	4.5
Calloway	34.6	31.5	19.0	8.4	6.5	321	66.1	3.8
Clark	21.9	11.9	18.4	17.6	30.3	370	33.8	2.8
Daniel	68.1	20.0	8.8	2.5	0.6	160	88.1	4.5
Erwin	50.3	31.6	11.0	3.2	3.9	155	81.9	4.2
Jackson	44.6	35.1	9.5	6.8	4.1	148	79.7	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	20.8	24.2	11.4	10.7	32.9	149	45.0	2.9
Kelley	40.9	28.0	15.7	5.5	9.8	254	68.9	3.8
McDonald	50.9	31.0	9.9	3.5	4.7	342	81.9	4.2
Morvant	60.7	25.0	10.7	2.1	1.4	140	85.7	4.4
Welch	50.5	34.8	11.4	1.5	1.8	325	85.3	4.3
Bergeron	38.0	29.1	24.1	2.5	6.3	79	67.1	3.9
Morgan	48.2	34.1	11.8	3.5	2.4	85	82.3	4.2
Higginbotham	51.7	27.8	11.3	4.6	4.6	151	79.5	4.2
Lassalle	51.8	31.4	12.4	2.9	1.5	137	83.2	4.3
LaVergne	40.6	35.7	9.1	4.9	9.8	143	76.3	3.9
Luse	63.6	26.4	5.0	1.4	3.6	140	90.0	4.5
Richey	66.3	27.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	104	94.2	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	29.9	19.5	19.5	5.2	26.0	77	49.4	3.2
Alexander	42.8	30.8	15.1	3.8	7.5	159	73.6	4.0
Davis	49.1	35.2	9.3	1.9	4.6	108	84.3	4.2
Ponder	61.5	23.9	7.3	5.4	2.0	205	85.4	4.4
Wall	63.7	29.3	5.1	1.3	0.6	157	93.0	4.5
White	43.3	33.7	10.6	5.8	6.7	104	77.0	4.0
Engelsman	45.7	28.3	21.7	2.2	2.2	46	74.0	4.1
Myles	36.4	30.3	18.2	3.0	12.1	33	66.7	3.8
Brady	57.3	33.7	7.9	1.1	0.0	89	91.0	4.5
Parker	55.9	22.9	11.7	3.7	5.9	188	78.8	4.2
Polozola	53.7	24.9	11.8	3.1	6.6	229	78.6	4.2
Tyson	61.9	25.9	9.4	2.9	0.0	139	87.8	4.5
Dalby	58.3	28.2	9.7	1.9	1.9	103	86.5	4.4
Noland	56.5	31.5	7.1	3.3	1.6	184	88.0	4.4
Reidlinger	67.7	23.4	6.8	1.0	1.0	192	91.1	4.6
Phillips	56.1	18.7	9.3	4.7	11.2	107	74.8	4.0

Rules without Gender Bias

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	54.5	27.6	12.2	3.8	1.9	156	82.1	4.3
Bates	37.4	37.1	16	4.2	5.4	313	74.5	4.0
Caldwell	62.6	28.9	6.2	0.3	2.0	305	91.5	4.5
Calloway	39.9	36.2	18.2	2.5	3.1	318	76.1	4.1
Clark	27.2	23.3	22.5	9.4	17.5	360	50.5	3.3
Daniel	68.5	21.6	7.4	1.2	1.2	162	90.1	4.5
Erwin	52.6	26.6	13.6	5.2	1.9	154	79.2	4.2
Jackson	50.0	32.4	11.5	4.1	2.0	148	82.4	4.2
Johnson, D.R.	33.6	25.2	16.8	9.1	15.4	143	58.8	3.5
Kelley	44.6	30.7	13.9	4.0	6.8	251	75.3	4.0
McDonald	52.8	33.0	8.0	2.7	3.5	339	85.8	4.3
Morvant	63.0	24.6	10.9	0.7	0.7	138	87.6	4.5
Welch	51.5	35.6	9.5	1.5	1.8	326	87.1	4.3
Bergeron	41.0	25.6	20.5	5.1	7.7	78	66.6	3.9
Morgan	52.4	32.1	10.7	1.2	3.6	84	84.5	4.3
Higginbotham	48.1	18.8	14.9	7.8	10.4	154	66.9	3.9
Lassalle	46.8	23.7	15.8	7.9	5.8	139	70.5	4.0
LaVergne	42.5	25.3	16.4	4.8	11.0	146	67.8	3.8
Luse	62.0	25.4	3.5	4.2	4.9	142	87.4	4.4
Richey	68.9	24.3	2.9	1.9	1.9	103	93.2	4.6
Johnson, P.T.	34.2	27.6	17.1	0.0	21.1	76	61.8	3.5
Alexander	45.6	31.9	13.8	1.9	6.9	160	77.5	4.1
Davis	52.3	34.9	6.4	2.8	3.7	109	87.2	4.3
Ponder	64.1	22.8	6.8	3.9	2.4	206	86.9	4.4
Wall	66.9	28.0	4.5	0.0	0.6	157	94.9	4.6
White	50.5	29.5	8.6	3.8	7.6	105	80.0	4.1
Engelsman	45.7	32.6	19.6	0.0	2.2	46	78.3	4.2
Myles	46.9	21.9	15.6	9.4	6.3	32	68.8	3.9
Brady	59.8	29.9	9.2	1.1	0.0	87	89.7	4.5
Parker	56.1	23.5	11.8	3.7	4.8	187	79.6	4.2
Polozola	56.6	23.7	11.0	1.8	7.0	228	80.3	4.2
Tyson	63.6	27.9	8.6	0.0	0.0	140	91.5	4.6
Dalby	60.6	25.0	10.6	2.9	1.0	104	85.6	4.4
Noland	53.8	31.3	7.7	3.8	3.3	182	85.1	4.3
Reidlinger	68.2	22.9	6.3	1.6	1.0	192	91.1	4.6
Phillips	57.5	17.0	8.5	6.6	10.4	106	74.5	4.0

Knowledge of Recent Legal Developments

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	33.8	36.6	22.5	4.2	2.8	142	70.4	3.9
Bates	17.3	34	35.9	8.2	4.6	329	51.3	3.5
Caldwell	52.6	39.3	6.5	0.9	0.6	321	91.9	4.4
Calloway	11.8	26.7	40.6	13.3	7.6	330	38.5	3.2
Clark	23.9	29.8	26.3	10.8	9.1	372	53.7	3.5
Daniel	63.8	30.2	4.7	1.3	0.0	149	94.0	4.6
Erwin	29.3	41.3	24.0	3.3	2.0	150	70.6	3.9
Jackson	48.2	40.9	8.8	1.5	0.7	137	89.1	4.3
Johnson, D.R.	18.7	32.1	21.6	12.7	14.9	134	50.8	3.3
Kelley	33.3	38.8	18.1	7.2	2.5	237	72.1	3.9
McDonald	40.8	46.9	8.7	2.6	0.9	343	87.7	4.2
Morvant	57.4	30.2	10.9	0.8	0.8	129	87.6	4.4
Welch	32.8	45.5	16.7	3.1	1.9	323	78.3	4.0
Bergeron	18.3	28.0	34.1	11.0	8.5	82	46.3	3.4
Morgan	47.6	35.7	8.3	3.6	4.8	84	83.3	4.2
Higginbotham	27.1	35.5	25.8	5.2	6.5	155	62.6	3.7
Lassalle	45.1	38.0	9.9	3.5	3.5	142	83.1	4.2
LaVergne	31.1	35.8	19.6	7.4	6.1	148	66.9	3.8
Luse	46.3	34.6	15.4	2.2	1.5	136	80.9	4.2
Richey	67.3	26.0	3.8	1.0	1.9	104	93.3	4.6
Johnson, P.T.	28.6	16.9	24.7	14.3	15.6	77	45.5	3.3
Alexander	24.2	28.0	32.3	9.9	5.6	161	52.2	3.6
Davis	21.0	41.9	25.7	6.7	4.8	105	62.9	3.7
Ponder	47.1	33.8	15.7	1.0	2.5	204	80.9	4.2
Wall	50.0	38.2	10.5	1.3	0.0	152	88.2	4.4
White	19.6	39.2	23.5	9.8	7.8	102	58.8	3.5
Engelsman	31.0	47.6	14.3	4.8	2.4	42	78.6	4.0
Myles	21.2	48.5	15.2	6.1	9.1	33	69.7	3.7
Brady	43.0	35.5	15.0	5.6	0.9	107	78.5	4.1
Parker	54.7	28.1	12.5	1.6	3.1	192	82.8	4.3
Polozola	63.9	24.5	7.1	2.5	2.1	241	88.4	4.5
Tyson	51.0	32.2	12.6	1.4	2.8	143	83.2	4.3
Dalby	41.8	37.3	13.6	5.5	1.8	110	79.1	4.1
Noland	28.6	34.9	27.1	6.3	3.1	192	63.5	3.8
Reidlinger	63.2	26.4	9.0	0.5	1.0	201	89.6	4.5
Phillips	72.5	17.4	3.7	2.8	3.7	109	89.9	4.5

Knowledge and Application of Rules of Evidence

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	36.9	30.5	26.2	3.5	2.8	141	67.4	3.9
Bates	20.6	35.8	30.5	9.7	3.4	321	56.4	3.6
Caldwell	51.7	38.4	7.1	2.2	0.6	323	90.1	4.4
Calloway	10.8	31.0	36.2	14.2	7.7	323	41.8	3.2
Clark	22.1	24.8	26.7	15.9	10.5	371	46.9	3.3
Daniel	59.7	32.9	6.7	0.7	0.0	149	92.6	4.5
Erwin	34.9	39.6	18.1	7.4	0.0	149	74.5	4.0
Jackson	45.7	42.8	9.4	1.4	0.7	138	88.5	4.3
Johnson, D.R.	16.4	35.1	23.1	11.2	14.2	134	51.5	3.3
Kelley	33.9	36.4	18.8	8.4	2.5	239	70.3	3.9
McDonald	42.9	43.8	10.0	2.4	0.9	340	86.7	4.3
Morvant	54.7	32.8	9.4	0.8	2.3	128	87.5	4.4
Welch	37.6	41.3	15.8	3.7	1.6	322	78.9	4.1
Bergeron	18.4	25.0	35.5	14.5	6.6	76	43.4	3.3
Morgan	41.6	39.0	11.7	2.6	5.2	77	80.6	4.1
Higginbotham	20.4	37.5	25.7	9.2	7.2	152	57.9	3.5
Lassalle	36.0	38.1	18.0	4.3	3.6	139	74.1	4.0
LaVergne	30.6	34.7	21.5	6.3	6.9	144	65.3	3.8
Luse	43.0	39.3	11.9	4.4	1.5	135	82.3	4.2
Richey	62.1	31.1	2.9	1.0	2.9	103	93.2	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	25.0	23.7	22.4	14.5	14.5	76	48.7	3.3
Alexander	25.3	31.0	27.2	10.8	5.7	158	56.3	3.6
Davis	20.6	34.6	31.8	10.3	2.8	107	55.2	3.6
Ponder	48.5	33.5	11.7	3.4	2.9	206	82.0	4.2
Wall	52.7	39.3	6.0	2.0	0.0	150	92.0	4.4
White	20.6	38.2	23.5	7.8	9.8	102	58.8	3.5
Engelsman	27.9	51.2	14.0	4.7	2.3	43	79.1	4.0
Myles	24.2	45.5	12.1	9.1	9.1	33	69.7	3.7
Brady	38.1	41.0	13.3	4.8	2.9	105	79.1	4.1
Parker	54.7	30.0	10.0	2.6	2.6	190	84.7	4.3
Polozola	61.9	25.4	8.5	1.3	3.0	236	87.3	4.4
Tyson	52.5	29.1	15.6	2.1	0.7	141	81.6	4.3
Dalby	42.7	36.9	14.6	4.9	1.0	103	79.6	4.2
Noland	27.7	37.5	26.1	6.0	2.7	184	65.2	3.8
Reidlinger	59.7	27.0	10.2	2.0	1.0	196	86.7	4.4
Phillips	58.2	21.8	10.9	3.6	5.5	110	80.0	4.2

Knowledge and Application of Rules of Procedure

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	39.2	33.6	21.0	2.1	4.2	143	72.8	4.0
Bates	22.0	36.3	30.1	8.4	3.1	322	58.3	3.7
Caldwell	53.7	38.2	5.3	2.5	0.3	322	91.9	4.4
Calloway	13.1	30.3	37.3	12.2	7.0	327	43.4	3.3
Clark	22.7	25.9	22.5	16.0	12.8	374	48.6	3.3
Daniel	58.7	32.7	7.3	1.3	0.0	150	91.4	4.5
Erwin	32.9	42.3	18.8	6.0	0.0	149	75.2	4.0
Jackson	47.5	43.9	5.8	2.2	0.7	139	91.4	4.4
Johnson, D.R.	15.3	33.6	23.7	12.2	15.3	131	48.9	3.2
Kelley	34.9	36.6	18.9	7.6	2.1	238	71.5	3.9
McDonald	45.7	44.0	7.3	2.1	0.9	341	89.7	4.3
Morvant	55.5	34.4	7.8	0.8	1.6	128	89.9	4.4
Welch	39.3	41.1	14.4	3.7	1.5	326	80.4	4.1
Bergeron	17.9	29.5	34.6	12.8	5.1	78	47.4	3.4
Morgan	43.2	38.3	11.1	2.5	4.9	81	81.5	4.1
Higginbotham	20.9	33.3	30.7	6.5	8.5	153	54.2	3.5
Lassalle	35.5	39.1	18.1	3.6	3.6	138	74.6	4.0
LaVergne	32.2	32.9	21.0	5.6	8.4	143	65.1	3.8
Luse	42.2	41.5	11.1	2.2	3.0	135	83.7	4.2
Richey	61.8	30.4	2.9	2.0	2.9	102	92.2	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	23.0	23.0	21.6	13.5	18.9	74	46.0	3.2
Alexander	24.2	32.9	28.6	8.7	5.6	161	57.1	3.6
Davis	18.9	37.7	31.1	9.4	2.8	106	56.6	3.6
Ponder	48.8	34.1	10.2	3.9	2.9	205	82.9	4.2
Wall	51.7	40.4	7.3	0.7	0.0	151	92.1	4.4
White	20.6	37.3	25.5	7.8	8.8	102	57.9	3.5
Engelsman	21.4	54.8	19.0	2.4	2.4	42	76.2	3.9
Myles	24.2	45.5	15.2	3.0	12.1	33	69.7	3.7
Brady	39.6	41.5	10.4	5.7	2.8	106	81.1	4.1
Parker	59.9	24.5	9.4	3.6	2.6	192	84.4	4.4
Polozola	64.8	23.3	7.2	1.7	3.0	236	88.1	4.5
Tyson	50.0	33.6	13.6	1.4	1.4	140	83.6	4.3
Dalby	46.1	35.3	13.7	2.0	2.9	102	81.4	4.2
Noland	31.1	38.8	21.3	5.5	3.3	183	69.9	3.9
Reidlinger	61.5	26.7	8.7	2.1	1.0	195	88.2	4.5
Phillips	56.5	24.1	9.3	3.7	6.5	108	80.6	4.2

Clarity and Completeness of Written Rulings (percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	30.9	33.3	25.2	6.5	4.1	123	64.2	3.8
Bates	18.5	32.1	27.6	14.3	7.5	308	50.6	3.4
Caldwell	46.7	40.7	10.3	1.7	0.7	302	87.4	4.3
Calloway	11.7	23.9	35.6	18.1	10.7	309	35.6	3.1
Clark	19.8	24.6	22.7	16.7	16.1	353	44.4	3.2
Daniel	48.4	38.9	11.1	1.6	0.0	126	87.3	4.3
Erwin	33.9	37.0	26.8	2.4	0.0	127	70.9	4.0
Jackson	42.9	42.9	9.2	2.5	2.5	119	85.8	4.2
Johnson, D.R.	17.7	28.3	21.2	15.9	16.8	113	46.0	3.1
Kelley	37.5	35.2	17.1	6.5	3.7	216	72.7	4.0
McDonald	41.4	40.7	12.3	4.3	1.2	324	82.1	4.2
Morvant	51.9	36.1	11.1	0.0	0.9	108	88.0	4.4
Welch	34.7	42.2	16.2	4.9	1.9	308	76.9	4.0
Bergeron	18.3	26.8	32.4	12.7	9.9	71	45.1	3.3
Morgan	41.1	42.5	6.8	5.5	4.1	73	83.6	4.1
Higginbotham	26.8	33.3	29.7	4.3	5.8	138	60.1	3.7
Lassalle	34.1	37.3	20.6	6.3	1.6	126	71.4	4.0
LaVergne	23.8	33.8	20.8	10.8	10.8	130	57.6	3.5
Luse	43.2	33.6	16.8	4.8	1.6	125	76.8	4.1
Richey	62.9	25.8	6.2	3.1	2.1	97	88.7	4.4
Johnson, P.T.	25.0	16.2	23.5	16.2	19.1	68	41.2	3.1
Alexander	23.7	31.9	30.4	8.1	5.9	135	55.6	3.6
Davis	22.0	45.1	23.1	6.6	3.3	91	67.1	3.8
Ponder	45.6	36.1	11.7	2.8	3.9	180	81.7	4.2
Wall	48.8	36.4	11.6	3.1	0.0	129	85.2	4.3
White	26.7	31.1	26.7	6.7	8.9	90	57.8	3.6
Engelsman	21.6	51.4	21.6	2.7	2.7	37	73.0	3.9
Myles	25.8	45.2	12.9	3.2	12.9	31	71.0	3.7
Brady	37.5	39.6	14.6	6.3	2.1	96	77.1	4.0
Parker	46.8	30.6	14.0	5.9	2.7	186	77.4	4.1
Polozola	48.3	34.6	9.8	3.8	3.4	234	82.9	4.2
Tyson	46.3	33.8	13.2	5.1	1.5	136	80.1	4.2
Dalby	41.9	37.1	12.4	3.8	4.8	105	79.0	4.1
Noland	29.0	35.5	24.0	6.6	4.9	183	64.5	3.8
Reidlinger	59.3	26.8	10.8	2.1	1.0	115	86.1	4.4
Phillips	49.0	25.5	10.8	3.9	10.8	102	74.5	4.0

Adequacy and Clarity of Instructions to Jurors

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	33.6	38.1	21.2	2.7	4.4	113	71.7	3.9
Bates	22.7	37.7	30	5	4.5	220	60.4	3.7
Caldwell	47.7	41.3	9.6	0.9	0.5	218	89.0	4.3
Calloway	15.0	33.5	37.4	8.8	5.3	227	48.5	3.4
Clark	27.7	26.6	23.4	12.4	9.9	274	54.3	3.5
Daniel	51.3	38.3	10.4	0.0	0.0	115	89.6	4.4
Erwin	32.8	43.7	18.5	4.2	0.8	119	76.5	4.0
Jackson	52.2	34.5	11.5	0.9	0.9	113	86.7	4.4
Johnson, D.R.	21.2	27.9	28.8	12.5	9.6	104	49.1	3.4
Kelley	37.0	40.5	16.2	4.0	2.3	173	77.5	4.1
McDonald	43.6	42.0	11.2	2.0	1.2	250	85.6	4.2
Morvant	51.6	36.8	10.5	1.1	0.0	95	88.4	4.4
Welch	40.5	43.5	12.1	3.0	0.9	232	84.0	4.2
Bergeron	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morgan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Higginbotham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lassalle	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LaVergne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Luse	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Richey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson, P.T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alexander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Davis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ponder	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wall	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Engelsman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Myles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brady	44.1	39.7	11.8	4.4	0.0	68	83.8	4.2
Parker	48.6	30.0	15.7	1.4	4.3	140	78.6	4.2
Polozola	51.2	28.5	14.5	1.7	4.1	172	79.7	4.2
Tyson	51.9	31.1	15.1	1.9	0.0	106	83.0	4.3
Dalby	43.8	35.9	15.6	3.1	1.6	64	79.7	4.2
Noland	31.6	34.2	27.2	4.4	2.6	114	65.8	3.9
Reidlinger	58.5	24.4	12.2	2.4	2.4	123	82.9	4.3
Phillips	64.2	17.0	9.4	1.9	7.5	53	81.2	4.3

Understanding of Complex Legal Issues

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	35.1	29.9	23.9	6.7	4.5	134	65.0	3.8
Bates	16.6	28.8	30.1	13.8	10.7	319	45.4	3.3
Caldwell	51.3	36.7	8.5	2.2	1.3	316	88.0	4.3
Calloway	9.4	17.9	37.1	20.4	15.1	318	27.3	2.9
Clark	20.8	24.6	23.0	16.8	14.9	370	45.4	3.2
Daniel	60.8	31.8	4.7	1.4	1.4	148	92.6	4.5
Erwin	31.7	35.9	24.6	6.3	1.4	142	67.6	3.9
Jackson	48.9	38.0	9.5	2.2	1.5	137	86.9	4.3
Johnson, D.R.	16.3	25.2	24.4	13.8	20.3	123	41.5	3.0
Kelley	37.8	30.7	17.6	9.7	4.2	238	68.5	3.9
McDonald	42.3	39.9	12.8	3.3	1.8	336	82.2	4.2
Morvant	56.5	31.5	10.5	0.8	0.8	124	88.0	4.4
Welch	31.0	40.2	19.8	5.9	3.1	323	71.2	3.9
Bergeron	15.6	35.1	19.5	13.0	16.9	77	50.7	3.2
Morgan	42.7	37.3	12.0	2.7	5.3	75	80.0	4.1
Higginbotham	19.2	31.8	30.5	8.6	9.9	151	51.0	3.4
Lassalle	37.1	32.6	19.7	6.8	3.8	132	69.7	3.9
LaVergne	21.7	35.5	21.7	11.6	9.4	138	57.2	3.5
Luse	42.5	37.8	15.0	3.1	1.6	127	80.3	4.2
Richey	69.7	22.2	4.0	1.0	3.0	99	91.9	4.5
Johnson, P.T.	25.0	16.7	23.6	13.9	20.8	72	41.7	3.1
Alexander	21.9	30.5	27.8	9.9	9.9	151	52.4	3.4
Davis	17.5	40.8	25.2	12.6	3.9	103	58.3	3.6
Ponder	44.2	34.0	13.7	3.6	4.6	197	78.2	4.1
Wall	51.0	35.4	10.2	2.0	1.4	147	86.4	4.3
White	23.5	30.6	22.4	12.2	11.2	98	54.1	3.4
Engelsman	27.9	37.2	23.3	9.3	2.3	43	65.1	3.8
Myles	25.0	37.5	18.8	6.3	12.5	32	62.5	3.6
Brady	36.9	39.8	15.5	2.9	4.9	103	76.7	4.0
Parker	52.4	28.3	12.6	2.1	4.7	191	80.7	4.2
Polozola	59.0	26.1	7.3	4.3	3.4	234	85.1	4.3
Tyson	48.9	31.7	13.7	4.3	1.4	139	80.6	4.2
Dalby	38.1	38.1	16.2	4.8	2.9	105	76.2	4.0
Noland	22.1	34.2	28.9	9.5	5.3	190	56.3	3.6
Reidlinger	58.2	28.6	9.7	2.0	1.5	196	86.8	4.4
Phillips	61.1	24.1	3.7	3.7	7.4	108	85.2	4.3

Starts Proceedings on Time

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	34.5	33.8	15.5	10.6	5.6	142	68.3	3.8
Bates	13.6	21.1	28.5	18.9	18	323	34.7	2.9
Caldwell	59.3	34.0	5.6	0.3	0.9	324	93.3	4.5
Calloway	29.1	34.9	19.9	10.1	6.1	327	64.0	3.7
Clark	18.2	20.9	22.2	20.1	18.7	369	39.1	3.0
Daniel	68.9	22.5	6.6	1.3	0.7	151	91.4	4.6
Erwin	26.6	32.9	29.4	9.1	2.1	143	59.5	3.7
Jackson	32.2	27.3	21.0	11.2	8.4	143	59.5	3.6
Johnson, D.R.	50.0	21.5	8.5	13.1	6.9	130	71.5	3.9
Kelley	46.0	37.7	11.7	3.3	1.3	239	83.7	4.2
McDonald	35.6	45.0	15.0	3.5	0.9	340	80.6	4.1
Morvant	54.3	29.1	13.4	3.1	0.0	127	83.4	4.3
Welch	42.9	39.5	15.2	1.5	0.9	329	82.4	4.2
Bergeron	30.8	29.5	23.1	7.7	9.0	78	60.3	3.7
Morgan	51.3	33.3	7.7	2.6	5.1	78	84.6	4.2
Higginbotham	28.3	38.2	16.4	9.9	7.2	152	66.5	3.7
Lassalle	38.7	34.3	16.1	4.4	6.6	137	73.0	3.9
LaVergne	37.3	31.0	17.6	5.6	8.5	142	68.3	3.8
Luse	43.2	41.7	12.1	1.5	1.5	132	84.9	4.2
Richey	34.0	26.2	22.3	9.7	7.8	103	60.2	3.7
Johnson, P.T.	30.7	24.0	17.3	10.7	17.3	75	54.7	3.4
Alexander	13.4	19.5	20.7	19.5	26.8	164	32.9	2.7
Davis	41.6	41.6	13.3	1.8	1.8	113	83.2	4.2
Ponder	61.7	26.8	7.7	1.9	1.9	209	88.5	4.4
Wall	54.2	34.6	7.8	2.0	1.3	153	88.8	4.4
White	27.6	33.3	20.0	5.7	13.3	105	60.9	3.6
Engelsman	42.2	35.6	15.6	4.4	2.2	45	77.8	4.1
Myles	25.0	40.6	21.9	3.1	9.4	32	65.6	3.7
Brady	53.4	36.9	7.8	1.9	0.0	103	90.3	4.4
Parker	64.7	23.5	8.6	0.5	2.7	187	88.2	4.5
Polozola	59.1	28.9	8.1	1.7	2.1	235	88.0	4.4
Tyson	61.7	24.1	10.6	2.1	1.4	141	85.8	4.4
Dalby	58.5	29.2	10.4	0.9	0.9	106	87.7	4.4
Noland	50.5	33.0	11.7	2.1	2.7	188	83.5	4.3
Reidlinger	71.9	21.9	4.6	0.5	1.0	196	93.8	4.6
Phillips	40.2	32.7	11.2	8.4	7.5	107	72.9	3.9

Level of Preparation for Proceedings

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	36.2	34.0	19.9	5.7	4.3	141	70.2	3.9
Bates	17.1	28.7	26.8	15.5	11.9	328	45.8	3.2
Caldwell	57.6	34.7	6.2	0.6	0.9	323	92.3	4.5
Calloway	19.4	34.5	28.5	11.8	5.8	330	53.9	3.5
Clark	21.1	25.7	23.3	15.5	14.4	374	46.8	3.2
Daniel	60.1	30.1	9.2	0.7	0.0	153	90.2	4.5
Erwin	27.7	30.5	31.2	9.2	1.4	141	58.2	3.7
Jackson	39.7	42.6	12.8	3.5	1.4	141	82.3	4.2
Johnson, D.R.	20.2	38.0	19.4	9.3	13.2	129	58.2	3.4
Kelley	42.7	40.6	10.5	4.6	1.7	239	83.3	4.2
McDonald	42.2	45.2	9.1	2.3	1.2	341	87.4	4.2
Morvant	57.7	32.3	9.2	0.8	0.0	130	90.0	4.5
Welch	39.0	38.7	16.6	3.9	1.8	331	77.7	4.1
Bergeron	18.2	32.5	24.7	11.7	13.0	77	50.7	3.3
Morgan	43.6	42.3	7.7	1.3	5.1	78	85.9	4.2
Higginbotham	21.7	42.1	19.7	9.2	7.2	152	63.8	3.6
Lassalle	30.6	41.0	17.2	6.7	4.5	134	71.6	3.9
LaVergne	27.5	38.4	16.7	9.4	8.0	138	65.9	3.7
Luse	39.2	41.5	14.6	2.3	2.3	130	80.7	4.1
Richey	62.1	28.2	4.9	1.0	3.9	103	90.3	4.4
Johnson, P.T.	20.0	29.3	17.3	16.0	17.3	75	49.3	3.2
Alexander	21.3	28.8	27.5	13.8	8.8	160	50.1	3.4
Davis	32.1	42.0	20.5	3.6	1.8	112	74.1	4.0
Ponder	55.6	30.2	9.8	2.4	2.0	205	85.8	4.4
Wall	52.7	36.0	9.3	2.0	0.0	150	88.7	4.4
White	27.5	31.4	24.5	8.8	7.8	102	58.9	3.6
Engelsman	36.4	38.6	18.2	4.5	2.3	44	75.0	4.0
Myles	25.0	37.5	25.0	3.1	9.4	32	62.5	3.7
Brady	52.4	32.0	10.7	4.9	0.0	103	84.4	4.3
Parker	52.4	31.9	10.8	2.2	2.7	185	84.3	4.3
Polozola	59.6	29.4	7.7	0.9	2.6	235	89.0	4.4
Tyson	52.9	30.4	12.3	3.6	0.7	138	83.3	4.3
Dalby	51.9	33.7	8.7	2.9	2.9	104	85.6	4.3
Noland	36.4	35.8	19.8	6.4	1.6	187	72.2	4.0
Reidlinger	67.5	24.4	6.6	0.5	1.0	197	91.9	4.6
Phillips	58.7	22.1	10.6	3.8	4.8	104	80.8	4.3

Avoids Keeping Cases under Advisement for Too Long

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	39.5	37.2	17.8	3.9	1.6	129	76.7	4.1
Bates	14.0	26.4	22.1	16.9	20.5	307	40.4	3.0
Caldwell	52.6	36.8	8.9	1.0	0.7	302	89.4	4.4
Calloway	19.4	35.9	29.9	9.5	5.3	304	55.3	3.5
Clark	18.4	20.2	26.5	18.4	16.4	347	38.6	3.1
Daniel	54.7	33.8	9.4	2.2	0.0	139	88.5	4.4
Erwin	33.3	43.9	18.9	3.0	0.8	132	77.2	4.1
Jackson	39.8	46.1	11.7	1.6	0.8	128	85.9	4.2
Johnson, D.R.	24.6	41.5	13.6	11.9	8.5	118	66.1	3.6
Kelley	38.8	43.5	13.1	2.8	1.9	214	82.3	4.1
McDonald	35.4	40.4	13.8	5.6	4.7	319	75.8	4.0
Morvant	54.4	35.1	10.5	0.0	0.0	114	89.5	4.4
Welch	39.2	44.0	13.9	1.9	1.0	309	83.2	4.2
Bergeron	21.6	32.4	27.0	13.5	5.4	74	54.0	3.5
Morgan	38.9	43.1	12.5	0.0	5.6	72	82.0	4.1
Higginbotham	25.2	37.4	18.7	9.4	9.4	139	62.6	3.6
Lassalle	35.8	35.8	12.2	9.8	6.5	123	71.6	3.8
LaVergne	29.5	36.4	14.4	11.4	8.3	132	65.9	3.7
Luse	41.6	39.2	13.6	4.0	1.6	125	80.8	4.2
Richey	56.6	26.3	11.1	4.0	2.0	99	82.9	4.3
Johnson, P.T.	21.4	27.1	20.0	17.1	14.3	70	48.5	3.2
Alexander	26.6	37.4	22.3	7.2	6.5	139	64.0	3.7
Davis	35.6	48.5	10.9	4.0	1.0	101	84.1	4.1
Ponder	53.5	31.6	11.2	1.6	2.1	187	85.1	4.3
Wall	49.6	37.6	10.6	2.1	0.0	141	87.2	4.3
White	33.3	32.3	24.0	4.2	6.3	96	65.6	3.8
Engelsman	35.7	50.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	42	85.7	4.1
Myles	30.3	42.4	12.1	3.0	12.1	33	72.7	3.8
Brady	41.6	35.6	14.9	3.0	5.0	101	77.2	4.1
Parker	39.7	30.2	17.3	4.5	8.4	179	69.9	3.9
Polozola	40.1	26.4	18.1	5.7	9.7	227	66.5	3.8
Tyson	44.4	21.5	15.3	9.0	9.7	144	65.9	3.8
Dalby	45.1	29.4	18.6	2.9	3.9	102	74.5	4.1
Noland	33.0	30.2	27.9	5.6	3.4	179	63.2	3.8
Reidlinger	56.7	29.4	10.7	1.6	1.6	187	86.1	4.4
Phillips	41.2	20.6	12.7	6.9	18.6	102	61.8	3.6

Promptness in Making Rules

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	43.2	36.0	18.0	0.7	2.2	139	79.2	4.2
Bates	15.4	28.2	24.5	16.3	15.7	319	43.6	3.1
Caldwell	54.4	35.2	9.4	0.6	0.3	318	89.6	4.4
Calloway	23.2	36.5	26.3	9.2	4.8	315	59.7	3.6
Clark	20.3	21.4	25.5	17.5	15.3	365	41.7	3.1
Daniel	57.7	31.0	9.9	1.4	0.0	142	88.7	4.5
Erwin	38.4	41.3	18.1	2.2	0.0	138	79.7	4.2
Jackson	44.1	41.9	11.0	2.2	0.7	136	86.0	4.3
Johnson, D.R.	26.2	39.3	16.4	8.2	9.8	122	65.5	3.6
Kelley	42.2	40.4	12.0	4.0	1.3	225	82.6	4.2
McDonald	36.9	42.6	12.6	4.5	3.3	333	79.5	4.1
Morvant	55.6	30.2	13.5	0.8	0.0	126	85.8	4.4
Welch	42.1	41.4	14.0	1.6	0.9	321	83.5	4.2
Bergeron	24.7	28.6	27.3	13.0	6.5	77	53.3	3.5
Morgan	40.8	43.4	9.2	1.3	5.3	76	84.2	4.1
Higginbotham	27.0	34.5	23.6	10.1	4.7	148	61.5	3.7
Lassalle	39.2	36.2	10.0	9.2	5.4	130	75.4	3.9
LaVergne	31.9	39.3	13.3	8.9	6.7	135	71.2	3.8
Luse	42.6	38.8	12.4	4.7	1.6	129	81.4	4.2
Richey	56.0	29.0	10.0	3.0	2.0	100	85.0	4.3
Johnson, P.T.	23.9	26.8	18.3	15.5	15.5	71	50.7	3.3
Alexander	26.7	35.3	24.0	7.3	6.7	150	62.0	3.7
Davis	33.7	47.1	12.5	5.8	1.0	104	80.8	4.1
Ponder	55.3	30.7	10.6	1.5	2.0	199	86.0	4.4
Wall	50.7	38.4	8.9	2.1	0.0	146	89.1	4.4
White	31.6	33.7	26.5	3.1	5.1	98	65.3	3.8
Engelsman	39.5	39.5	16.3	2.3	2.3	43	79.0	4.1
Myles	26.5	41.2	14.7	2.9	14.7	34	67.7	3.6
Brady	43.7	35.0	15.5	1.9	3.9	103	78.7	4.1
Parker	38.7	30.1	19.9	5.4	5.9	186	68.8	3.9
Polozola	41.2	25.3	18.0	7.3	8.2	233	66.5	3.8
Tyson	45.8	20.8	16.7	9.7	6.9	144	66.6	3.9
Dalby	45.2	25.0	21.2	4.8	3.8	104	70.2	4.0
Noland	33.2	30.4	26.6	6.5	3.3	184	63.6	3.8
Reidlinger	57.3	29.2	9.4	2.6	1.6	192	86.5	4.4
Phillips	44.3	19.8	13.2	6.6	16.0	106	64.1	3.7

Efficiency in Managing Caseload

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	38.1	34.5	20.9	2.9	3.6	139	72.6	4.0
Bates	12.8	26	28.5	18.3	14.4	312	38.8	3.0
Caldwell	49.2	41.8	6.8	1.9	0.3	311	91.0	4.4
Calloway	15.9	26.9	25.9	18.4	12.8	320	42.8	3.1
Clark	21.8	21.3	26.4	16.6	13.9	367	43.1	3.2
Daniel	61.1	29.2	7.6	2.1	0.0	144	90.3	4.5
Erwin	42.3	30.3	24.6	2.1	0.7	142	72.6	4.1
Jackson	36.0	44.6	13.7	3.6	2.2	139	80.6	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	25.2	33.9	16.5	13.4	11.0	127	59.1	3.5
Kelley	38.1	40.3	14.7	4.8	2.2	231	78.4	4.1
McDonald	37.9	43.7	13.5	3.4	1.5	327	81.6	4.1
Morvant	55.0	28.7	14.7	0.8	0.8	129	83.7	4.4
Welch	42.7	39.5	15.9	1.3	0.6	314	82.2	4.2
Bergeron	16.2	33.8	31.1	9.5	9.5	74	50.0	3.4
Morgan	37.3	42.7	14.7	0.0	5.3	75	80.0	4.1
Higginbotham	28.1	34.2	24.0	6.2	7.5	146	62.3	3.7
Lassalle	34.6	39.8	12.0	8.3	5.3	133	74.4	3.9
LaVergne	29.9	37.2	19.0	8.0	5.8	137	67.1	3.8
Luse	42.6	43.4	10.1	3.1	0.8	129	86.0	4.2
Richey	46.6	35.0	10.7	3.9	3.9	103	81.6	4.2
Johnson, P.T.	23.6	25.0	19.4	12.5	19.4	72	48.6	3.2
Alexander	25.3	29.2	24.7	13.0	7.8	154	54.5	3.5
Davis	33.6	42.1	18.7	3.7	1.9	107	75.7	4.0
Ponder	59.6	27.8	9.1	2.0	1.5	198	87.4	4.4
Wall	51.0	37.6	8.7	2.7	0.0	149	88.6	4.4
White	32.0	31.1	23.3	7.8	5.8	103	63.1	3.8
Engelsman	43.2	34.1	15.9	4.5	2.3	44	77.3	4.1
Myles	25.0	43.8	15.6	6.3	9.4	32	68.8	3.7
Brady	43.3	35.1	17.5	3.1	1.0	97	78.4	4.2
Parker	44.9	24.7	16.9	7.3	6.2	178	69.6	3.9
Polozola	40.6	26.2	19.7	5.2	8.3	229	66.8	3.9
Tyson	43.2	28.8	15.8	7.9	4.3	139	72.0	4.0
Dalby	51.0	28.4	13.7	2.0	4.9	102	79.4	4.2
Noland	37.8	32.2	22.2	3.3	4.4	180	70.0	4.0
Reidlinger	59.9	29.7	6.8	2.6	1.0	192	89.6	4.4
Phillips	46.2	23.1	17.3	4.8	8.7	104	69.3	3.9

Accessible and Present During Working Hours

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	51.4	25.4	16.2	2.8	4.2	142	76.8	4.2
Bates	17.6	28.6	21.4	17.9	14.5	318	46.2	3.2
Caldwell	52.7	36.5	7.3	2.9	0.6	315	89.2	4.4
Calloway	26.2	36.8	22.4	10.0	4.7	321	63.0	3.7
Clark	25.5	22.2	24.1	17.1	11.1	369	47.7	3.3
Daniel	58.2	30.8	10.3	0.7	0.0	146	89.0	4.5
Erwin	37.5	25.7	20.8	11.1	4.9	144	63.2	3.8
Jackson	37.9	38.6	17.9	4.3	1.4	140	76.5	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	23.2	32.8	20.0	15.2	8.8	125	56.0	3.5
Kelley	36.1	38.7	14.8	7.4	3.0	230	74.8	4.0
McDonald	47.5	36.3	11.8	3.5	0.9	339	83.8	4.3
Morvant	53.1	28.5	10.8	6.9	0.8	130	81.6	4.3
Welch	46.3	39.4	10.9	2.5	0.9	320	85.7	4.3
Bergeron	29.3	30.7	25.3	9.3	5.3	75	60.0	3.7
Morgan	56.4	29.5	9.0	0.0	5.1	78	85.9	4.3
Higginbotham	38.3	30.9	18.8	6.0	6.0	149	69.2	3.9
Lassalle	29.1	29.9	16.4	13.4	11.2	134	59.0	3.5
LaVergne	34.8	30.5	18.4	8.5	7.8	141	65.3	3.8
Luse	41.7	39.4	15.2	2.3	1.5	132	81.1	4.2
Richey	51.0	28.4	13.7	2.9	3.9	102	79.4	4.2
Johnson, P.T.	22.4	22.4	23.7	15.8	15.8	76	44.8	3.2
Alexander	19.6	27.5	30.1	9.8	13.1	153	47.1	3.3
Davis	33.6	39.3	22.4	2.8	1.9	107	72.9	4.0
Ponder	55.1	28.3	12.1	2.5	2.0	198	83.4	4.3
Wall	50.7	38.4	8.2	2.1	0.7	146	89.1	4.4
White	32.0	29.0	26.0	6.0	7.0	100	61.0	3.7
Engelsman	34.1	36.4	22.7	4.5	2.3	44	70.5	4.0
Myles	21.2	45.5	18.2	6.1	9.1	33	66.7	3.6
Brady	36.5	41.7	18.8	2.1	1.0	96	78.2	4.1
Parker	34.1	27.2	19.1	9.8	9.8	173	61.3	3.7
Polozola	35.8	28.4	17.4	9.2	9.2	218	64.2	3.7
Tyson	42.1	25.6	19.5	8.3	4.5	133	67.7	3.9
Dalby	48.5	28.7	15.8	5.9	1.0	101	77.2	4.2
Noland	37.0	34.8	20.7	3.3	4.3	386	71.8	4.0
Reidlinger	61.8	26.3	9.7	0.0	2.2	186	88.1	4.5
Phillips	42.0	17.0	21.0	9.0	11.0	100	59.0	3.7

Resourceful and Industrious Work Ethic

(percent)

Judge	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Anderson	50.0	24.6	16.9	4.9	3.5	142	74.6	4.1
Bates	14.0	24.5	26.1	17.5	17.8	314	38.5	3.0
Caldwell	56.6	35.2	5.7	1.9	0.6	318	91.8	4.5
Calloway	23.5	36.7	24.5	10.7	4.7	319	60.2	3.6
Clark	27.1	29.1	19.4	10.5	13.9	361	56.2	3.5
Daniel	66.0	25.3	7.3	1.3	0.0	150	91.3	4.6
Erwin	28.5	25.7	29.9	10.4	5.6	144	54.2	3.6
Jackson	41.0	38.1	14.4	5.8	0.7	139	79.1	4.1
Johnson, D.R.	23.6	29.1	21.3	10.2	15.7	127	52.7	3.3
Kelley	40.6	38.5	12.4	6.4	2.1	234	79.1	4.1
McDonald	47.5	37.9	9.0	4.2	1.5	335	85.4	4.3
Morvant	62.0	23.3	14.0	0.8	0.0	129	85.3	4.5
Welch	44.4	37.8	13.4	2.5	1.9	320	82.2	4.2
Bergeron	22.1	23.4	31.2	11.7	11.7	77	45.5	3.3
Morgan	58.5	22.0	12.2	0.0	7.3	82	80.5	4.2
Higginbotham	37.4	32.7	17.7	4.8	7.5	147	70.1	3.9
Lassalle	33.8	27.8	18.8	8.3	11.3	133	61.6	3.6
LaVergne	35.7	35.0	14.3	6.4	8.6	140	70.7	3.8
Luse	43.8	36.9	13.8	3.8	1.5	130	80.7	4.2
Richey	62.5	26.0	7.7	0.0	3.8	104	88.5	4.4
Johnson, P.T.	24.0	24.0	17.3	13.3	21.3	75	48.0	3.2
Alexander	20.8	31.2	21.4	14.9	11.7	154	52.0	3.3
Davis	38.5	37.6	15.6	6.4	1.8	109	76.1	4.0
Ponder	60.0	26.0	9.0	3.5	1.5	200	86.0	4.4
Wall	55.8	31.3	10.2	1.4	1.4	147	87.1	4.4
White	32.3	30.3	23.2	9.1	5.1	99	62.6	3.8
Engelsman	29.5	40.9	22.7	4.5	2.3	44	70.4	3.9
Myles	24.2	36.4	27.3	3.0	9.1	33	60.6	3.6
Brady	45.9	34.7	17.3	2.0	0.0	98	80.6	4.2
Parker	45.9	25.4	15.5	7.2	6.1	181	71.3	4.0
Polozola	56.2	26.1	8.8	3.5	5.3	226	82.3	4.2
Tyson	53.2	28.1	12.9	4.3	1.4	139	81.3	4.3
Dalby	53.5	28.7	11.9	3.0	3.0	101	82.2	4.3
Noland	34.8	35.9	19.9	6.1	3.3	181	70.7	3.9
Reidlinger	67.4	21.4	9.1	0.5	1.6	187	88.8	4.5
Phillips	50.9	21.7	9.4	8.5	9.4	106	72.6	4.0

Appendix 2

Judges

Anderson, Richard D.
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristic	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	54.5	32.9	8.4	2.4	1.8	167	87.4	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	45.3	36.5	11.3	4.4	2.5	159	81.8	4.2
Attentive during proceedings	48.4	33.3	11.3	3.8	3.1	159	81.7	4.2
Maintains dignified demeanor	54.3	33.3	8.6	1.9	1.9	162	87.6	4.4
Decisive	43.3	35.0	12.7	5.7	3.2	157	78.3	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	40.8	24.2	20.4	4.5	10.2	157	65.0	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	37.3	29.7	20.3	5.7	7.0	158	67.0	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by media	42.8	25.0	17.8	5.9	8.6	152	67.8	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	51.6	26.8	13.1	2.6	5.9	153	78.4	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	44.6	28.0	16.6	5.7	5.1	157	72.6	4.0
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	44.2	31.4	13.5	6.4	4.5	156	75.6	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	43.5	28.6	14.3	7.1	6.5	154	72.1	4.0
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	52.6	26.9	12.8	4.5	3.2	156	79.5	4.2
Rules without gender bias	54.5	27.6	12.2	3.8	1.9	156	82.1	4.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	33.8	36.6	22.5	4.2	2.8	142	70.4	3.9
Knowledge of rules of evidence	36.9	30.5	26.2	3.5	2.8	141	67.4	3.9
Knowledge of rules of procedure	39.2	33.6	21.0	2.1	4.2	143	72.8	4.0
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	30.9	33.3	25.2	6.5	4.1	123	64.2	3.8
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	33.6	38.1	21.2	2.7	4.4	113	71.7	3.9
Understanding of complex legal issues	35.1	29.9	23.9	6.7	4.5	134	65.0	3.8
Starts proceedings on time	34.5	33.8	15.5	10.6	5.6	142	68.3	3.8
Level of preparation for proceedings	36.2	34.0	19.9	5.7	4.3	141	70.2	3.9
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	39.5	37.2	17.8	3.9	1.6	129	76.7	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	43.2	36.0	18.0	0.7	2.2	139	79.2	4.2
Efficiency in managing caseload	38.1	34.5	20.9	2.9	3.6	139	72.6	4.0
Accessible and present during working hours	51.4	25.4	16.2	2.8	4.2	142	76.8	4.2
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	50.0	24.6	16.9	4.9	3.5	142	74.6	4.1

Bates, Kay

Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	49.1	37.3	8.4	3.2	2.0	346	86.4	4.3
Maintains control of the proceedings	29.5	38.8	23.0	6.2	2.9	339	68.3	3.9
Attentive during proceedings	29.0	36.7	22.5	8.9	3.0	338	65.7	3.8
Maintains dignified demeanor	32.0	37.0	18.6	6.8	5.6	338	69.0	3.8
Decisive	23.3	32.7	23.6	11.2	9.1	339	56.0	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	19.7	33.5	24.5	12.2	10.0	319	53.2	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	17.6	33.5	24.8	13.8	10.3	319	51.1	3.3
Outcomes not influenced by media	21.9	35.0	25.5	9.5	8.2	306	56.9	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	23.7	28.0	22.7	12.2	13.5	304	51.7	3.4
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	20.9	26.2	25.2	15.0	12.8	321	47.1	3.3
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	21.5	28.0	28.7	12.8	9.0	321	49.5	3.4
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	22.7	26.5	25.2	15.8	9.8	317	49.2	3.4
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	41.6	36.1	17.1	2.3	2.9	310	77.7	4.1
Rules without gender bias	37.4	37.1	16.0	4.2	5.4	313	74.5	4.0
Knowledge of recent legal developments	17.3	34.0	35.9	8.2	4.6	329	51.3	3.5
Knowledge of rules of evidence	20.6	35.8	30.5	9.7	3.4	321	56.4	3.6
Knowledge of rules of procedure	22.0	36.3	30.1	8.4	3.1	322	58.3	3.7
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	18.5	32.1	27.6	14.3	7.5	308	50.6	3.4
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	22.7	37.7	30.0	5.0	4.5	220	60.4	3.7
Understanding of complex legal issues	16.6	28.8	30.1	13.8	10.7	319	45.4	3.3
Starts proceedings on time	13.6	21.1	28.5	18.9	18.0	323	34.7	2.9
Level of preparation for proceedings	17.1	28.7	26.8	15.5	11.9	328	45.8	3.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	14.0	26.4	22.1	16.9	20.5	307	40.4	3.0
Promptness in making rulings	15.4	28.2	24.5	16.3	15.7	319	43.6	3.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	12.8	26.0	28.5	18.3	14.4	312	38.8	3.0
Accessible and present during working hours	17.6	28.6	21.4	17.9	14.5	318	46.2	3.2
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	14.0	24.5	26.1	17.5	17.8	314	38.5	3.0

Caldwell, R. Michael
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	63.3	23.2	10.4	1.8	1.2	327	86.5	4.5
Maintains control of the proceedings	61.7	29.9	6.9	0.6	0.9	321	91.6	4.5
Attentive during proceedings	68.0	28.9	5.9	0.3	0.9	322	96.9	4.7
Maintains dignified demeanor	68.6	24.8	5.6	0.0	0.9	322	93.4	4.6
Decisive	57.9	31.5	8.4	0.9	1.2	321	89.4	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	51.4	32.9	10.2	2.9	2.6	313	84.3	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	46.5	36.5	11.2	3.5	2.2	312	83.0	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by media	52.3	34.1	9.6	2.3	1.7	302	86.4	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	53.7	32.7	9.0	3.0	1.7	300	86.4	4.3
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	51.0	33.5	11.6	1.9	1.9	310	84.5	4.3
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	52.6	35.2	8.4	2.6	1.3	310	87.8	4.4
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	51.3	34.4	10.1	2.6	1.6	308	85.7	4.3
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	61.9	28.7	6.5	1.3	1.6	307	90.6	4.5
Rules without gender bias	62.6	28.9	6.2	0.3	2.0	305	91.5	4.5
Knowledge of recent legal developments	52.6	39.3	6.5	0.9	0.6	321	91.9	4.4
Knowledge of rules of evidence	51.7	38.4	7.1	2.2	0.6	323	90.1	4.4
Knowledge of rules of procedure	53.7	38.2	5.3	2.5	0.3	322	91.9	4.4
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	46.7	40.7	10.3	1.7	0.7	302	87.4	4.3
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	47.7	41.3	9.6	0.9	0.5	218	89.0	4.3
Understanding of complex legal issues	51.3	36.7	8.5	2.2	1.3	316	88.0	4.3
Starts proceedings on time	59.3	34.0	5.6	0.3	0.9	324	93.3	4.5
Level of preparation for proceedings	57.6	34.7	6.2	0.6	0.9	323	92.3	4.5
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	52.6	36.8	8.9	1.0	0.7	302	89.4	4.4
Promptness in making rulings	54.4	35.2	9.4	0.6	0.3	318	89.6	4.4
Efficiency in managing caseload	49.2	41.8	6.8	1.9	0.3	311	91.0	4.4
Accessible and present during working hours	52.7	36.5	7.3	2.9	0.6	315	89.2	4.4
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	56.6	35.2	5.7	1.9	0.6	318	91.8	4.5

Calloway, Curtis A.

Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	56.3	30.3	9.3	1.7	2.3	227	86.6	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	33.8	36.8	22.5	3.9	3.0	334	70.6	3.9
Attentive during proceedings	29.2	38.4	22.0	6.5	3.9	336	67.6	3.8
Maintains dignified demeanor	47.3	33.7	12.7	4.4	1.8	338	81.0	4.2
Decisive	19.9	28.4	34.1	11.5	6.0	331	48.3	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	26.1	32.6	29.5	5.9	5.9	322	58.7	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	23.6	34.3	27.4	8.8	6.0	318	57.9	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by media	26.5	36.6	24.9	5.8	6.1	309	63.1	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	28.6	37.3	21.4	6.2	6.5	308	65.9	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	29.4	35.6	21.9	8.4	4.7	320	65.0	3.8
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	22.9	31.3	29.8	11.3	4.7	319	54.2	3.6
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	26.4	35.1	23.0	9.3	6.2	322	61.5	3.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	34.6	31.5	19.0	8.4	6.5	321	66.1	3.8
Rules without gender bias	39.9	36.2	18.2	2.5	3.1	318	76.1	4.1
Knowledge of recent legal developments	11.8	26.7	40.6	13.3	7.6	330	38.5	3.2
Knowledge of rules of evidence	10.8	31.0	36.2	14.2	7.7	323	41.8	3.2
Knowledge of rules of procedure	13.1	30.3	37.3	12.2	7.0	327	43.4	3.3
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	11.7	23.9	35.6	18.1	10.7	309	35.6	3.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	15.0	33.5	37.4	8.8	5.3	227	48.5	3.4
Understanding of complex legal issues	9.4	17.9	37.1	20.4	15.1	318	27.3	2.9
Starts proceedings on time	29.1	34.9	19.9	10.1	6.1	327	64.0	3.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	19.4	34.5	28.5	11.8	5.8	330	53.9	3.5
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	19.4	35.9	29.9	9.5	5.3	304	55.3	3.5
Promptness in making rulings	23.2	36.5	26.3	9.2	4.8	315	59.7	3.6
Efficiency in managing caseload	15.9	26.9	25.9	18.4	12.8	320	42.8	3.1
Accessible and present during working hours	26.2	36.8	22.4	10.0	4.7	321	63.0	3.7
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	23.5	36.7	24.5	10.7	4.7	319	60.2	3.6

Clark, Janice

Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	35.3	24.9	19.8	11.9	8.1	394	60.2	3.7
Maintains control of the proceedings	40.7	33.2	15.2	6.2	4.6	388	73.9	4.0
Attentive during proceedings	37.2	32.0	15.5	9.0	6.2	387	69.2	3.8
Maintains dignified demeanor	30.8	29.0	20.3	10.3	9.5	389	59.8	3.6
Decisive	36.1	29.5	18.2	9.7	6.6	380	65.6	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	15.4	11.7	19.9	22.1	30.9	376	27.1	2.6
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	15.6	11.4	21.5	21.2	30.2	377	27.0	2.6
Outcomes not influenced by media	21.1	12.6	21.6	18.1	26.6	365	33.7	2.8
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	19.9	12.0	19.6	17.1	31.4	357	31.9	2.7
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	16.7	14.9	18.3	19.4	30.8	377	31.6	2.7
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	18.5	17.7	18.7	20.3	24.8	379	36.2	2.8
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	17.9	14.7	18.2	19.8	29.4	374	32.6	2.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	21.9	11.9	18.4	17.6	30.3	370	33.8	2.8
Rules without gender bias	27.2	23.3	22.5	9.4	17.5	360	50.5	3.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	23.9	29.8	26.3	10.8	9.1	372	53.7	3.5
Knowledge of rules of evidence	22.1	24.8	26.7	15.9	10.5	371	46.9	3.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	22.7	25.9	22.5	16.0	12.8	374	48.6	3.3
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	19.8	24.6	22.7	16.7	16.1	353	44.4	3.2
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	27.7	26.6	23.4	12.4	9.9	274	54.3	3.5
Understanding of complex legal issues	20.8	24.6	23.0	16.8	14.9	370	45.4	3.2
Starts proceedings on time	18.2	20.9	22.2	20.1	18.7	369	39.1	3.0
Level of preparation for proceedings	21.1	25.7	23.3	15.5	14.4	374	46.8	3.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	18.4	20.2	26.5	18.4	16.4	347	38.6	3.1
Promptness in making rulings	20.3	21.4	25.5	17.5	15.3	365	41.7	3.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	21.8	21.3	26.4	16.6	13.9	367	43.1	3.2
Accessible and present during working hours	25.5	22.2	24.1	17.1	11.1	369	47.7	3.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	27.1	29.1	19.4	10.5	13.9	361	56.2	3.5

Daniel, Louis R.

Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	66.3	24.7	7.8	1.2	0.0	166	91.0	4.6
Maintains control of the proceedings	68.9	25.5	5.0	0.6	0.0	161	94.4	4.6
Attentive during proceedings	75.9	19.1	4.3	0.6	0.0	162	95.0	4.7
Maintains dignified demeanor	75.2	19.9	3.7	1.2	0.0	161	95.1	4.7
Decisive	64.8	25.2	8.2	1.9	0.0	159	90.0	4.5
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	53.1	23.8	15.6	6.9	0.6	160	76.9	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	47.6	25.0	18.9	6.1	2.4	164	72.6	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by media	50.3	28.0	14.9	5.6	1.2	161	78.3	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	62.9	25.8	7.5	3.1	0.6	159	88.7	4.5
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	53.5	28.3	12.6	3.1	2.5	159	81.8	4.3
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	59.1	27.0	10.7	2.5	0.6	159	86.1	4.4
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	54.9	26.5	13.0	4.3	1.2	162	81.4	4.3
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	68.1	20.0	8.8	2.5	0.6	160	88.1	4.5
Rules without gender bias	68.5	21.6	7.4	1.2	1.2	162	90.1	4.5
Knowledge of recent legal developments	63.8	30.2	4.7	1.3	0.0	149	94.0	4.6
Knowledge of rules of evidence	59.7	32.9	6.7	0.7	0.0	149	92.6	4.5
Knowledge of rules of procedure	58.7	32.7	7.3	1.3	0.0	150	91.4	4.5
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	48.4	38.9	11.1	1.6	0.0	126	87.3	4.3
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	51.3	38.3	10.4	0.0	0.0	115	89.6	4.4
Understanding of complex legal issues	60.8	31.8	4.7	1.4	1.4	148	92.6	4.5
Starts proceedings on time	68.9	22.5	6.6	1.3	0.7	151	91.4	4.6
Level of preparation for proceedings	60.1	30.1	9.2	0.7	0.0	153	90.2	4.5
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	54.7	33.8	9.4	2.2	0.0	139	88.5	4.4
Promptness in making rulings	57.7	31.0	9.9	1.4	0.0	142	88.7	4.5
Efficiency in managing caseload	61.1	29.2	7.6	2.1	0.0	144	90.3	4.5
Accessible and present during working hours	58.2	30.8	10.3	0.7	0.0	146	89.0	4.5
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	66.0	25.3	7.3	1.3	0.0	150	91.3	4.6

Erwin, Michael R.
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	
Courteous	43.8	32.7	15.4	6.2	1.9	162	76.5	4.1
Maintains control of the proceedings	48.1	35.3	14.1	2.6	0.0	156	83.4	4.3
Attentive during proceedings	36.1	38.7	15.5	6.5	3.2	155	74.8	4.0
Maintains dignified demeanor	35.4	34.8	16.5	9.5	3.8	158	70.2	3.9
Decisive	52.9	30.3	11.0	5.2	0.6	155	83.2	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	37.3	35.3	20.3	4.6	2.6	153	72.6	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	32.7	34.6	20.5	7.7	4.5	156	67.3	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by media	40.1	39.5	13.8	5.9	0.7	152	79.6	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	43.0	33.8	13.9	6.6	2.6	151	76.8	4.1
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	33.1	32.5	19.5	11.0	3.9	154	65.6	3.8
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	36.6	38.6	14.4	7.8	2.6	153	75.2	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	40.1	34.4	14.6	8.3	2.5	157	74.5	4.0
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	50.3	31.6	11.0	3.2	3.9	155	81.9	4.2
Rules without gender bias	52.6	26.6	13.6	5.2	1.9	154	79.2	4.2
Knowledge of recent legal developments	29.3	41.3	24.0	3.3	2.0	150	70.6	3.9
Knowledge of rules of evidence	34.9	39.6	18.1	7.4	0.0	149	74.5	4.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	32.9	42.3	18.8	6.0	0.0	149	75.2	4.0
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	33.9	37.0	26.8	2.4	0.0	127	70.9	4.0
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	32.8	43.7	18.5	4.2	0.8	119	76.5	4.0
Understanding of complex legal issues	31.7	35.9	24.6	6.3	1.4	142	67.6	3.9
Starts proceedings on time	26.6	32.9	29.4	9.1	2.1	143	59.5	3.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	27.7	30.5	31.2	9.2	1.4	141	58.2	3.7
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	33.3	43.9	18.9	3.0	0.8	132	77.2	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	38.4	41.3	18.1	2.2	0.0	138	79.7	4.2
Efficiency in managing caseload	42.3	30.3	24.6	2.1	0.7	142	72.6	4.1
Accessible and present during working hours	37.5	25.7	20.8	11.1	4.9	144	63.2	3.8
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	28.5	25.7	29.9	10.4	5.6	144	54.2	3.6

Jackson, Bonnie

Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	
Courteous	48.0	33.6	11.2	5.9	1.3	152	81.6	4.2
Maintains control of the proceedings	57.3	30.7	9.3	2.7	0.0	150	88.0	4.4
Attentive during proceedings	59.3	30.7	6.0	3.3	0.7	150	90.0	4.4
Maintains dignified demeanor	56.7	32.0	8.7	2.0	0.7	150	88.7	4.4
Decisive	57.7	29.5	10.1	2.0	0.7	149	87.2	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	37.2	35.8	16.9	7.4	2.7	148	73.0	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	32.0	35.4	19.0	10.2	3.4	147	67.4	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by media	40.5	38.5	14.2	4.1	2.7	148	79.0	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	44.8	33.6	13.3	5.6	2.8	143	78.4	4.1
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	41.9	33.8	14.9	6.1	3.4	148	75.7	4.1
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	42.9	37.4	12.9	5.4	1.4	147	80.3	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	39.9	37.8	11.5	8.1	2.7	148	77.7	4.0
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	44.6	35.1	9.5	6.8	4.1	148	79.7	4.1
Rules without gender bias	50.0	32.4	11.5	4.1	2.0	148	82.4	4.2
Knowledge of recent legal developments	48.2	40.9	8.8	1.5	0.7	137	89.1	4.3
Knowledge of rules of evidence	45.7	42.8	9.4	1.4	0.7	138	88.5	4.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	47.5	43.9	5.8	2.2	0.7	139	91.4	4.4
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	42.9	42.9	9.2	2.5	2.5	119	85.8	4.2
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	52.2	34.5	11.5	0.9	0.9	113	86.7	4.4
Understanding of complex legal issues	48.9	38.0	9.5	2.2	1.5	137	86.9	4.3
Starts proceedings on time	32.2	27.3	21.0	11.2	8.4	143	59.5	3.6
Level of preparation for proceedings	39.7	42.6	12.8	3.5	1.4	141	82.3	4.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	39.8	46.1	11.7	1.6	0.8	128	85.9	4.2
Promptness in making rulings	44.1	41.9	11.0	2.2	0.7	136	86.0	4.3
Efficiency in managing caseload	36.0	44.6	13.7	3.6	2.2	139	80.6	4.1
Accessible and present during working hours	37.9	38.6	17.9	4.3	1.4	140	76.5	4.1
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	41.0	38.1	14.4	5.8	0.7	139	79.1	4.1

Johnson, Donald R.
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	35.1	29.9	20.1	9.7	5.2	154	65.0	3.8
Maintains control of the proceedings	36.1	32.7	12.2	15.0	4.1	147	68.8	3.8
Attentive during proceedings	33.8	32.4	15.5	11.5	6.8	148	66.2	3.7
Maintains dignified demeanor	26.4	27.7	17.6	16.9	11.5	148	54.1	3.4
Decisive	33.3	28.6	16.3	15.6	6.1	149	61.9	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	14.1	20.8	22.8	16.1	26.2	149	34.9	2.8
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	14.9	17.6	20.9	18.2	28.4	148	32.5	2.7
Outcomes not influenced by media	18.4	21.1	19.0	17.7	23.8	147	39.5	2.9
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	19.0	20.4	16.9	15.5	28.2	142	39.4	2.9
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	41.9	33.8	14.9	6.1	3.4	148	75.7	4.1
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	19.9	27.4	17.1	11.6	24.0	146	47.3	3.1
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	17.8	24.0	19.9	13.0	25.3	146	41.8	3.0
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	20.8	24.2	11.4	10.7	32.9	149	45.0	2.9
Rules without gender bias	33.6	25.2	16.8	9.1	15.4	143	58.8	3.5
Knowledge of recent legal developments	18.7	32.1	21.6	12.7	14.9	134	50.8	3.3
Knowledge of rules of evidence	16.4	35.1	23.1	11.2	14.2	134	51.5	3.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	15.3	33.6	23.7	12.2	15.3	131	48.9	3.2
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	17.7	28.3	21.2	15.9	16.8	113	46.0	3.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	21.2	27.9	28.8	12.5	9.6	104	49.1	3.4
Understanding of complex legal issues	16.3	25.2	24.4	13.8	20.3	123	41.5	3.0
Starts proceedings on time	50.0	21.5	8.5	13.1	6.9	130	71.5	3.9
Level of preparation for proceedings	20.2	38.0	19.4	9.3	13.2	129	58.2	3.4
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	24.6	41.5	13.6	11.9	8.5	118	66.1	3.6
Promptness in making rulings	26.2	39.3	16.4	8.2	9.8	122	65.5	3.6
Efficiency in managing caseload	25.2	33.9	16.5	13.4	11.0	127	59.1	3.5
Accessible and present during working hours	23.2	32.8	20.0	15.2	8.8	125	56.0	3.5
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	23.6	29.1	21.3	10.2	15.7	127	52.7	3.3

Kelley, Timothy E.
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	40.1	26.8	16.5	7.0	9.6	272	66.9	3.8
Maintains control of the proceedings	47.9	35.6	10.9	3.0	2.6	267	83.5	4.2
Attentive during proceedings	51.7	34.1	7.5	3.4	3.4	267	85.8	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	52.2	26.5	11.6	5.2	4.5	268	78.7	4.2
Decisive	51.0	33.1	10.3	1.5	4.2	263	84.1	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	26.6	29.3	23.2	10.0	10.8	259	55.9	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	27.0	27.4	21.2	11.2	13.1	259	54.4	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by media	34.0	30.1	13.7	10.9	11.3	256	64.1	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	43.4	24.6	14.3	7.8	9.8	244	68.0	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	27.7	35.5	16.0	11.3	9.4	256	63.2	3.6
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	32.0	33.2	17.4	8.1	9.3	259	65.2	3.7
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	31.6	32.0	18.0	8.2	10.2	256	63.6	3.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	40.9	28.0	15.7	5.5	9.8	254	68.9	3.8
Rules without gender bias	44.6	30.7	13.9	4.0	6.8	251	75.3	4.0
Knowledge of recent legal developments	33.3	38.8	18.1	7.2	2.5	237	72.1	3.9
Knowledge of rules of evidence	33.9	36.4	18.8	8.4	2.5	239	70.3	3.9
Knowledge of rules of procedure	34.9	36.6	18.9	7.6	2.1	238	71.5	3.9
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	37.5	35.2	17.1	6.5	3.7	216	72.7	4.0
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	37.0	40.5	16.2	4.0	2.3	173	77.5	4.1
Understanding of complex legal issues	37.8	30.7	17.6	9.7	4.2	238	68.5	3.9
Starts proceedings on time	46.0	37.7	11.7	3.3	1.3	239	83.7	4.2
Level of preparation for proceedings	42.7	40.6	10.5	4.6	1.7	239	83.3	4.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	38.8	43.5	13.1	2.8	1.9	214	82.3	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	42.2	40.4	12.0	4.0	1.3	225	82.6	4.2
Efficiency in managing caseload	38.1	40.3	14.7	4.8	2.2	231	78.4	4.1
Accessible and present during working hours	36.1	38.7	14.8	7.4	3.0	230	74.8	4.0
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	40.6	38.5	12.4	6.4	2.1	234	79.1	4.1

McDonald, J. Michael
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	59.9	26.5	9.7	2.2	1.7	359	86.4	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	54.5	35.0	7.9	1.1	1.4	354	89.5	4.4
Attentive during proceedings	52.8	35.0	9.6	1.1	1.4	354	87.8	4.4
Maintains dignified demeanor	59.4	30.7	5.6	2.8	1.4	355	90.1	4.4
Decisive	45.0	38.5	11.3	2.8	2.3	353	83.5	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	35.0	33.5	19.5	6.4	5.5	343	68.5	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	34.3	35.5	19.1	5.0	6.2	341	69.8	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by media	41.7	33.1	15.7	4.4	5.0	338	74.8	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	40.1	32.9	14.4	6.3	6.3	334	73.0	3.9
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	41.4	33.6	14.9	5.2	4.9	348	75.0	4.0
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	43.4	33.0	16.1	3.7	3.7	348	76.4	4.1
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	43.5	34.9	12.1	5.2	4.3	347	78.4	4.1
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	50.9	31.0	9.9	3.5	4.7	342	81.9	4.2
Rules without gender bias	52.8	33.0	8.0	2.7	3.5	339	85.8	4.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	40.8	46.9	8.7	2.6	0.9	343	87.7	4.2
Knowledge of rules of evidence	42.9	43.8	10.0	2.4	0.9	340	86.7	4.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	45.7	44.0	7.3	2.1	0.9	341	89.7	4.3
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	41.4	40.7	12.3	4.3	1.2	324	82.1	4.2
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	43.6	42.0	11.2	2.0	1.2	250	85.6	4.2
Understanding of complex legal issues	42.3	39.9	12.8	3.3	1.8	336	82.2	4.2
Starts proceedings on time	35.6	45.0	15.0	3.5	0.9	340	80.6	4.1
Level of preparation for proceedings	42.2	45.2	9.1	2.3	1.2	341	87.4	4.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	35.4	40.4	13.8	5.6	4.7	319	75.8	4.0
Promptness in making rulings	36.9	42.6	12.6	4.5	3.3	333	79.5	4.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	37.9	43.7	13.5	3.4	1.5	327	81.6	4.1
Accessible and present during working hours	47.5	36.3	11.8	3.5	0.9	339	83.8	4.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	47.5	37.9	9.0	4.2	1.5	335	85.4	4.3

Morvant, William A.
 Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	66.3	18.8	10.6	1.3	3.1	160	85.1	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	60.7	24.0	11.3	2.7	1.3	150	84.7	4.4
Attentive during proceedings	62.8	25.7	9.5	1.4	0.7	148	88.5	4.5
Maintains dignified demeanor	64.2	22.5	8.6	1.3	3.3	151	86.7	4.4
Decisive	58.5	25.9	12.9	1.4	1.4	147	84.4	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	47.7	30.2	14.8	3.4	4.0	149	77.9	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	45.5	31.0	14.5	4.8	4.1	145	76.5	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by media	46.5	29.6	15.5	4.2	4.2	142	76.1	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	55.7	29.3	9.3	2.1	3.6	140	85.0	4.3
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	46.5	31.9	9.0	6.9	5.6	144	78.4	4.1
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	53.1	25.9	12.9	6.1	2.0	147	79.0	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	52.5	25.5	12.8	5.7	3.5	141	78.0	4.2
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	60.7	25.0	10.7	2.1	1.4	140	85.7	4.4
Rules without gender bias	63.0	24.6	10.9	0.7	0.7	138	87.6	4.5
Knowledge of recent legal developments	57.4	30.2	10.9	0.8	0.8	129	87.6	4.4
Knowledge of rules of evidence	54.7	32.8	9.4	0.8	2.3	128	87.5	4.4
Knowledge of rules of procedure	55.5	34.4	7.8	0.8	1.6	128	89.9	4.4
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	51.9	36.1	11.1	0.0	0.9	108	88.0	4.4
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	51.6	36.8	10.5	1.1	0.0	95	88.4	4.4
Understanding of complex legal issues	56.5	31.5	10.5	0.8	0.8	124	88.0	4.4
Starts proceedings on time	54.3	29.1	13.4	3.1	0.0	127	83.4	4.3
Level of preparation for proceedings	57.7	32.3	9.2	0.8	0.0	130	90.0	4.5
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	54.4	35.1	10.5	0.0	0.0	114	89.5	4.4
Promptness in making rulings	55.6	30.2	13.5	0.8	0.0	126	85.8	4.4
Efficiency in managing caseload	55.0	28.7	14.7	0.8	0.8	129	83.7	4.4
Accessible and present during working hours	53.1	28.5	10.8	6.9	0.8	130	81.6	4.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	62.0	23.3	14.0	0.8	0.0	129	85.3	4.5

Welch, Jewel E. "Duke"

Judge, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	62.0	28.6	7.1	1.4	0.9	350	90.6	4.5
Maintains control of the proceedings	51.6	37.3	7.9	2.0	1.2	343	88.9	4.4
Attentive during proceedings	47.8	37.9	9.6	2.9	1.7	343	85.7	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	52.6	35.5	9.0	2.0	0.9	344	88.1	4.4
Decisive	44.6	38.7	12.3	2.3	2.1	341	83.3	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	30.1	38.9	21.3	6.4	3.3	329	69.0	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	31.4	37.5	22.6	5.2	3.4	328	68.9	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by media	33.5	39.4	18.6	5.6	2.8	322	72.9	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	35.7	35.4	16.6	7.6	4.8	314	71.1	3.9
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	32.1	38.8	18.8	4.8	5.5	330	70.9	3.9
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	34.9	39.8	17.5	4.2	3.6	332	74.7	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	36.5	35.3	18.8	6.1	3.3	329	71.8	4.0
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	50.5	34.8	11.4	1.5	1.8	325	85.3	4.3
Rules without gender bias	51.5	35.6	9.5	1.5	1.8	326	87.1	4.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	32.8	45.5	16.7	3.1	1.9	323	78.3	4.0
Knowledge of rules of evidence	37.6	41.3	15.8	3.7	1.6	322	78.9	4.1
Knowledge of rules of procedure	39.3	41.1	14.4	3.7	1.5	326	80.4	4.1
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	34.7	42.2	16.2	4.9	1.9	308	76.9	4.0
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	40.5	43.5	12.1	3.0	0.9	232	84.0	4.2
Understanding of complex legal issues	31.0	40.2	19.8	5.9	3.1	323	71.2	3.9
Starts proceedings on time	42.9	39.5	15.2	1.5	0.9	329	82.4	4.2
Level of preparation for proceedings	39.0	38.7	16.6	3.9	1.8	331	77.7	4.1
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	39.2	44.0	13.9	1.9	1.0	309	83.2	4.2
Promptness in making rulings	42.1	41.4	14.0	1.6	0.9	321	83.5	4.2
Efficiency in managing caseload	42.7	39.5	15.9	1.3	0.6	314	82.2	4.2
Accessible and present during working hours	46.3	39.4	10.9	2.5	0.9	320	85.7	4.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	44.4	37.8	13.4	2.5	1.9	320	82.2	4.2

Bergeron, Allen

Commissioner, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	32.6	17.4	28.3	9.8	12.0	92	50.0	3.5
Maintains control of the proceedings	29.1	31.4	26.7	7.0	5.8	86	60.5	3.7
Attentive during proceedings	32.9	22.4	31.8	8.2	4.7	85	55.3	3.7
Maintains dignified demeanor	30.3	21.3	22.5	14.6	11.2	89	51.6	3.4
Decisive	29.1	24.4	22.1	12.8	11.6	86	53.5	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	32.5	28.8	28.8	5.0	5.0	80	61.3	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	27.8	24.1	26.6	10.1	11.4	79	51.9	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by media	35.1	24.7	24.7	7.8	7.8	77	59.8	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	30.4	30.4	25.3	6.3	7.6	79	60.8	3.7
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	27.8	24.1	31.6	6.3	10.1	79	51.9	3.5
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	32.9	22.8	30.4	5.1	8.9	79	55.7	3.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	38.0	29.1	24.1	2.5	6.3	79	67.1	3.9
Rules without gender bias	41.0	25.6	20.5	5.1	7.7	78	66.6	3.9
Knowledge of recent legal developments	18.3	28.0	34.1	11.0	8.5	82	46.3	3.4
Knowledge of rules of evidence	18.4	25.0	35.5	14.5	6.6	76	43.4	3.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	17.9	29.5	34.6	12.8	5.1	78	47.4	3.4
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	18.3	26.8	32.4	12.7	9.9	71	45.1	3.3
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	15.6	35.1	19.5	13.0	16.9	77	50.7	3.2
Starts proceedings on time	30.8	29.5	23.1	7.7	9.0	78	60.3	3.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	18.2	32.5	24.7	11.7	13.0	77	50.7	3.3
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	21.6	32.4	27.0	13.5	5.4	74	54.0	3.5
Promptness in making rulings	24.7	28.6	27.3	13.0	6.5	77	53.3	3.5
Efficiency in managing caseload	16.2	33.8	31.1	9.5	9.5	74	50.0	3.4
Accessible and present during working hours	29.3	30.7	25.3	9.3	5.3	75	60.0	3.7
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	22.1	23.4	31.2	11.7	11.7	77	45.5	3.3

Morgan, Rachel Pitcher

Commissioner, 19th Judicial District Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	
Courteous	63.2	26.3	5.3	3.2	2.1	95	89.5	4.5
Maintains control of the proceedings	44.3	36.4	14.8	0.0	4.5	88	80.7	4.2
Attentive during proceedings	50.6	35.6	11.5	0.0	2.3	87	86.2	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	52.8	32.6	11.2	0.0	3.4	89	85.4	4.3
Decisive	40.7	37.2	12.8	4.7	4.7	86	77.9	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	49.4	27.7	14.5	4.8	3.6	83	77.1	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	39.5	30.9	19.8	4.9	4.9	81	70.4	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by media	49.4	25.9	17.3	4.9	2.5	81	75.3	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	41.0	41.0	10.8	3.6	3.6	83	82.0	4.1
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	45.8	37.3	9.6	3.6	3.6	83	83.1	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	42.9	36.9	13.1	3.6	3.6	84	79.8	4.1
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	48.2	34.1	11.8	3.5	2.4	85	82.3	4.2
Rules without gender bias	52.4	32.1	10.7	1.2	3.6	84	84.5	4.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	47.6	35.7	8.3	3.6	4.8	84	83.3	4.2
Knowledge of rules of evidence	41.6	39.0	11.7	2.6	5.2	77	80.6	4.1
Knowledge of rules of procedure	43.2	38.3	11.1	2.5	4.9	81	81.5	4.1
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	41.1	42.5	6.8	5.5	4.1	73	83.6	4.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	42.7	37.3	12.0	2.7	5.3	75	80.0	4.1
Starts proceedings on time	51.3	33.3	7.7	2.6	5.1	78	84.6	4.2
Level of preparation for proceedings	43.6	42.3	7.7	1.3	5.1	78	85.9	4.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	38.9	43.1	12.5	0.0	5.6	72	82.0	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	40.8	43.4	9.2	1.3	5.3	76	84.2	4.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	37.3	42.7	14.7	0.0	5.3	75	80.0	4.1
Accessible and present during working hours	56.4	29.5	9.0	0.0	5.1	78	85.9	4.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	58.5	22.0	12.2	0.0	7.3	82	80.5	4.2

Higginbotham, Toni M.

Judge, Family Court, Parish Of East Baton Rouge

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	63.1	22.5	8.1	3.1	3.1	160	85.6	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	35.4	32.9	18.0	8.7	5.0	161	68.3	3.9
Attentive during proceedings	45.1	32.1	15.4	4.3	3.1	162	77.2	4.1
Maintains dignified demeanor	50.0	28.4	13.0	4.9	3.7	162	78.4	4.2
Decisive	30.0	26.3	23.8	11.3	8.8	160	56.3	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	31.4	26.8	22.2	9.2	10.5	153	58.2	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	21.7	27.0	17.8	17.1	16.4	152	48.7	3.2
Outcomes not influenced by media	32.2	30.9	19.5	10.7	6.7	149	63.1	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	35.0	25.9	19.6	9.8	9.8	143	60.9	3.7
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	34.8	26.5	20.6	9.0	9.0	155	61.3	3.7
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	29.7	32.9	21.3	7.1	9.0	155	62.6	3.7
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	38.3	24.7	20.1	7.8	9.1	154	63.0	3.8
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	51.7	27.8	11.3	4.6	4.6	151	79.5	4.2
Rules without gender bias	48.1	18.8	14.9	7.8	10.4	154	66.9	3.9
Knowledge of recent legal developments	27.1	35.5	25.8	5.2	6.5	155	62.6	3.7
Knowledge of rules of evidence	20.4	37.5	25.7	9.2	7.2	152	57.9	3.5
Knowledge of rules of procedure	20.9	33.3	30.7	6.5	8.5	153	54.2	3.5
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	26.8	33.3	29.7	4.3	5.8	138	60.1	3.7
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	19.2	31.8	30.5	8.6	9.9	151	51.0	3.4
Starts proceedings on time	28.3	38.2	16.4	9.9	7.2	152	66.5	3.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	21.7	42.1	19.7	9.2	7.2	152	63.8	3.6
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	25.2	37.4	18.7	9.4	9.4	139	62.6	3.6
Promptness in making rulings	27.0	34.5	23.6	10.1	4.7	148	61.5	3.7
Efficiency in managing caseload	28.1	34.2	24.0	6.2	7.5	146	62.3	3.7
Accessible and present during working hours	38.3	30.9	18.8	6.0	6.0	149	69.2	3.9
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	37.4	32.7	17.7	4.8	7.5	147	70.1	3.9

Lassalle, Annette M.

Judge, Family Court, Parish of East Baton Rouge

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	49.7	27.5	14.1	4.0	4.7	149	77.2	4.1
Maintains control of the proceedings	52.4	33.1	11.7	1.4	1.4	145	85.5	4.3
Attentive during proceedings	52.1	28.1	14.4	2.1	3.4	146	80.2	4.2
Maintains dignified demeanor	46.6	27.4	13.7	8.2	4.1	146	74.0	4.0
Decisive	51.0	26.2	14.6	7.6	0.7	145	77.2	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	36.0	30.9	21.6	7.2	4.3	139	66.9	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	25.2	30.9	23.0	13.7	7.2	139	56.1	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by media	38.7	29.9	16.1	11.7	3.6	137	68.6	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	38.8	26.9	17.2	9.7	7.5	134	65.7	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	29.8	22.7	17.7	14.2	15.6	141	52.5	3.4
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	29.3	30.7	18.6	10.0	11.4	140	60.0	3.6
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	36.7	23.7	19.4	9.4	10.8	139	60.4	3.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	51.8	31.4	12.4	2.9	1.5	137	83.2	4.3
Rules without gender bias	46.8	23.7	15.8	7.9	5.8	139	70.5	4.0
Knowledge of recent legal developments	45.1	38.0	9.9	3.5	3.5	142	83.1	4.2
Knowledge of rules of evidence	36.0	38.1	18.0	4.3	3.6	139	74.1	4.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	35.5	39.1	18.1	3.6	3.6	138	74.6	4.0
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	34.1	37.3	20.6	6.3	1.6	126	71.4	4.0
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	37.1	32.6	19.7	6.8	3.8	132	69.7	3.9
Starts proceedings on time	38.7	34.3	16.1	4.4	6.6	137	73.0	3.9
Level of preparation for proceedings	30.6	41.0	17.2	6.7	4.5	134	71.6	3.9
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	35.8	35.8	12.2	9.8	6.5	123	71.6	3.8
Promptness in making rulings	39.2	36.2	10.0	9.2	5.4	130	75.4	3.9
Efficiency in managing caseload	34.6	39.8	12.0	8.3	5.3	133	74.4	3.9
Accessible and present during working hours	29.1	29.9	16.4	13.4	11.2	134	59.0	3.5
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	33.8	27.8	18.8	8.3	11.3	133	61.6	3.6

LaVergne, Luke A.

Judge, Family Court, Parish of East Baton Rouge

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	33.1	24.8	22.3	13.4	6.4	157	57.9	3.6
Maintains control of the proceedings	54.2	32.9	10.3	1.3	1.3	155	87.1	4.4
Attentive during proceedings	44.5	33.5	13.5	4.5	3.9	155	78.0	4.1
Maintains dignified demeanor	46.8	33.3	12.8	3.8	3.2	156	80.1	4.2
Decisive	43.8	30.7	18.3	4.6	2.6	153	74.5	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	27.4	31.5	23.3	8.2	9.6	146	58.9	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	19.2	32.2	26.1	11.0	11.6	146	51.4	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by media	29.9	37.5	18.1	6.9	7.6	144	67.4	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	34.8	35.5	17.0	4.3	8.5	141	70.3	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	32.4	28.4	19.6	12.8	6.8	148	60.8	3.7
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	27.0	31.1	21.6	10.1	10.1	148	58.1	3.5
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	30.3	30.3	24.1	6.2	9.0	145	60.6	3.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	40.6	35.7	9.1	4.9	9.8	143	76.3	3.9
Rules without gender bias	42.5	25.3	16.4	4.8	11.0	146	67.8	3.8
Knowledge of recent legal developments	31.1	35.8	19.6	7.4	6.1	148	66.9	3.8
Knowledge of rules of evidence	30.6	34.7	21.5	6.3	6.9	144	65.3	3.8
Knowledge of rules of procedure	32.2	32.9	21.0	5.6	8.4	143	65.1	3.8
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	23.8	33.8	20.8	10.8	10.8	130	57.6	3.5
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	21.7	35.5	21.7	11.6	9.4	138	57.2	3.5
Starts proceedings on time	37.3	31.0	17.6	5.6	8.5	142	68.3	3.8
Level of preparation for proceedings	27.5	38.4	16.7	9.4	8.0	138	65.9	3.7
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	29.5	36.4	14.4	11.4	8.3	132	65.9	3.7
Promptness in making rulings	31.9	39.3	13.3	8.9	6.7	135	71.2	3.8
Efficiency in managing caseload	29.9	37.2	19.0	8.0	5.8	137	67.1	3.8
Accessible and present during working hours	34.8	30.5	18.4	8.5	7.8	141	65.3	3.8
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	35.7	35.0	14.3	6.4	8.6	140	70.7	3.8

Luse, Jennifer

Judge, Family Court, Parish of East Baton Rouge

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	71.3	23.3	2.7	0.0	2.7	150	94.6	4.6
Maintains control of the proceedings	51.4	30.4	12.2	2.7	3.4	148	81.8	4.2
Attentive during proceedings	58.8	25.0	10.1	2.7	3.4	148	83.8	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	66.9	22.3	8.1	0.0	2.7	148	89.2	4.5
Decisive	48.6	27.4	16.4	2.1	5.5	146	76.0	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	56.0	30.5	8.5	2.1	2.8	141	86.5	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	49.3	37.0	8.7	1.4	3.6	138	86.3	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by media	55.8	32.6	8.7	0.7	2.2	138	88.4	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	59.0	28.4	9.0	0.7	3.0	134	87.4	4.4
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	47.9	30.6	11.1	6.9	3.5	144	78.5	4.1
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	47.6	33.6	11.2	3.5	4.2	143	81.2	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	54.6	29.8	8.5	2.8	4.3	141	84.4	4.3
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	63.6	26.4	5.0	1.4	3.6	140	90.0	4.5
Rules without gender bias	62.0	25.4	3.5	4.2	4.9	142	87.4	4.4
Knowledge of recent legal developments	46.3	34.6	15.4	2.2	1.5	136	80.9	4.2
Knowledge of rules of evidence	43.0	39.3	11.9	4.4	1.5	135	82.3	4.2
Knowledge of rules of procedure	42.2	41.5	11.1	2.2	3.0	135	83.7	4.2
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	43.2	33.6	16.8	4.8	1.6	125	76.8	4.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	42.5	37.8	15.0	3.1	1.6	127	80.3	4.2
Starts proceedings on time	43.2	41.7	12.1	1.5	1.5	132	84.9	4.2
Level of preparation for proceedings	39.2	41.5	14.6	2.3	2.3	130	80.7	4.1
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	41.6	39.2	13.6	4.0	1.6	125	80.8	4.2
Promptness in making rulings	42.6	38.8	12.4	4.7	1.6	129	81.4	4.2
Efficiency in managing caseload	42.6	43.4	10.1	3.1	0.8	129	86.0	4.2
Accessible and present during working hours	41.7	39.4	15.2	2.3	1.5	132	81.1	4.2
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	43.8	36.9	13.8	3.8	1.5	130	80.7	4.2

Richey, Kathleen S.

Judge, Juvenile Court, Parish of East Baton Rouge

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	
Courteous	68.9	22.6	5.7	0.0	2.8	106	91.5	4.5
Maintains control of the proceedings	63.8	25.7	9.5	0.0	1.0	105	89.5	4.5
Attentive during proceedings	71.4	23.8	1.9	1.9	1.0	105	95.2	4.6
Maintains dignified demeanor	64.8	27.6	3.8	1.0	2.9	105	92.4	4.5
Decisive	66.3	23.1	8.7	1.0	1.0	104	89.4	4.5
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	54.7	35.8	4.7	1.9	2.8	106	90.5	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	52.4	34.3	4.8	3.8	4.8	105	86.7	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by media	61.0	30.5	4.8	1.9	1.9	105	91.5	4.5
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	62.1	28.2	7.8	0.0	1.9	103	90.3	4.5
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	57.3	32.0	6.8	1.9	1.9	103	89.3	4.4
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	62.5	27.9	4.8	2.9	1.9	104	90.4	4.5
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	59.6	29.8	6.7	1.0	2.9	104	89.4	4.4
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	66.3	27.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	104	94.2	4.5
Rules without gender bias	68.9	24.3	2.9	1.9	1.9	103	93.2	4.6
Knowledge of recent legal developments	67.3	26.0	3.8	1.0	1.9	104	93.3	4.6
Knowledge of rules of evidence	62.1	31.1	2.9	1.0	2.9	103	93.2	4.5
Knowledge of rules of procedure	61.8	30.4	2.9	2.0	2.9	102	92.2	4.5
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	62.9	25.8	6.2	3.1	2.1	97	88.7	4.4
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	69.7	22.2	4.0	1.0	3.0	99	91.9	4.5
Starts proceedings on time	34.0	26.2	22.3	9.7	7.8	103	60.2	3.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	62.1	28.2	4.9	1.0	3.9	103	90.3	4.4
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	56.6	26.3	11.1	4.0	2.0	99	82.9	4.3
Promptness in making rulings	56.0	29.0	10.0	3.0	2.0	100	85.0	4.3
Efficiency in managing caseload	46.6	35.0	10.7	3.9	3.9	103	81.6	4.2
Accessible and present during working hours	51.0	28.4	13.7	2.9	3.9	102	79.4	4.2
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	62.5	26.0	7.7	0.0	3.8	104	88.5	4.4

Johnson, Pamela Taylor

Judge, Juvenile Court, Parish of East Baton Rouge

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	
Courteous	24.1	29.1	21.5	10.1	15.2	79	53.2	3.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	27.3	37.7	18.2	3.9	13.0	77	65.0	3.6
Attentive during proceedings	29.9	29.9	26.0	3.9	10.4	77	59.8	3.7
Maintains dignified demeanor	28.2	26.9	17.9	12.8	14.1	78	55.1	3.4
Decisive	30.3	27.6	21.1	6.6	14.5	76	57.9	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	23.4	19.5	23.4	6.5	27.3	77	42.9	3.1
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	19.7	21.1	22.4	9.2	27.6	76	40.8	3.0
Outcomes not influenced by media	27.0	20.3	23.0	9.5	20.3	74	47.3	3.2
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	27.8	26.4	19.4	4.2	22.2	72	54.2	3.3
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	24.0	25.3	22.7	5.3	22.7	75	49.3	3.2
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	23.4	26.0	16.9	11.7	22.1	77	49.4	3.2
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	22.1	24.7	26.0	3.9	23.4	77	46.8	3.2
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	29.9	19.5	19.5	5.2	26.0	77	49.4	3.2
Rules without gender bias	34.2	27.6	17.1	0.0	21.1	76	61.8	3.5
Knowledge of recent legal developments	28.6	16.9	24.7	14.3	15.6	77	45.5	3.3
Knowledge of rules of evidence	25.0	23.7	22.4	14.5	14.5	76	48.7	3.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	23.0	23.0	21.6	13.5	18.9	74	46.0	3.2
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	25.0	16.2	23.5	16.2	19.1	68	41.2	3.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	25.0	16.7	23.6	13.9	20.8	72	41.7	3.1
Starts proceedings on time	30.7	24.0	17.3	10.7	17.3	75	54.7	3.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	20.0	29.3	17.3	16.0	17.3	75	49.3	3.2
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	21.4	27.1	20.0	17.1	14.3	70	48.5	3.2
Promptness in making rulings	23.9	26.8	18.3	15.5	15.5	71	50.7	3.3
Efficiency in managing caseload	23.6	25.0	19.4	12.5	19.4	72	48.6	3.2
Accessible and present during working hours	22.4	22.4	23.7	15.8	15.8	76	44.8	3.2
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	24.0	24.0	17.3	13.3	21.3	75	48.0	3.2

Alexander, Yvette M.
 Judge, Baton Rouge City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	59.6	26.3	8.8	2.9	2.3	171	85.9	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	39.5	32.3	15.6	8.4	4.2	167	71.8	3.9
Attentive during proceedings	40.7	32.9	15.6	7.2	3.6	167	73.6	4.0
Maintains dignified demeanor	47.9	29.3	12.6	4.8	5.4	167	77.2	4.1
Decisive	39.6	24.4	19.5	9.8	6.7	164	64.0	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	31.9	34.4	21.9	5.6	6.3	160	66.3	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	29.6	34.0	24.5	4.4	7.5	159	63.6	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by media	37.5	34.9	17.8	3.3	6.6	152	72.4	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	37.9	31.4	19.6	2.6	8.5	153	69.3	3.9
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	35.6	31.9	21.3	3.8	7.5	160	67.5	3.8
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	32.3	34.8	22.4	4.3	6.2	161	67.1	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	36.1	32.9	18.4	5.1	7.6	158	69.0	3.9
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	42.8	30.8	15.1	3.8	7.5	159	73.6	4.0
Rules without gender bias	45.6	31.9	13.8	1.9	6.9	160	77.5	4.1
Knowledge of recent legal developments	24.2	28.0	32.3	9.9	5.6	161	52.2	3.6
Knowledge of rules of evidence	25.3	31.0	27.2	10.8	5.7	158	56.3	3.6
Knowledge of rules of procedure	24.2	32.9	28.6	8.7	5.6	161	57.1	3.6
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	23.7	31.9	30.4	8.1	5.9	135	55.6	3.6
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	21.9	30.5	27.8	9.9	9.9	151	52.4	3.4
Starts proceedings on time	13.4	19.5	20.7	19.5	26.8	164	32.9	2.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	21.3	28.8	27.5	13.8	8.8	160	50.1	3.4
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	26.6	37.4	22.3	7.2	6.5	139	64.0	3.7
Promptness in making rulings	26.7	35.3	24.0	7.3	6.7	150	62.0	3.7
Efficiency in managing caseload	25.3	29.2	24.7	13.0	7.8	154	54.5	3.5
Accessible and present during working hours	19.6	27.5	30.1	9.8	13.1	153	47.1	3.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	20.8	31.2	21.4	14.9	11.7	154	52.0	3.3

Davis, Laura Prosser
 Judge, Baton Rouge City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	
Courteous	54.8	33.0	8.7	1.7	1.7	115	87.8	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	41.1	31.3	21.4	3.6	2.7	112	72.4	4.0
Attentive during proceedings	52.3	33.3	9.9	2.7	1.8	111	85.6	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	53.2	28.8	12.6	2.7	2.7	111	82.0	4.3
Decisive	30.9	39.1	19.1	6.4	4.5	110	70.0	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	37.4	31.8	19.6	3.7	7.5	107	69.2	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	34.0	37.7	17.0	5.7	5.7	106	71.7	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by media	41.7	36.9	10.7	4.9	5.8	103	78.6	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	39.8	34.0	12.6	5.8	7.8	103	73.8	3.9
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	36.8	35.8	16.0	5.7	5.7	106	72.6	3.9
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	37.4	40.2	13.1	2.8	6.5	107	77.6	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	38.5	36.7	12.8	3.7	8.3	109	75.2	3.9
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	49.1	35.2	9.3	1.9	4.6	108	84.3	4.2
Rules without gender bias	52.3	34.9	6.4	2.8	3.7	109	87.2	4.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	21.0	41.9	25.7	6.7	4.8	105	62.9	3.7
Knowledge of rules of evidence	20.6	34.6	31.8	10.3	2.8	107	55.2	3.6
Knowledge of rules of procedure	18.9	37.7	31.1	9.4	2.8	106	56.6	3.6
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	22.0	45.1	23.1	6.6	3.3	91	67.1	3.8
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	17.5	40.8	25.2	12.6	3.9	103	58.3	3.6
Starts proceedings on time	41.6	41.6	13.3	1.8	1.8	113	83.2	4.2
Level of preparation for proceedings	32.1	42.0	20.5	3.6	1.8	112	74.1	4.0
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	35.6	48.5	10.9	4.0	1.0	101	84.1	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	33.7	47.1	12.5	5.8	1.0	104	80.8	4.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	33.6	42.1	18.7	3.7	1.9	107	75.7	4.0
Accessible and present during working hours	33.6	39.3	22.4	2.8	1.9	107	72.9	4.0
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	38.5	37.6	15.6	6.4	1.8	109	76.1	4.0

Ponder, Suzan S.

Judge, Baton Rouge City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	66.5	20.2	6.4	5.0	1.8	218	86.7	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	68.5	22.7	6.9	0.9	0.9	216	91.2	4.6
Attentive during proceedings	69.8	20.9	6.5	1.9	0.9	215	90.7	4.6
Maintains dignified demeanor	69.4	22.7	5.6	0.9	1.4	216	92.1	4.6
Decisive	61.5	26.3	8.5	1.9	1.9	213	87.8	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	48.8	30.9	12.6	5.3	2.4	207	79.7	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	47.1	30.6	12.1	7.3	2.9	206	77.7	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by media	54.0	27.2	11.4	5.0	2.5	202	81.2	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	54.5	26.0	11.0	5.0	3.5	200	80.5	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	55.0	24.4	11.5	5.3	3.8	209	79.4	4.2
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	54.1	28.7	9.1	4.3	3.8	209	82.8	4.3
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	52.2	28.5	11.1	4.8	3.4	207	80.7	4.2
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	61.5	23.9	7.3	5.4	2.0	205	85.4	4.4
Rules without gender bias	64.1	22.8	6.8	3.9	2.4	206	86.9	4.4
Knowledge of recent legal developments	47.1	33.8	15.7	1.0	2.5	204	80.9	4.2
Knowledge of rules of evidence	48.5	33.5	11.7	3.4	2.9	206	82.0	4.2
Knowledge of rules of procedure	48.8	34.1	10.2	3.9	2.9	205	82.9	4.2
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	45.6	36.1	11.7	2.8	3.9	180	81.7	4.2
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	44.2	34.0	13.7	3.6	4.6	197	78.2	4.1
Starts proceedings on time	61.7	26.8	7.7	1.9	1.9	209	88.5	4.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	55.6	30.2	9.8	2.4	2.0	205	85.8	4.4
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	53.5	31.6	11.2	1.6	2.1	187	85.1	4.3
Promptness in making rulings	55.3	30.7	10.6	1.5	2.0	199	86.0	4.4
Efficiency in managing caseload	59.6	27.8	9.1	2.0	1.5	198	87.4	4.4
Accessible and present during working hours	55.1	28.3	12.1	2.5	2.0	198	83.4	4.3
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	60.0	26.0	9.0	3.5	1.5	200	86.0	4.4

Wall, Alex Brick

Judge, Baton Rouge City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G Avg.	Avg.
Courteous	73.4	20.7	4.7	0.6	0.6	169	94.1	4.7
Maintains control of the proceedings	67.7	25.7	6.0	0.6	0.0	167	93.4	4.6
Attentive during proceedings	64.9	26.8	5.4	2.4	0.6	168	91.7	4.5
Maintains dignified demeanor	67.1	26.9	5.4	0.6	0.0	167	94.0	4.6
Decisive	63.8	31.3	4.3	0.6	0.0	163	95.1	4.6
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	53.5	33.1	8.9	1.9	2.5	157	86.6	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	52.6	34.0	8.3	3.8	1.3	156	86.6	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by media	57.8	29.9	10.4	0.6	1.3	154	87.7	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	55.3	30.3	9.2	2.6	2.6	152	85.6	4.3
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	53.8	32.9	8.9	1.3	3.2	158	86.7	4.3
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	60.8	31.0	5.1	1.3	1.9	158	91.8	4.5
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	58.5	30.8	7.5	1.3	1.9	159	89.3	4.4
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	63.7	29.3	5.1	1.3	0.6	157	93.0	4.5
Rules without gender bias	66.9	28.0	4.5	0.0	0.6	157	94.9	4.6
Knowledge of recent legal developments	50.0	38.2	10.5	1.3	0.0	152	88.2	4.4
Knowledge of rules of evidence	52.7	39.3	6.0	2.0	0.0	150	92.0	4.4
Knowledge of rules of procedure	51.7	40.4	7.3	0.7	0.0	151	92.1	4.4
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	48.8	36.4	11.6	3.1	0.0	129	85.2	4.3
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	51.0	35.4	10.2	2.0	1.4	147	86.4	4.3
Starts proceedings on time	54.2	34.6	7.8	2.0	1.3	153	88.8	4.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	52.7	36.0	9.3	2.0	0.0	150	88.7	4.4
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	49.6	37.6	10.6	2.1	0.0	141	87.2	4.3
Promptness in making rulings	50.7	38.4	8.9	2.1	0.0	146	89.1	4.4
Efficiency in managing caseload	51.0	37.6	8.7	2.7	0.0	149	88.6	4.4
Accessible and present during working hours	50.7	38.4	8.2	2.1	0.7	146	89.1	4.4
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	55.8	31.3	10.2	1.4	1.4	147	87.1	4.4

White, Trudy M.

Judge, Baton Rouge City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	56.6	27.4	10.6	1.8	3.5	113	84.0	4.3
Maintains control of the proceedings	45.0	28.8	18.9	3.6	3.6	111	73.8	4.1
Attentive during proceedings	48.6	35.1	7.2	5.4	3.6	111	83.7	4.2
Maintains dignified demeanor	53.6	27.3	10.9	4.5	3.6	110	80.9	4.2
Decisive	39.4	29.4	19.3	7.3	4.6	109	68.8	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	34.3	35.2	14.8	7.4	8.3	108	69.5	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	33.6	29.9	20.6	7.5	8.4	107	63.5	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by media	41.3	33.7	11.5	8.7	4.8	104	75.0	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	40.8	34.0	11.7	5.8	7.8	103	74.8	3.9
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	37.5	32.7	21.2	2.9	5.8	104	70.2	3.9
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	39.0	34.3	13.3	5.7	7.6	105	73.3	3.9
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	33.3	35.2	19.0	4.8	7.6	105	68.5	3.8
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	43.3	33.7	10.6	5.8	6.7	104	77.0	4.0
Rules without gender bias	50.5	29.5	8.6	3.8	7.6	105	80.0	4.1
Knowledge of recent legal developments	19.6	39.2	23.5	9.8	7.8	102	58.8	3.5
Knowledge of rules of evidence	20.6	38.2	23.5	7.8	9.8	102	58.8	3.5
Knowledge of rules of procedure	20.6	37.3	25.5	7.8	8.8	102	57.9	3.5
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	26.7	31.1	26.7	6.7	8.9	90	57.8	3.6
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	23.5	30.6	22.4	12.2	11.2	98	54.1	3.4
Starts proceedings on time	27.6	33.3	20.0	5.7	13.3	105	60.9	3.6
Level of preparation for proceedings	27.5	31.4	24.5	8.8	7.8	102	58.9	3.6
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	33.3	32.3	24.0	4.2	6.3	96	65.6	3.8
Promptness in making rulings	31.6	33.7	26.5	3.1	5.1	98	65.3	3.8
Efficiency in managing caseload	32.0	31.1	23.3	7.8	5.8	103	63.1	3.8
Accessible and present during working hours	32.0	29.0	26.0	6.0	7.0	100	61.0	3.7
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	32.3	30.3	23.2	9.1	5.1	99	62.6	3.8

Engelsman, John D.

Judge, Baker City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	46.9	32.7	12.2	6.1	2.0	49	79.6	4.2
Maintains control of the proceedings	50.0	32.6	13.0	2.2	2.2	46	82.6	4.3
Attentive during proceedings	42.2	42.2	11.1	2.2	2.2	45	84.4	4.2
Maintains dignified demeanor	44.4	37.8	13.3	2.2	2.2	45	82.2	4.2
Decisive	43.5	34.8	17.4	0.0	4.3	46	78.3	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	30.4	39.1	21.7	6.5	2.2	46	69.5	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	26.7	44.4	22.2	4.4	2.2	45	71.1	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by media	37.0	43.5	15.2	2.2	2.2	46	80.5	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	35.6	40.0	20.0	2.2	2.2	45	75.6	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	38.3	31.9	21.3	4.3	4.3	47	70.2	4.0
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	31.3	43.8	20.8	2.1	2.1	48	75.1	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	37.0	37.0	17.4	4.3	4.3	46	74.0	4.0
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	45.7	28.3	21.7	2.2	2.2	46	74.0	4.1
Rules without gender bias	45.7	32.6	19.6	0.0	2.2	46	78.3	4.2
Knowledge of recent legal developments	31.0	47.6	14.3	4.8	2.4	42	78.6	4.0
Knowledge of rules of evidence	27.9	51.2	14.0	4.7	2.3	43	79.1	4.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	21.4	54.8	19.0	2.4	2.4	42	76.2	3.9
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	21.6	51.4	21.6	2.7	2.7	37	73.0	3.9
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	27.9	37.2	23.3	9.3	2.3	43	65.1	3.8
Starts proceedings on time	42.2	35.6	15.6	4.4	2.2	45	77.8	4.1
Level of preparation for proceedings	36.4	38.6	18.2	4.5	2.3	44	75.0	4.0
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	35.7	50.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	42	85.7	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	39.5	39.5	16.3	2.3	2.3	43	79.0	4.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	43.2	34.1	15.9	4.5	2.3	44	77.3	4.1
Accessible and present during working hours	34.1	36.4	22.7	4.5	2.3	44	70.5	4.0
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	29.5	40.9	22.7	4.5	2.3	44	70.4	3.9

Myles, Lonny A.
 Judge, Zachary City Court

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	39.5	28.9	13.2	7.9	10.5	38	68.4	3.8
Maintains control of the proceedings	44.4	30.6	8.3	8.3	8.3	36	75.0	3.9
Attentive during proceedings	37.8	35.1	13.5	2.7	10.8	37	72.9	3.9
Maintains dignified demeanor	36.4	30.3	21.2	6.1	6.1	33	66.7	3.9
Decisive	34.3	40.0	11.4	8.6	5.7	35	74.3	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	27.3	24.2	27.3	9.1	12.1	33	51.5	3.5
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	24.2	27.3	27.3	6.1	15.2	33	51.5	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by media	21.2	33.3	24.2	6.1	15.2	33	54.5	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	25.8	32.3	19.4	9.7	12.9	31	58.1	3.5
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	30.3	27.3	15.2	15.2	12.1	33	57.6	3.5
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	30.3	36.4	18.2	3.0	12.1	33	66.7	3.7
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	31.3	31.3	18.8	6.3	12.5	32	62.6	3.6
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	36.4	30.3	18.2	3.0	12.1	33	66.7	3.8
Rules without gender bias	46.9	21.9	15.6	9.4	6.3	32	68.8	3.9
Knowledge of recent legal developments	21.2	48.5	15.2	6.1	9.1	33	69.7	3.7
Knowledge of rules of evidence	24.2	45.5	12.1	9.1	9.1	33	69.7	3.7
Knowledge of rules of procedure	24.2	45.5	15.2	3.0	12.1	33	69.7	3.7
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	25.8	45.2	12.9	3.2	12.9	31	71.0	3.7
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Understanding of complex legal issues	25.0	37.5	18.8	6.3	12.5	32	62.5	3.6
Starts proceedings on time	25.0	40.6	21.9	3.1	9.4	32	65.6	3.7
Level of preparation for proceedings	25.0	37.5	25.0	3.1	9.4	32	62.5	3.7
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	30.3	42.4	12.1	3.0	12.1	33	72.7	3.8
Promptness in making rulings	26.5	41.2	14.7	2.9	14.7	34	67.7	3.6
Efficiency in managing caseload	25.0	43.8	15.6	6.3	9.4	32	68.8	3.7
Accessible and present during working hours	21.2	45.5	18.2	6.1	9.1	33	66.7	3.6
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	24.2	36.4	27.3	3.0	9.1	33	60.6	3.6

Brady, James J.

Judge, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	55.2	33.3	10.5	1.0	0.0	105	88.5	4.4
Maintains control of the proceedings	55.2	33.3	10.5	1.0	0.0	105	88.5	4.4
Attentive during proceedings	55.1	32.7	11.2	1.0	0.0	98	87.8	4.4
Maintains dignified demeanor	59.2	31.6	9.2	0.0	0.0	98	90.8	4.5
Decisive	48.5	32.0	17.5	1.0	1.0	97	80.5	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	38.5	38.5	19.8	2.2	1.1	91	77.0	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	36.7	42.2	17.8	2.2	1.1	90	78.9	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by media	48.3	35.6	11.5	3.4	1.1	87	83.9	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	44.3	42.0	9.1	1.1	3.4	88	86.3	4.2
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	42.2	35.6	14.4	5.6	2.2	90	77.8	4.1
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	45.6	36.7	11.1	2.2	4.4	90	82.3	4.2
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	57.3	33.7	7.9	1.1	0.0	89	91.0	4.5
Rules without gender bias	59.8	29.9	9.2	1.1	0.0	87	89.7	4.5
Knowledge of recent legal developments	43.0	35.5	15.0	5.6	0.9	107	78.5	4.1
Knowledge of rules of evidence	38.1	41.0	13.3	4.8	2.9	105	79.1	4.1
Knowledge of rules of procedure	39.6	41.5	10.4	5.7	2.8	106	81.1	4.1
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	37.5	39.6	14.6	6.3	2.1	96	77.1	4.0
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	44.1	39.7	11.8	4.4	0.0	68	83.8	4.2
Understanding of complex legal issues	36.9	39.8	15.5	2.9	4.9	103	76.7	4.0
Starts proceedings on time	53.4	36.9	7.8	1.9	0.0	103	90.3	4.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	52.4	32.0	10.7	4.9	0.0	103	84.4	4.3
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	41.6	35.6	14.9	3.0	5.0	101	77.2	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	43.7	35.0	15.5	1.9	3.9	103	78.7	4.1
Efficiency in managing caseload	43.3	35.1	17.5	3.1	1.0	97	78.4	4.2
Accessible and present during working hours	36.5	41.7	18.8	2.1	1.0	96	78.2	4.1
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	45.9	34.7	17.3	2.0	0.0	98	80.6	4.2

Parker, John V.

Judge, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	32.5	29.1	22.2	11.3	4.9	203	61.6	3.7
Maintains control of the proceedings	67.3	21.9	7.7	2.0	1.0	196	89.2	4.5
Attentive during proceedings	51.8	31.3	13.3	2.1	1.5	195	83.1	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	56.1	25.8	13.1	2.5	2.5	198	81.9	4.3
Decisive	57.2	22.2	14.9	3.6	2.1	194	79.4	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	42.0	19.1	18.1	11.2	9.6	188	61.1	3.7
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	34.0	25.0	19.1	10.6	11.2	188	59.0	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by media	52.4	25.1	12.3	8.0	2.1	187	77.5	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	41.1	27.9	16.3	6.8	7.9	190	69.0	3.9
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	39.1	26.6	19.8	7.8	6.8	192	65.7	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	40.2	28.0	15.9	8.5	7.4	189	68.2	3.9
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	55.9	22.9	11.7	3.7	5.9	188	78.8	4.2
Rules without gender bias	56.1	23.5	11.8	3.7	4.8	187	79.6	4.2
Knowledge of recent legal developments	54.7	28.1	12.5	1.6	3.1	192	82.8	4.3
Knowledge of rules of evidence	54.7	30.0	10.0	2.6	2.6	190	84.7	4.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	59.9	24.5	9.4	3.6	2.6	192	84.4	4.4
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	46.8	30.6	14.0	5.9	2.7	186	77.4	4.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	48.6	30.0	15.7	1.4	4.3	140	78.6	4.2
Understanding of complex legal issues	52.4	28.3	12.6	2.1	4.7	191	80.7	4.2
Starts proceedings on time	64.7	23.5	8.6	0.5	2.7	187	88.2	4.5
Level of preparation for proceedings	52.4	31.9	10.8	2.2	2.7	185	84.3	4.3
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	39.7	30.2	17.3	4.5	8.4	179	69.9	3.9
Promptness in making rulings	38.7	30.1	19.9	5.4	5.9	186	68.8	3.9
Efficiency in managing caseload	44.9	24.7	16.9	7.3	6.2	178	69.6	3.9
Accessible and present during working hours	34.1	27.2	19.1	9.8	9.8	173	61.3	3.7
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	45.9	25.4	15.5	7.2	6.1	181	71.3	4.0

Polozola, Frank J.

Judge, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	27.1	28.3	21.5	12.1	10.9	247	55.4	3.5
Maintains control of the proceedings	70.2	18.6	6.6	2.5	2.1	242	88.8	4.5
Attentive during proceedings	63.5	23.2	10.4	1.2	1.7	241	86.7	4.5
Maintains dignified demeanor	51.2	25.6	11.6	5.8	5.8	242	76.8	4.1
Decisive	64.6	20.7	9.7	1.3	3.8	237	85.3	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	34.3	23.9	20.0	9.1	12.6	230	58.2	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	27.7	25.5	22.1	11.3	13.4	231	53.2	3.4
Outcomes not influenced by media	43.4	20.2	17.5	8.3	10.5	228	63.6	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	38.3	27.2	17.4	6.4	10.6	235	65.5	3.8
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	38.0	26.1	19.2	9.0	7.7	234	64.1	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	39.7	26.5	14.1	7.7	12.0	234	66.2	3.7
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	53.7	24.9	11.8	3.1	6.6	229	78.6	4.2
Rules without gender bias	56.6	23.7	11.0	1.8	7.0	228	80.3	4.2
Knowledge of recent legal developments	63.9	24.5	7.1	2.5	2.1	241	88.4	4.5
Knowledge of rules of evidence	61.9	25.4	8.5	1.3	3.0	236	87.3	4.4
Knowledge of rules of procedure	64.8	23.3	7.2	1.7	3.0	236	88.1	4.5
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	48.3	34.6	9.8	3.8	3.4	234	82.9	4.2
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	51.2	28.5	14.5	1.7	4.1	172	79.7	4.2
Understanding of complex legal issues	59.0	26.1	7.3	4.3	3.4	234	85.1	4.3
Starts proceedings on time	59.1	28.9	8.1	1.7	2.1	235	88.0	4.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	59.6	29.4	7.7	0.9	2.6	235	89.0	4.4
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	40.1	26.4	18.1	5.7	9.7	227	66.5	3.8
Promptness in making rulings	41.2	25.3	18.0	7.3	8.2	233	66.5	3.8
Efficiency in managing caseload	40.6	26.2	19.7	5.2	8.3	229	66.8	3.9
Accessible and present during working hours	35.8	28.4	17.4	9.2	9.2	218	64.2	3.7
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	56.2	26.1	8.8	3.5	5.3	226	82.3	4.2

Tyson, Ralph E.

Judge, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	67.7	23.2	7.1	1.9	0.0	155	90.9	4.6
Maintains control of the proceedings	62.5	25.7	11.1	0.7	0.0	144	88.2	4.5
Attentive during proceedings	64.8	25.4	7.0	2.1	0.7	142	90.2	4.5
Maintains dignified demeanor	70.4	20.4	7.7	1.4	0.0	142	90.8	4.6
Decisive	58.2	26.2	12.1	1.4	2.1	141	84.4	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	51.4	29.3	15.7	3.6	0.0	140	80.7	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	44.9	34.1	15.9	5.1	0.0	138	79.0	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by media	53.6	29.0	15.2	1.4	0.7	138	82.6	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	52.2	33.3	13.8	0.7	0.0	138	85.5	4.4
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	49.6	36.5	10.9	2.9	0.0	137	86.1	4.3
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	51.1	37.4	9.4	1.4	0.7	139	88.5	4.4
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	61.9	25.9	9.4	2.9	0.0	139	87.8	4.5
Rules without gender bias	63.6	27.9	8.6	0.0	0.0	140	91.5	4.6
Knowledge of recent legal developments	51.0	32.2	12.6	1.4	2.8	143	83.2	4.3
Knowledge of rules of evidence	52.5	29.1	15.6	2.1	0.7	141	81.6	4.3
Knowledge of rules of procedure	50.0	33.6	13.6	1.4	1.4	140	83.6	4.3
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	46.3	33.8	13.2	5.1	1.5	136	80.1	4.2
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	51.9	31.1	15.1	1.9	0.0	106	83.0	4.3
Understanding of complex legal issues	48.9	31.7	13.7	4.3	1.4	139	80.6	4.2
Starts proceedings on time	61.7	24.1	10.6	2.1	1.4	141	85.8	4.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	52.9	30.4	12.3	3.6	0.7	138	83.3	4.3
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	44.4	21.5	15.3	9.0	9.7	144	65.9	3.8
Promptness in making rulings	45.8	20.8	16.7	9.7	6.9	144	66.6	3.9
Efficiency in managing caseload	43.2	28.8	15.8	7.9	4.3	139	72.0	4.0
Accessible and present during working hours	42.1	25.6	19.5	8.3	4.5	133	67.7	3.9
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	53.2	28.1	12.9	4.3	1.4	139	81.3	4.3

Dalby, Docia

Magistrate, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	49.1	34.5	12.1	0.9	3.4	116	83.6	4.3
Maintains control of the proceedings	47.7	33.9	14.7	2.8	0.9	109	81.6	4.2
Attentive during proceedings	55.9	30.6	10.8	1.8	0.9	111	86.5	4.4
Maintains dignified demeanor	59.6	26.6	8.3	4.6	0.9	109	86.2	4.4
Decisive	45.9	37.6	10.1	3.7	2.8	109	83.5	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	50.0	34.9	10.4	3.8	0.9	106	84.9	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	45.7	37.1	12.4	2.9	1.9	105	82.8	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by media	55.8	30.8	10.6	2.9	0.0	104	86.6	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	49.0	34.6	10.6	4.8	1.0	104	83.6	4.3
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	44.2	37.5	13.5	3.8	1.0	104	81.7	4.2
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	49.0	34.6	11.5	4.8	0.0	104	83.6	4.3
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	58.3	28.2	9.7	1.9	1.9	103	86.5	4.4
Rules without gender bias	60.6	25.0	10.6	2.9	1.0	104	85.6	4.4
Knowledge of recent legal developments	41.8	37.3	13.6	5.5	1.8	110	79.1	4.1
Knowledge of rules of evidence	42.7	36.9	14.6	4.9	1.0	103	79.6	4.2
Knowledge of rules of procedure	46.1	35.3	13.7	2.0	2.9	102	81.4	4.2
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	41.9	37.1	12.4	3.8	4.8	105	79.0	4.1
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	43.8	35.9	15.6	3.1	1.6	64	79.7	4.2
Understanding of complex legal issues	38.1	38.1	16.2	4.8	2.9	105	76.2	4.0
Starts proceedings on time	58.5	29.2	10.4	0.9	0.9	106	87.7	4.4
Level of preparation for proceedings	51.9	33.7	8.7	2.9	2.9	104	85.6	4.3
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	45.1	29.4	18.6	2.9	3.9	102	74.5	4.1
Promptness in making rulings	45.2	25.0	21.2	4.8	3.8	104	70.2	4.0
Efficiency in managing caseload	51.0	28.4	13.7	2.0	4.9	102	79.4	4.2
Accessible and present during working hours	48.5	28.7	15.8	5.9	1.0	101	77.2	4.2
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	53.5	28.7	11.9	3.0	3.0	101	82.2	4.3

Noland, Christine

Magistrate, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	54.0	28.0	12.0	2.5	3.5	200	82.0	4.3
Maintains control of the proceedings	35.4	33.3	22.4	5.7	3.1	192	68.7	3.9
Attentive during proceedings	49.5	32.0	14.9	2.6	1.0	194	81.5	4.3
Maintains dignified demeanor	50.0	34.0	10.8	2.1	3.1	194	84.0	4.3
Decisive	34.7	29.0	25.9	5.7	4.7	193	63.7	3.8
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	43.3	38.0	10.7	4.3	3.7	187	81.3	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	39.6	36.9	14.4	4.8	4.3	187	76.5	4.0
Outcomes not influenced by media	48.1	35.1	13.0	2.2	1.6	185	83.2	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	47.1	33.2	10.7	3.7	5.3	187	80.3	4.1
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	41.1	35.1	13.5	5.9	4.3	185	76.2	4.0
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	44.1	36.0	10.8	3.2	5.9	186	80.1	4.1
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	56.5	31.5	7.1	3.3	1.6	184	88.0	4.4
Rules without gender bias	53.8	31.3	7.7	3.8	3.3	182	85.1	4.3
Knowledge of recent legal developments	28.6	34.9	27.1	6.3	3.1	192	63.5	3.8
Knowledge of rules of evidence	27.7	37.5	26.1	6.0	2.7	184	65.2	3.8
Knowledge of rules of procedure	31.1	38.8	21.3	5.5	3.3	183	69.9	3.9
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	29.0	35.5	24.0	6.6	4.9	183	64.5	3.8
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	31.6	34.2	27.2	4.4	2.6	114	65.8	3.9
Understanding of complex legal issues	22.1	34.2	28.9	9.5	5.3	190	56.3	3.6
Starts proceedings on time	50.5	33.0	11.7	2.1	2.7	188	83.5	4.3
Level of preparation for proceedings	36.4	35.8	19.8	6.4	1.6	187	72.2	4.0
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	33.0	30.2	27.9	5.6	3.4	179	63.2	3.8
Promptness in making rulings	33.2	30.4	26.6	6.5	3.3	184	63.6	3.8
Efficiency in managing caseload	37.8	32.2	22.2	3.3	4.4	180	70.0	4.0
Accessible and present during working hours	37.0	34.8	20.7	3.3	4.3	386	71.8	4.0
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	34.8	35.9	19.9	6.1	3.3	181	70.7	3.9

Reidlinger, Stephen C.

Magistrate, United States District Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	71.5	22.7	2.9	0.5	2.4	207	94.2	4.6
Maintains control of the proceedings	65.7	25.4	8.0	0.0	1.0	201	91.1	4.6
Attentive during proceedings	69.7	24.4	5.0	0.0	1.0	201	94.1	4.6
Maintains dignified demeanor	71.3	20.8	6.4	0.5	1.0	202	92.1	4.6
Decisive	62.4	26.2	10.4	0.0	1.0	202	88.6	4.5
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	57.7	26.3	8.2	4.1	3.6	194	84.0	4.3
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	53.9	25.4	13.0	4.7	3.1	193	79.3	4.2
Outcomes not influenced by media	59.6	28.7	8.0	1.6	2.1	188	88.3	4.4
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	59.0	26.2	10.3	2.1	2.6	195	85.2	4.4
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	57.2	27.3	8.8	3.1	3.6	194	84.5	4.3
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	58.0	26.9	8.8	3.1	3.1	193	84.9	4.3
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	67.7	23.4	6.8	1.0	1.0	192	91.1	4.6
Rules without gender bias	68.2	22.9	6.3	1.6	1.0	192	91.1	4.6
Knowledge of recent legal developments	63.2	26.4	9.0	0.5	1.0	201	89.6	4.5
Knowledge of rules of evidence	59.7	27.0	10.2	2.0	1.0	196	86.7	4.4
Knowledge of rules of procedure	61.5	26.7	8.7	2.1	1.0	195	88.2	4.5
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	59.3	26.8	10.8	2.1	1.0	115	86.1	4.4
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	58.5	24.4	12.2	2.4	2.4	123	82.9	4.3
Understanding of complex legal issues	58.2	28.6	9.7	2.0	1.5	196	86.8	4.4
Starts proceedings on time	71.9	21.9	4.6	0.5	1.0	196	93.8	4.6
Level of preparation for proceedings	67.5	24.4	6.6	0.5	1.0	197	91.9	4.6
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	56.7	29.4	10.7	1.6	1.6	187	86.1	4.4
Promptness in making rulings	57.3	29.2	9.4	2.6	1.6	192	86.5	4.4
Efficiency in managing caseload	59.9	29.7	6.8	2.6	1.0	192	89.6	4.4
Accessible and present during working hours	61.8	26.3	9.7	0.0	2.2	186	88.1	4.5
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	67.4	21.4	9.1	0.5	1.6	187	88.8	4.5

Phillips, Louis M.

Judge, United States Bankruptcy Court, Middle District of Louisiana

Characteristics	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	(N)	VG + G	Avg.
Courteous	36.6	13.8	13.8	14.6	21.1	123	50.4	3.3
Maintains control of the proceedings	57.6	17.8	15.3	4.2	5.1	118	75.4	4.2
Attentive during proceedings	50.4	23.1	13.7	7.7	5.1	117	73.5	4.1
Maintains dignified demeanor	36.7	18.3	14.2	12.5	18.3	120	55.0	3.4
Decisive	55.0	20.8	10.8	5.8	7.5	120	75.8	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by political beliefs	51.8	17.9	11.6	7.1	11.6	112	69.7	3.9
Outcomes not influenced by personal beliefs	42.0	16.1	13.4	13.4	15.2	112	58.1	3.6
Outcomes not influenced by media	57.0	17.8	11.2	5.6	8.4	107	74.8	4.1
Outcomes not influenced by contributions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Avoids favoritism toward lawyers	43.2	12.6	13.5	9.0	21.6	111	55.8	3.5
Fair and consistent practices and rulings	48.6	16.2	11.7	10.8	12.6	111	64.8	3.8
Avoids favoritism toward particular litigants	45.9	16.5	10.1	11.0	16.5	109	62.4	3.6
Rules without racial or ethnic bias	56.1	18.7	9.3	4.7	11.2	107	74.8	4.0
Rules without gender bias	57.5	17.0	8.5	6.6	10.4	106	74.5	4.0
Knowledge of recent legal developments	72.5	17.4	3.7	2.8	3.7	109	89.9	4.5
Knowledge of rules of evidence	58.2	21.8	10.9	3.6	5.5	110	80.0	4.2
Knowledge of rules of procedure	56.5	24.1	9.3	3.7	6.5	108	80.6	4.2
Clarity and completeness of written rulings	49.0	25.5	10.8	3.9	10.8	102	74.5	4.0
Adequacy and clarity of instructions to jurors	64.2	17.0	9.4	1.9	7.5	53	81.2	4.3
Understanding of complex legal issues	61.1	24.1	3.7	3.7	7.4	108	85.2	4.3
Starts proceedings on time	40.2	32.7	11.2	8.4	7.5	107	72.9	3.9
Level of preparation for proceedings	58.7	22.1	10.6	3.8	4.8	104	80.8	4.3
Avoids keeping cases under advisement	41.2	20.6	12.7	6.9	18.6	102	61.8	3.6
Promptness in making rulings	44.3	19.8	13.2	6.6	16.0	106	64.1	3.7
Efficiency in managing caseload	46.2	23.1	17.3	4.8	8.7	104	69.3	3.9
Accessible and present during working hours	42.0	17.0	21.0	9.0	11.0	100	59.0	3.7
Resourceful and industrious work ethic	50.9	21.7	9.4	8.5	9.4	106	72.6	4.0

