

Agenda and Minutes

Judicial Performance Evaluation Program Subcommittee:

Evaluating Judges Assigned to High Volume Courts and Presiding Judges

Tuesday, March 31, 2009 at 2:15 p.m.

Middlesex Judicial District

One Court Street

Middletown, CT

Attendees: Hon. F. Iannotti (Co-Chair), Atty. A. Dranginis (Co-Chair), Hon. J. Alexander, Hon. P. Clifford, Hon. W. Cremins, Atty. R. Hassett, Hon. K. Hutchinson

Absent: Hon. W. Bright, Rep. G. Fox, Hon. T. O'Keefe, Atty. H. Woodard

Staff: K. Chorney

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from Feb. 26, 2009

Minutes accepted with the following changes:

- Page 2, last line of first bold paragraph, remove the word "statewide" after the word "survey".
- Page 2, last line of second bold paragraph, delete "...and special proceedings judges"; replace with "..., special proceedings judges, and Family Support Magistrates."
- Page 3, last line of last paragraph, substitute the word "crafting" for the word "identifying".
- Page 4, second sentence of bold paragraph, delete sentence and replace with "The first peer monitoring findings will be conveyed orally with the mentoring judge present; the second peer monitoring findings will be conveyed in writing with the mentoring judge present; both will occur by the first year anniversary of a new judge's appointment."

2. Discussion of Questions Specific to Evaluation for High Volume Court Judges

The members discussed various rating scales ranging from "Satisfied/Dissatisfied" to "Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor" to "Above Average, Average, Below Average." The members agreed that limiting the evaluation form to one page and keeping the response options simplified might encourage a higher rate of questionnaires returned. The members further agreed that the individual/organization certifying the evaluation instrument as valid would also need to advise the Judicial Branch regarding the number of response options required to support the instrument's validity. ***The committee agreed to recommend using as few response options as possible while maintaining a statistically valid evaluation instrument.***

3. Develop Questions Specific to Evaluation for High Volume Court Judges

In preparation for developing specific questions for high volume court judges, the members reviewed copies of previous Attorney Questionnaires (JD-ES-69 Rev. 10-90, JD-ES-141 Rev. 9-94, JD-ES-69 Rev. 5/2001, and JD-ES-69 Rev. 3/07) in addition to a list of potential evaluation questions submitted for consideration by Hon. F. Iannotti and Hon. W. Cremins.

The committee members agreed to the following Attorney Questionnaire items:

Please rate the judge before whom you appeared	Rating Scale
<i>(Please note that the rating scale will be established by the validating individual/organization.)</i>	
1) Decisiveness During Proceedings	
2) Courtesy of the Judge	
3) Patience During Proceedings	
4) Courtroom Decorum	
5) Demonstrates Respect During Proceedings	
6) Efficient Pace of Proceedings	
7) Control of Courtroom	
8) Impartiality of Conduct	
9) Consistency of Rulings	
10) Explanation of Rulings	
11) Ability to Effectively Settle Cases	
12) Facilitation in Development of Options for Settlements/Pleas <i>(This question is specific to Presiding Judges and therefore the rating scale should include "N/A" or Not Applicable)</i>	
Please indicate the number of years you have practiced law: 1-5, 6-10, more than 10	

4. Discussion and Development of Questions Specific to Evaluation of Presiding Judges

The last item in the box above was identified as being specific to Presiding Judges.

5. Next Steps

The committee members requested that support staff make inquiries regarding the electronic distribution and submission of the Attorney Questionnaires.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 30, 2009 at 2:15 p.m. in the Middlesex JD, Room 607L.