

OVERVIEW OF OFFICIAL JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAMS

STATE OR JURISDICTION	OPERATION AND AUTHORIZATION	STATED GOALS	COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	PARTICIPATING JUDGES	FREQUENCY	PUBLIC DISSEMINATION?
Alaska	Alaska Judicial Council (Alaska Stat. §§22.05.100, 22.07.060, 22.10.150, 22.15.195)	To provide information to voters for retention elections; to provide useful feedback to judges for self-improvement	7 members: Chief Justice (ex officio chair), 3 attorneys appointed by state bar, 3 members of the public appointed by governor.	All judges	Prior to retention election	Yes – Included in election pamphlet mailed to every voter; detailed evaluations posted on website. Alaska Judicial Council also uses social media, paid media, and community presentations to disseminate evaluation results.
Arizona	Commission on Judicial Performance Review (Ariz. Const. art. VI, §42)	To provide information to voters for retention elections; to identify needed education and training programs; to promote appropriate judicial assignments	34 members, all appointed by state supreme court: up to 6 attorneys, up to 7 judges, the remainder members of the public.	All appellate judges; Superior Court judges in Coconino, Maricopa, Pima and Pinal Counties	Every two years (mid-term and prior to retention election)	Yes – Retention reviews are mailed to voters and made available on Arizona courts webpage. Mid-term performance reviews are confidential.
Colorado	Office of Judicial Performance Evaluation (OJPE); State Commission (for appellate judges) and 22 district commissions (for trial judges) (C.R.S. §13-5.5-101 et seq.)	To provide information to voters for retention elections; to provide useful feedback to judges for self-improvement	State commission has 11 members: 5 attorneys and 6 members of the public. District commissions have 10 members: 4 attorneys and 6 members of the public.	All judges	Interim evaluations within first 2 years on bench, with optional follow-up. Regular retention year for all judges.	Yes – Blue Book of Ballot Issues (election information) sent to all voters prior to election; also available on OJPE website.

STATE OR JURISDICTION	OPERATION AND AUTHORIZATION	STATED GOALS	COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	PARTICIPATING JUDGES	FREQUENCY	PUBLIC DISSEMINATION?
Connecticut	Judicial Selection Commission (Conn. Gen. Stat. § 51-44a <i>et seq.</i>)	To provide recommendations to the governor on new judicial candidates and candidates seeking reappointment	12 members, two from each Congressional district. No more than 6 members may belong to the same political party, and no more than 6 members may be attorneys.	New judicial nominees and incumbent judges seeking reappointment	Upon seeking reappointment	Only evaluation criteria and procedural rules are made public. Judge may request that hearings concerning reappointment be open to the public.
D.C.	D.C. Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure (Title 11, Appx. IV433)	To evaluate judges' performance and fitness for reappointment or senior status	7 members, including 4 attorneys, 2 members of the public, and a federal judge.	Those seeking reappointment or senior status	Upon seeking reappointment or senior status	Reports are sent to the President of the United States and posted on the Commission's website.
Hawaii	Committee on Judicial Performance (Supreme Court Rule 19)	To improve judicial performance; increase the efficiency of judicial management; provide the Judicial Selection Commission with information for retention and promotion decisions; improve judicial education programs; and public trust and confidence in the courts	12 members, all appointed by Chief Justice: currently includes 3 judges, 5 attorneys, 3 members of the public, and Administrative Director of the Courts	All full-time judges, and a limited number of per diem judges who appear to have worked on substantive matters.	As retention and appointment decisions warrant	Summary reports are disseminated through circuit law libraries; individual results are kept confidential.

STATE OR JURISDICTION	OPERATION AND AUTHORIZATION	STATED GOALS	COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	PARTICIPATING JUDGES	FREQUENCY	PUBLIC DISSEMINATION?
Idaho	Idaho Supreme Court program	To promote professional self-improvement	None	Trial judges	Nine months and 18 months into initial term, then every three years	No – results are kept strictly confidential.
Illinois	Illinois Supreme Court Rule 58	To promote professional self-improvement	Internally designated by Supreme Court	Circuit and Associate judges	No regular timetable; 150-175 judges randomly chosen for evaluation each year	No – evaluation data is confidential, with a limited exception for internal use if judge's conduct negatively affects court operations or public confidence
Massachusetts	Supreme Judicial Court Judicial Performance Evaluation Committee (M.G.L. ch. 211, §26-26b; Sup. Ct. R. 1:16)	To promote professional self-improvement	19-member advisory committee, all selected by the court system	All trial judges	Every three years	No – report goes only to evaluated judge, Chief Justice of the relevant trial court, and Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court
Missouri	Judicial Performance Review Committee, administered by The Missouri Bar in partnership with the courts (Supreme Court Rule 10.50)	To educate voters in advance of retention elections	21 members: 2 from each of six trial circuits, and 3 from each of three appellate districts; total of 9 lawyers, 9 members of the public, and 3 retired judges	Appellate judges and trial judges in the six Circuit Courts which use the Missouri Nonpartisan Court plan (i.e., merit selection)	In retention years	Evaluation results posted on dedicated website and distributed widely to the media via press conference and press releases
New Hampshire	JPE Advisory Committee (New Hampshire Supreme Court Rule 56)	To promote judicial self-improvement; to provide information to the public about the overall performance of the judiciary	Judicial, bar, and legislative representatives	All judges, including marital masters	Every three years	Annual summary report for entire judiciary is presented to Governor and other top state officials

STATE OR JURISDICTION	OPERATION AND AUTHORIZATION	STATED GOALS	COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	PARTICIPATING JUDGES	FREQUENCY	PUBLIC DISSEMINATION?
New Jersey	Judicial Evaluation Commission operating under auspices of New Jersey Supreme Court (RGA 1:35A-2-4)	To provide feedback useful for self-improvement; to assist with reappointment decisions; to enrich judicial education programs	3 retired judges	All judges	Second and fifth year after appointment	No public dissemination. Reports are shared externally with Governor and Senate Judiciary Committee
New Mexico	Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission (N.M. Ct. R. 28-101 et seq.)	To improve judicial performance; to provide information to voters for retention elections	15 members – 7 lawyers and 8 members of the public. Members are selected from nominations by the Governor, Chief Justice, and legislative leaders	All sitting judges except those running in a partisan election	Midterm and prior to retention election	Yes – Retention evaluations are posted on commission’s website, published in newspapers, and promoted through paid media. Midterm evaluations are confidential.
Puerto Rico	Judicial Evaluation Commission (within the Office of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court) (P.R. Laws Title 4, §73 et seq.)	To promote self-improvement; build education programs; recommend allocation of resources; make recommendations on renomination and promotion	9 members, including 1 supreme court justice, 1 member experienced in managerial and administrative affairs, and at least 1 member of the public.	Trial judges	Every 3 years for Superior Court; every 4 years for District Court; every 3 years for Municipal Court	No public dissemination. Annual report provided to the Chief Justice, the Administrator of the Office of Court Administration, and the Governor (in cases of renomination and promotion).
Rhode Island	Judicial Performance Evaluation Committee (R.I. Sup. Ct. R. 7.1 et seq.)	To promote judicial self-improvement; to improve the design and content of continuing judicial education classes	11 members – 6 judges, 3 members of the state bar, 2 members of the public familiar with the judicial system	All judges	Every 2 years	No – sent to Chief Justice of Supreme Court and Chief Judge of each district court only. Disclosure of data is heavily circumscribed.

STATE OR JURISDICTION	OPERATION AND AUTHORIZATION	STATED GOALS	COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	PARTICIPATING JUDGES	FREQUENCY	PUBLIC DISSEMINATION?
Utah	Utah Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission (Utah Rev. Stat. 78A-12-101 et seq.)	To provide information to voters for retention; to provide information to judges for self-improvement	13 members, appointed by different branches of state government. At least 2 members, but no more than 6, must be attorneys	All judges	Trial judges face midterm evaluation after three years and final evaluation after five; Supreme Court evaluated at three, seven, and nine years	Yes – published on JPEC website and in paid and social media
Vermont	Joint Committee on Judicial Retention (4 V.S.A. § 608)	To make recommendations to the state legislature on judicial retention	8 members – four from the House of Representatives and four from the Senate	Judges seeking retention	Prior to retention elections	Report for each judge seeking retention presented to the General Assembly for consideration
Virginia	Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia (Va. Code §17.1-100; Rules of Sup. Ct. of Va. 9:1 & 9:2)	To provide information to legislators for retention; to provide information to judges for self-improvement	JPE Advisory Committee advises Chief Justice on program (currently 11 judges, 2 retired judges, 1 attorney, and program director)	All judges	Three times per term	No public dissemination. Final report sent to Chairs of Senate and House Judiciary Committees; these are treated as public records open to inspection

Note: This chart reflects official judicial performance evaluation programs only. State and/or local bars conduct independent judicial evaluations or attorney polls in California, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming. In Maryland, a private website with no apparent connection to the state or the bar (www.mdjudicialevaluations.com) offers lawyers a chance to “complete an evaluation” for eventual publication. In Nevada, evaluations are conducted by a newspaper, the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*.