

**Columbus Bar Association
2013 Judicial Performance Poll of Municipal Court Judges
Combined Judges Average**

Total Responses: 304

	Objectivity	Judicial Temperament	Legal Knowledge	Timeliness	Sentencing	Overall Rating
Barrows	8.5	8.5	8.7	8.9	7.8	8.4
Brandt	7.0	6.6	7.2	7.8	7.2	7.1
Glaeden	7.0	7.2	7.6	8.2	6.4	7.2
Green	6.8	6.9	7.1	7.3	6.4	7.0
Herbert	8.6	9.0	8.2	8.7	8.6	8.6
Hummer	8.3	8.3	8.1	8.4	8.1	8.3
O'Grady	7.7	7.6	7.4	8.0	7.9	7.7
Peeples	6.8	7.1	6.7	5.8	6.3	6.6
Pollitt	8.6	8.7	8.4	8.6	8.7	8.6
Salerno	6.5	6.5	5.8	5.7	6.8	6.2
Taylor	8.5	8.9	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6
Tyack	8.1	8.4	7.8	8.3	8.1	8.0
VanDerKarr	8.4	8.7	8.5	8.6	8.5	8.5
Young	8.4	8.4	8.2	8.5	8.3	8.1
Average All Judges	7.8	7.9	7.7	8.0	7.7	7.8

Rating Criteria

9 or 10 Excellence

7 or 8 Strong: Minor improvement may be needed

5 or 6 Acceptable: Moderate improvement is recommended and/or needed; however, Judge is performing his or her responsibilities as a judicial officer to the minimum level believed acceptable by the reviewer

3 or 4 Weak: Significant improvement is recommended and/or needed; Judge is not on a whole (*i.e.*, day-to-day) performing his or her responsibilities as a judicial officer at a level believed satisfactory (*i.e.*, acceptable) by the reviewer

1 or 2 Poor: The Judge is generally not performing his or her judicial responsibilities on a day-to-day basis at a level commiserate with the oath of office or for the benefit of the people of the jurisdiction he or she serves