



JUDICIARY COMMITTEE EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Each judicial candidate requesting an evaluation by the LBA Judiciary Committee is eligible to receive a rating of “Highly Recommended,” “Recommended” or “Not Recommended.”

The LBA Judiciary Committee bases its ratings for each candidate on a two-part evaluation process. Each candidate completes a Judicial Candidate Questionnaire. An Investigator conducts the first phase of the process, which includes personal interviews with the candidates and with individuals who have had professional or personal dealings with them. Upon completion of the investigative process, the Investigator submits confidential reports to the Chair of the Committee.

The Committee then conducts the second phase of the evaluation process. The Committee interviews each candidate, discusses his or her qualifications, and reaches a consensus on each candidate’s rating. Ratings are made public, through the Judiciary Committee Chair, as the Committee deems appropriate.

Definitions of the ratings are:

Highly Recommended: The candidate possesses the highest combination of legal ability, experience, integrity, and temperament, and would be capable of outstanding performance as a judge for which he/she is a candidate.

Recommended: Based on legal ability, experience, integrity, and temperament, the candidate would be able to perform satisfactorily as a judge for which he/she is a candidate.

Not Recommended: Based on legal ability, experience, integrity or temperament, or any combination thereof, at the present time, the candidate is inadequate to perform satisfactorily as a judge for which he/she is a candidate. A candidate who refuses to



participate in the Committee's evaluation process may receive a rating of "Not Recommended for Failure to Participate in the Evaluation Process."