



**COLORADO**

**Office of Judicial  
Performance Evaluation**

Judicial Branch

---

The Honorable Judge Craig P. Henderson  
2019 Judicial Performance Survey Report  
County Court

Conducted by:



75 Washington Ave. Ste. 2C  
Portland, ME 04101  
[www.marketdecisions.com](http://www.marketdecisions.com)

# Contents


Summary of Results.....	3
Overall Score.....	3
Performance Scores.....	4
Individual Category Scores.....	5
Summary of Responses .....	6
Detailed Report.....	7
Case Management .....	7
Application and Knowledge of Law .....	8
Communications.....	9
Demeanor .....	10
Diligence .....	11
Fairness .....	13
Appendix 1. Survey Methods – Attorney and Non-attorney .....	14
Methodology and How to Read Results.....	14
Appendix 2: Judge Response Counts by Type of Respondent.....	17

# Summary of Results

For Judge Henderson, 82 individuals completed surveys with at least a single rating question answered. This report reflects these 82 responses.


Respondents rated judges on various questions using an A to F scale, in which the grades were then converted to the following numerical scores: A= 4, B=3, C=2, D=1 and Fail=0. An average score of 4.0 is the highest possible score and a 0.0 is the lowest possible score.

## Overall Score



	Judge Henderson	All County Judges
Overall Grade	3.5	3.5


## Performance Scores



	Attorneys		Non-Attorneys	
	Judge Henderson	All County Judges	Judge Henderson	All County Judges
Yes, meets performance standards	78%	81%	84%	86%
No, does not meet performance standards	6%	13%	11%	10%
No opinion	17%	5%	5%	4%

Note: All percentages in this report are rounded to the nearest percentage point.

## Individual Category Scores



	Judge Henderson	All County Judges
Case Management	3.4	3.4
Application and Knowledge of Law	3.3	3.4
Communications	3.7	3.6
Diligence	3.5	3.5
Demeanor	3.4	3.5
Fairness	3.5	3.5


## Summary of Responses

Group	Responses	Response Rate	Percent with Sufficient Knowledge	Number with Sufficient Knowledge
Attorneys	29	43%	66%	19
Non-Attorneys	83	4%	76%	63

In addition to the responses above, Judge Henderson received 0 response(s) via the open Citizen Feedback survey. Those responses are included with non-attorney results wherever applicable. However, due to the nature of data collection, they are not included in response rates.


# Detailed Report

## Case Management



	Judge Henderson Overall	County Judges Overall	Judge Henderson Attorneys	Judge Henderson Non-Attorneys	Number of Responses
Promptly issuing a decision on the case after trial	3.5	3.5	3.5	N/A	18
Maintaining appropriate control over proceedings	3.1	3.4	3.1	N/A	19
Promptly ruling on pre-trial motions	3.5	3.4	3.5	N/A	16
Setting reasonable schedules for cases	3.4	3.4	3.4	N/A	19


## Application and Knowledge of Law



	Judge Henderson Overall	County Judges Overall	Judge Henderson Attorneys	Judge Henderson Non-Attorneys	Number of Responses
Being able to identify and analyze relevant facts	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	79
Basing decisions on evidence and arguments	3	3.2	3	N/A	19
Issuing consistent sentences when the circumstances are similar	3.3	3.4	3.3	N/A	13
Being fair and impartial to both sides of the case	2.9	3.2	2.9	N/A	19
Consistently applying laws and rules	3	3.2	3	N/A	19
Giving reasons for rulings	3.5	3.5	N/A	3.5	61
Willing to make decision without regard to possible outside pressure	3.3	3.5	N/A	3.3	57




## Communications




	Judge Henderson Overall	County Judges Overall	Judge Henderson Attorneys	Judge Henderson Non-Attorneys	Number of Responses
Making sure all participants understand the proceedings	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	82
Providing written communications that are clear, thorough and well reasoned	3.2	3.4	3.2	N/A	17
Using language that everyone can understand	3.7	3.7	N/A	3.7	63
Speaking clearly so everyone in the courtroom can hear what's being said	3.8	3.7	N/A	3.8	62

## Demeanor



	Judge Henderson Score	County Judges Overall	Judge Henderson Attorneys	Judge Henderson Non-Attorneys	Number of Responses
Giving proceedings a sense of dignity	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.6	82
Treating participants with respect	3.5	3.6	3	3.6	82
Conducting his/her courtroom in a neutral manner	3.3	3.4	2.8	3.4	82
Having a sense of compassion and human understanding for those who appear before him/her	3.5	3.5	N/A	3.5	62


## Diligence



	Judge Henderson Score	County Judges Overall	Judge Henderson Attorneys	Judge Henderson Non-Attorneys	Number of Responses
Using good judgment in application of relevant law and rules	3.1	3.2	3.1	N/A	19
Doing the necessary “homework” and being prepared for cases	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6	78
Being willing to handle cases on the docket even when they are complicated and time consuming	3.4	3.5	3.4	N/A	19
Beginning court on time	3.7	3.6	N/A	3.7	62
Maintaining appropriate control over proceedings	3.6	3.7	N/A	3.6	63
Setting reasonable schedules for cases	3.6	3.6	N/A	3.6	58
Managing court proceedings so that there is little wasted time	3.6	3.5	N/A	3.6	63



## Fairness



	Judge Henderson Score	County Judges Overall	Judge Henderson Attorneys	Judge Henderson Non-Attorneys	Number of Responses
Giving participants an opportunity to be heard	3.6	3.6	N/A	3.6	62
Treating those involved in the case without bias	3.4	3.5	N/A	3.4	63
Treating fairly people who represent themselves	3.5	3.5	N/A	3.5	46
Giving each side enough time to present his or her case	3.6	3.6	N/A	3.6	58

# Appendix 1. Survey Methods – Attorney and Non-attorney

## Methodology and How to Read Results

For Judge Henderson, 82 individuals completed surveys with at least a single rating question answered. This report reflects these 82 responses. The survey results are divided into eight sections: Retention, Case Management, Application and Knowledge of Law, Communications, Demeanor, Diligence, Fairness, Strengths, and Weaknesses.

### a. Response rates

#### Attorneys

During the 2018 administration, a total of 16,364 survey invitations were sent to 5,769 attorneys inviting them to evaluate judges and justices receiving interim reports in 2019. On average, each attorney was asked to evaluate 2.8 judges. In total 3,837 surveys were completed with an additional 2,309 responses where the attorney indicated that they did not have enough experience with the judge to be comfortable evaluating him or her. The response rate for the survey was 38% and the survey completion rate (the number of those familiar enough to evaluate the judge divided by the total number of attorney responses including those indicating they did not have sufficient familiarity to evaluate the judge) was 62%.

#### Non-attorneys

During the 2018 administration, a total of 141,174 survey invitations were sent to non-attorneys inviting them to evaluate judges and justices receiving interim reports in 2019. In total 4,862 surveys were completed with an additional 1,925 responses where the individual indicated that they did not have enough experience with the judge to be comfortable evaluating him or her. The response rate for the survey was 6% and the survey completion rate (the number of those familiar enough to evaluate the judge divided by the total number of responses including those indicating they did not have sufficient familiarity to evaluate the judge) was 72%.

### b. Methodology

The 2018 attorney survey was conducted in 4 quarterly cycles online beginning on June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Attorneys with appearances in front of judges during the first quarter of 2018 were first mailed a pre-notification letter on June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018 informing them about the survey and providing a link and login information to access the survey online. Next, a series of three email invitations were sent on June 7<sup>th</sup>, June 18<sup>th</sup>, and July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018.

This process was repeated among attorneys with appearances in the second quarter of 2018 beginning with a pre-notification letter sent on August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018. The letter was followed up by email invitations sent on August 13<sup>th</sup>, August 27<sup>th</sup>, and September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018. For those attorneys with appearances during the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2018, the process was repeated again with a letter sent on November 26<sup>th</sup> and a series of emails sent on November 29<sup>th</sup>, December 11<sup>th</sup>, and December 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

To further increase the amount of data collected, an additional cycle of data collection took place in January and February 2019. Invitations were emailed to attorneys with appearances during the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2018. This cycle included a pre-notification letter sent on January 25<sup>th</sup> followed up by email invitations sent on February 5<sup>th</sup>, February 11<sup>th</sup>, and February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Additional invitations and reminders were sent out on request throughout the data collection process.

Data collection among non-attorneys also featured four quarterly cycles with each cycle consisting of a mailed invitation letter with instructions to access the survey online followed by a mailed survey booklet with a prepaid

return envelope. To meet tight reporting deadlines, the order was switched for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter administration and the survey booklet was sent first followed by the letter.

Due to the ability to contact court staff via email, respondents were split into two groups for data collection: court staff and other non-attorneys. The court staff group includes staff members, interpreters and probation officers. The other non-attorney group includes jurors, defendants, witnesses, litigants, and law enforcement personnel.

Court staff members were invited via emailed invitations sent on November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018 and reminders sent on November 13<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup>.

In addition to the main non-attorney survey where respondents were invited to participate, there was also a citizen feedback survey available to all citizens on the OJPE website. This survey was open for the entire data collection period and data was downloaded for analysis on February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2019. During this period 87 valid responses were received. The survey remained open and any responses received after February 21<sup>st</sup> or for judges not receiving an interim evaluation in 2019 were held over for the 2020 evaluation cycle.

**Table 1: Non-Attorney Data Collection Dates**

<b>Cycle</b>	<b>Invitation Letter</b>	<b>Survey Booklet</b>
Q1	5/18/18	6/20/18
Q2	8/2/18	9/7/18
Q3	11/9/18	12/19/18
Q4	1/31/19	1/23/19

### **c. Questions**

In the core of the survey, attorneys evaluated district and county judges on 17 aspects of judicial performance and appellate judges on 12 aspects of judicial performance using a grade scale of A, B, C, D, or F. These aspects were grouped by topic into different categories, five for district and county judges and two for appellate judges. The district and county categories were: Case Management, Application and Knowledge of Law, Communications, Demeanor, and Diligence. Questions regarding appellate judges were divided into two categories, one for general questions and one specific to their writing (only asked of those who indicated they had experience with the judge or justice's written opinions).

In a final question, respondents were asked if they thought whether the judge met judicial performance standards

The question wording for the core of the survey was carried over from the 2017 administration with only minor changes to make the survey gender neutral. The questions were originally developed in 1998 to meet the criteria outlined in statute 13-5.5-101 et seq.

Non-attorney respondents evaluated judges on 19 aspects of judicial performance using the same grade scale of A, B, C, D, or Fail. In a final question, respondents were asked if they thought whether the judge met judicial performance standards. The overall structure of the survey was similar to the attorney survey, but the individual rating questions were tailored to aspects that could be rated by those without specific legal experience.

### **d. Analysis and Reporting**

Letter grades were converted to a numerical score where A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1 and Fail = 0 for analysis. The results include an overall grade, a grade for each category, as well as a grade for each question. The overall score is calculated by averaging the responses to all questions answered by the attorneys. This score will have the same numerical range as the individual questions from zero to four.

Each category score is calculated by averaging the responses to all questions answered by the attorney within each category. This score will have the same zero to four numerical range as the individual questions. Similarly, 2019 Judicial Performance Survey Report for Judge Craig P. Henderson

an average score is calculated for each individual question with the exception of the final question on meeting performance standards.

The overall average and category scores will be reported for each judge along with the average scores for the judge's peers. The average score (with the exception noted above) will also be reported for each question along with the peer group score. In addition, the report will include the distribution of responses for each question, i.e. the percentage of attorneys that assigned a rating of A, B, C, D, and F. The distribution of responses is also reported for the question on retention.

#### **e. Comments**

At the end of each group of questions respondents had the option of leaving comments about the judge's performance in that area. By statute, these comments are confidential and only provided to the judge and the District Commission on Judicial Performance. They are not released to the public when the rest of the report is released.



## Appendix 2: Judge Response Counts by Type of Respondent

Respondent Type	Total Sent	Number of Responses	Undeliverable/ Not Applicable	Completes*	Cooperation Rate
Attorney	68	29	0	19	66%
Law Enforcement	72	7	0	3	43%
Litigant	2041	41	356	30	73%
Juror	109	30	5	25	83%
Others	8	5	0	5	100%
<b>Total Non-Attorneys</b>	2230	83	361	63	76%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	2298	112	361	82	73%

\*Completed surveys include respondents who said that they have sufficient experience to evaluate the judge.