

Hon. Judge Green  
 Appointment date: 5/21/2012  
 Bench assignment: Family Law

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Attorney Survey Responses

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>														
1. Legal reasoning ability	2	25%	3	38%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	2.75	8	1	88%
2. Knowledge of substantive law	2	25%	3	38%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	2.75	8	1	88%
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	2.88	8	1	100%
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	2	25%	4	50%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	8	1	100%
Category Total	8	25%	13	41%	9	28%	2	6%	0	0%	2.84	32		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>2. Integrity</b>														
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	2.88	8	1	100%
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	4	50%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	8	1	100%
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	1	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	4	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	3	100%
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	3	100%
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	43%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	7	2	100%
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	5	100%
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	43%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	7	2	100%
Category Total	25	42%	27	46%	7	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	59		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>3. Communication</b>														
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	2.88	8	1	100%
15. Clear and logical written decisions	1	14%	4	57%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	2.86	7	2	100%
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	2	25%	1	13%	5	63%	0	0%	0	0%	2.63	8	1	100%
Category Total	5	22%	8	35%	10	43%	0	0%	0	0%	2.78	23		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>4. Temperament</b>														
17. Understanding and compassion	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%	0	0%	2.50	8	1	75%
18. Dignified	3	38%	2	25%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	8	1	100%
19. Courteous	2	25%	1	13%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	2.50	8	1	88%
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	2	25%	2	25%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	2.63	8	1	88%
21. Patient	2	25%	1	13%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	2.50	8	1	88%
Category Total	11	28%	8	20%	16	40%	5	13%	0	0%	2.63	40		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>														
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	1	100%
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	4	50%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	8	1	100%
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	2.88	8	1	100%
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	2	25%	4	50%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	2.88	8	1	88%
26. Efficient management of the calendar	2	25%	4	50%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	8	1	100%
Category Total	13	33%	18	45%	8	20%	1	3%	0	0%	3.08	40		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>														
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	2.71	7	2	86%
Category Total	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	2.71	7		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Litigant Witness Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Green

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory	
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.					
<b>1. Integrity</b>															
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	13	81%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%		1	6%	3.44	16	0	88%
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.86	14	2	100%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	80%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%		1	7%	3.60	15	1	93%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.92	13	3	100%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.86	14	2	100%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	86%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%		1	7%	3.57	14	2	93%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.86	14	2	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.92	13	3	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	87%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%		1	7%	3.60	15	1	93%
Category Total	110	86%	10	8%	3	2%	1	1%		4	3%	3.73	128		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory	
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.					
<b>2. Communication</b>															
10. Explained proceedings	12	75%	2	13%	0	0%	1	6%		1	6%	3.44	16	0	88%
11. Explained reasons for delays	12	86%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%		1	7%	3.64	14	2	93%
Category Total	24	80%	3	10%	0	0%	1	3%		2	7%	3.53	30		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory	
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.					
<b>3. Temperament</b>															
12. Understanding and compassion	13	81%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%		1	6%	3.44	16	0	88%
13. Dignified	13	81%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%		1	6%	3.56	16	0	94%
14. Courteous	12	75%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%		1	6%	3.50	16	0	94%
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	13	81%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%		1	6%	3.50	16	0	88%
16. Patient	12	75%	1	6%	2	13%	0	0%		1	6%	3.44	16	0	94%
Category Total	63	79%	5	6%	5	6%	2	3%		5	6%	3.49	80		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory	
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.					
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>															
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.94	16	0	100%
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	13	81%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%		1	6%	3.63	16	0	94%
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	73%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%		1	7%	3.47	15	1	93%
Category Total	39	83%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%		2	4%	3.68	47		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Staff Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Green

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section I: Integrity</b>														
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
2. Equal Treatment regardless of race	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	1	100%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	1	100%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	1	100%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	1	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>104</b>		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section II: Communication Skills</b>														
10. Clear and logical communications	8	67%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0	100%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>12</b>		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section III: Judicial Temperament</b>														
11. Understanding and compassion	6	50%	4	33%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	12	0	100%
12. Dignified	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0	100%
13. Courteous	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0	100%
14. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the Court and commissioner's ability	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
15. Patient	6	50%	3	25%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	12	0	100%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>60</b>		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section IV: Administrative Performance</b>														
16. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	91%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	1	100%
17. Maintained proper control in the courtroom	10	91%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	1	100%
18. Was prepared for proceedings	10	91%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	1	100%
19. Respectful treatment of staff	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0	100%
20. Cooperation with peers	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	3	100%
21. Efficient management of the calendar	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	1	100%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>65</b>		