

Hon. Judge Olson  
 Appointment date: 8/29/2021  
 Bench assignment: Juvenile

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	4	22%	6	33%	2	11%	3	17%	3	17%	2.28	18	0	67%
2. Knowledge of substantive law	2	11%	8	44%	4	22%	1	6%	3	17%	2.28	18	0	78%
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	3	17%	7	39%	4	22%	1	6%	3	17%	2.33	18	0	78%
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	3	17%	6	33%	5	28%	1	6%	3	17%	2.28	18	0	78%
Category Total	12	17%	27	38%	15	21%	6	8%	12	17%	2.29	72		

	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	6	33%	1	6%	3	17%	5	28%	3	17%	2.11	18	0	56%
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	7	44%	4	25%	3	19%	2	13%	0	0%	3.00	16	2	88%
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	41%	4	24%	4	24%	2	12%	0	0%	2.94	17	1	88%
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	43%	4	29%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	3.07	14	4	93%
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	7	50%	3	21%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	3.14	14	4	93%
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	43%	3	21%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	2.86	14	4	79%
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	7	44%	4	25%	4	25%	1	6%	0	0%	3.06	16	2	94%
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	58%	1	8%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	3.08	12	6	83%
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	7	44%	3	19%	3	19%	3	19%	0	0%	2.88	16	2	81%
Category Total	60	44%	27	20%	27	20%	20	15%	3	2%	2.88	137		

	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	4	22%	3	17%	6	33%	5	28%	0	0%	2.33	18	0	72%
15. Clear and logical written decisions	4	29%	3	21%	1	7%	5	36%	1	7%	2.29	14	4	57%
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	5	28%	2	11%	2	11%	4	22%	5	28%	1.89	18	0	50%
Category Total	13	26%	8	16%	9	18%	14	28%	6	12%	2.16	50		

	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	3	17%	4	22%	3	17%	6	33%	2	11%	2.00	18	0	56%
18. Dignified	6	33%	3	17%	2	11%	5	28%	2	11%	2.33	18	0	61%
19. Courteous	4	22%	4	22%	2	11%	5	28%	3	17%	2.06	18	0	56%
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	5	28%	4	22%	1	6%	4	22%	4	22%	2.11	18	0	56%
21. Patient	3	17%	5	28%	1	6%	7	39%	2	11%	2.00	18	0	50%
Category Total	21	23%	20	22%	9	10%	27	30%	13	14%	2.10	90		

	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	6	33%	6	33%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	18	0	100%
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	7	39%	5	28%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%	3.00	18	0	94%
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	6	43%	2	14%	6	43%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	14	4	100%
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	39%	4	22%	4	22%	2	11%	1	6%	2.78	18	0	83%
26. Efficient management of the calendar	6	33%	5	28%	7	39%	0	0%	0	0%	2.94	18	0	100%
Category Total	32	37%	22	26%	28	33%	3	3%	1	1%	2.94	86		

	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	0	0%	1	13%	4	50%	2	25%	1	13%	1.63	8	10	63%
Category Total	0	0%	1	13%	4	50%	2	25%	1	13%	1.63	8		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Litigant Witness Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Olson

	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	5	33%	3	20%	4	27%	2	13%	1	7%	2.60	15	0	80%
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	43%	3	21%	4	29%	1	7%	0	0%	3.00	14	1	93%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	43%	3	21%	5	36%	0	0%	0	0%	3.07	14	1	100%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	36%	3	27%	4	36%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	11	4	100%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	38%	4	31%	3	23%	1	8%	0	0%	3.00	13	2	92%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	42%	1	8%	5	42%	1	8%	0	0%	2.83	12	3	92%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	43%	2	14%	4	29%	0	0%	2	14%	2.71	14	1	86%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	42%	3	25%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	3.00	12	3	92%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	43%	2	14%	3	21%	2	14%	1	7%	2.71	14	1	79%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>119</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>2. Communication</b>														
10. Explained proceedings	4	27%	4	27%	3	20%	3	20%	1	7%	2.47	15	0	73%
11. Explained reasons for delays	5	38%	3	23%	2	15%	2	15%	1	8%	2.69	13	2	77%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>28</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>3. Temperament</b>														
12. Understanding and compassion	6	40%	1	7%	4	27%	1	7%	3	20%	2.40	15	0	73%
13. Dignified	8	53%	2	13%	3	20%	1	7%	1	7%	3.00	15	0	87%
14. Courteous	7	47%	2	13%	2	13%	2	13%	2	13%	2.67	15	0	73%
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	7	47%	2	13%	3	20%	2	13%	1	7%	2.80	15	0	80%
16. Patient	7	47%	3	20%	1	7%	2	13%	2	13%	2.73	15	0	73%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>75</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>4. Admin Performance</b>														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	8	53%	3	20%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	3.20	15	0	93%
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	7	47%	4	27%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	3.13	15	0	93%
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	40%	5	33%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	3.07	15	0	93%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>45</b>		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Staff Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Olson

	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	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	0	100%
2. Equal Treatment regardless of race	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0	100%
Category Total	43	96%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	45		

	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	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	2.80	5	0	80%
Category Total	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	2.80	5		

	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	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	0	100%
12. Dignified	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0	100%
13. Courteous	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0	100%
14. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the Court and commissioner's ability	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0	100%
15. Patient	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	2.80	5	0	80%
Category Total	17	68%	3	12%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	3.44	25		

	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	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	1	100%
17. Maintained proper control in the courtroom	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0	100%
18. Was prepared for proceedings	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0	100%
19. Respectful treatment of staff	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0	100%
20. Cooperation with peers	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	1	100%
21. Efficient management of the calendar	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0	100%
Category Total	22	79%	0	0%	6	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28		