



Contact: Liz Neeley, Executive Director 402-742-8129

News Release – *For Immediate Release*

402-742-8129

July 27, 2026

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Lawyers Give High Marks to State's Judges

LINCOLN – The Nebraska State Bar Association (NSBA) today released results of its 2026 Judicial Performance Evaluation. Lawyers responding to the poll recommend that 98% of the 132 judges evaluated be retained on the bench. Fifty-six percent of the judges evaluated were given a 90% percent or higher retention approval. Thirty-four percent of the judges received an 80-89% retention approval, and five percent of the judges received a 70-79% retention approval.

The NSBA first used the Judicial Evaluation Poll in 1984. It is conducted biennially. “The poll provides an important way to provide feedback to the judiciary and to help the public better understand Nebraska’s merit system for the selection and retention of judges by providing information useful in making an informed decision about judges standing for retention” said Hon. John M. Gerrard, President of the NSBA.

The NSBA recently worked with the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System (IAALS) to update the Judicial Evaluation Poll instrument. The revised instrument uses a new scale and focuses on qualities central to the judicial role, including judicial competence, impartiality, clarity of communication, judicial temperament, and administrative capacity. The goal of these changes was to make the evaluation questions less subjective, more focused on observable behavior, and more useful in providing meaningful feedback to judges. The new instrument also uses a different rating scale than prior versions of the poll. Because the survey questions, rating categories, and evaluation framework were substantially revised, we strongly discourage comparing the 2026 results to reports from prior years.

An electronic survey was sent to 5,752 active NSBA members residing in Nebraska, Council Bluffs and Sioux City, Iowa and Yankton, South Dakota. Attorneys were instructed to evaluate only judges with whom they had recent, firsthand professional experience; or in the case of appeals court

judges, with whose written opinions they were familiar. Ultimately, 1,025 members completed the evaluation. The American Bar Association Center for Bar Leadership, in Chicago, compiled the results. The results may be viewed at www.nebar.com



NEBRASKA
State Bar Association

2026

**JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE
EVALUATION**

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE	SECTION	PAGE
Background Information	2	NE County Court District 4	41
Judges Standing for Retention in 2026	4	NE County Court District 5	46
Nebraska Supreme Court	5	NE County Court District 6	48
Nebraska Court of Appeals	7	NE County Court District 7	50
NE District Court 1	9	NE County Court District 8	52
NE District Court 2	11	NE County Court District 9	54
NE District Court 3	13	NE County Court District 10	56
NE District Court 4	15	NE County Court District 11	58
NE District Court 5	21	NE County Court District 12	60
NE District Court 6	23	Separate Juvenile Court 2	62
NE District Court 8	25	Separate Juvenile Court 3	64
NE District Court 9	27	Separate Juvenile Court 4	66
NE District Court 10	29	Worker's Compensation Court Judges	68
NE District Court 11	31	NE US District Court - Chief Justice Judge	70
NE District Court 12	33	NE US District Court - Lincoln	72
NE County Court District 1	35	NE US District Court - Omaha	74
NE County Court District 2	37	NE US District Court - Bankruptcy	76
NE County Court District 3	39	Index	78

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

CONDUCTED BY:

The Nebraska State Bar Association
635 S. 14th St. #200
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone: (402) 475-7091 / Fax: (402) 475-7098
Web page: www.nebar.com

FOR INTERVIEW:

Liz Neeley, Executive Director, (402) 742-8129

FOR INFORMATION:

Sam Clinch, Associate Executive Director, (402) 742-8125
E-mail: sclinch@nebar.com

Purpose: The 2026 Judicial Performance Evaluation is the 22nd biennial evaluation of Nebraska judges by Nebraska lawyers. The evaluation's purpose is two-fold: to provide each judge with a continuing assessment of his or her strengths and weaknesses, thereby improving the overall quality of the judiciary; and to help the public better understand Nebraska's merit system for the selection and retention of judges by providing information useful in making an informed decision about judges standing for retention.

Instrument: The NSBA recently worked with the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System (IAALS) to update the Judicial Evaluation Poll instrument. The revised instrument uses a new scale and focuses on qualities central to the judicial role, including judicial competence, impartiality, clarity of communication, judicial temperament, and administrative capacity. The goal of these changes was to make the evaluation questions less subjective, more focused on observable behavior, and more useful in providing meaningful feedback to judges.

Procedures: The evaluation was disseminated in April to active licensed lawyers residing in Nebraska, Council Bluffs and Sioux City, Iowa and Yankton, South Dakota. Judicial members are ineligible to participate and did not receive the poll. Unless requested, judges with less than one year's tenure on the bench were not evaluated. A total of 5,752 evaluations were disseminated. The response deadline was May 26, 2026.

Instructions: The poll was disseminated to 5,752 attorneys. Attorneys were instructed to evaluate only judges with whom they had recent, first-hand professional experience; or in the case of appeals court judges, with whose written opinions they were familiar. Ultimately, 1,025 evaluations were submitted. Attorneys were allowed to evaluate up to 52 District Court and 53 County Court judges, and any or all Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, Workers' Compensation Court, Juvenile Court and Federal Court judges.

Attorneys were asked to review characteristics carefully, and then assign each a numerical rating using a scale of "6" (Strongly Agree) to "1" (Strongly Disagree). If they could not rate a judge on a particular characteristic, they were asked to mark "N/A". Attorneys were also asked to indicate whether, in their opinion, the judge should be retained in office.

The evaluation is voluntary. Bar members have the opportunity to indicate their unwillingness to participate, or to decline to participate based on ineligibility (attorneys without a trial practice or who were recently admitted to the practice of law). All responses were confidential. No name, location or other identifying information was solicited or tabulated.

Results: The attached results represent an average score on each characteristic for each judge, using the 6-point scale noted on the top of each page. No attempt has been made to determine an overall rating for each judge, nor has any attempt been made to compare one judge's scores with those of any other judge. That is not the purpose of this evaluation and such a comparison would not be statistically valid.

The American Bar Association Center for Bar Leadership, based in Chicago, compiled the results. All specific characteristic questions were rounded to one decimal place, while all retention questions were rounded to two decimal places. When rounding, the following rules were used to avoid rounding bias: when the number to the right is 5 or greater, round up. Occasionally, rounding resulted in percentages that did not total exactly 100%. The responses represent a collection of individual opinions, which have been gathered and tabulated solely for their informational value. The Judicial Performance Evaluation does not present scientifically accurate conclusions, nor does the poll constitute an official NSBA opinion or position. It is a collection of individual opinions gathered and tabulated solely for informational value.

How Nebraska Judges are Selected and Retained:

Judges of Nebraska courts are selected through merit selection or the “Missouri Plan.” When a judicial vacancy occurs, individuals interested in being appointed to the bench submit their names for consideration.

Merit Selection judges are appointed by the governor, but the appointment is made after a politically balanced, nine-member commission reviews applicants, evaluates their qualifications, and holds public interviews. Comments from the public are encouraged and considered in the selection process. For each judicial vacancy, the commission selects at least two nominees whose names are sent to the governor for consideration and appointment.

In a retention election, voters decide whether a judge should be retained on the bench or removed from office.

A judge must run for retention in office in the first general election that occurs more than three (3) years after his or her appointment, and every six (6) years thereafter. When a judge runs for retention in office, the question presented on the voters’ ballots states: “Shall Judge _____ be retained in office?” If there are more votes to retain a judge than to remove him or her, then the judge remains on the bench for an additional six (6) years.

Note: Judges up for retention are marked with an asterisk (*) throughout the report. Judges are listed in order by judicial district. Refer to the enclosed alphabetical index to find the page on which a judge’s name appears. Copies of previous survey results are available upon request from Sam Clinch at the NSBA office, (402) 742-8125 or sclinch@nebar.com.

JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION IN 2026

Nebraska Court of Appeals

Michael W. Pirtle

Nebraska District Courts

NE District Court 1

David J. A. Barga
Rick Schreiner
Julie D. Smith

NE District Court 2

Stefanie A. Martinez
Michael A. Smith
George A. Thompson

NE District Court 3

Darla S. Ideus
Andrew R. Jacobsen
Kevin R. McManaman
Matthew O. Mellor

NE District Court 4

Katie L. Benson
Timothy P. Burns
Duane C. Dougherty
Molly B. Keane
Marlon A. Polk
LeAnne M. Srb

NE District Court 6

Geoffrey C. Hall

NE District Court 8

Mark D. Kozisek

NE District Court 9

Patrick M. Lee
John H. Marsh

NE District Court 10

Morgan R. Farquhar

NE District Court 11

Patrick M. Heng
Cindy R. Volkmer

NE District Court 12

Andrea Miller
Travis P. O'Gorman

Nebraska County Court Districts

NE County Court District 1

Richard R. Smith

NE County Court District 2

Todd J. Hutton
S. Colin Palm

NE County Court District 3

Rodney D. Reuter

NE County Court District 4

Marcena M. Hendrix
John E. Huber
Marcela A. Keim
Sheryl L. Lohaus
Craig Q. McDermott
Stephanie S. Shearer

NE County Court District 5

Denise J. Kracl

NE County Court District 6

Sara E. Bauer
Thomas J. Klein

NE County Court District 8

Kale B. Burdick

NE County Court District 9

Alfred E. Corey III
Bryan S. McQuay

NE County Court District 10

Michael P. Burns

NE County Court District 11

Tanya K. Roberts-Connick

NE County Court District 12

Aaron J. Conn
Kristen D. Mickey

Separate Juvenile Court Districts

District 2

Sarah M. Moore

District 4

Matthew R. Kahler

Workers' Compensation Courts

Dirk V. Block
Thomas E. Stine

NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Jason M. Bergevin	William B. Cassel	John R. Freudenberg	Jeffrey J. Funke	Jonathan J. Papik	Stephanie F. Stacy
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.4	5.4	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.2	5.1	5.1	5.5	5.4	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.2	5.1	5.1	5.4	5.4	5.2
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	5.0	4.9	5.4	5.3	5.1
Impartiality	Jason M. Bergevin	William B. Cassel	John R. Freudenberg	Jeffrey J. Funke	Jonathan J. Papik	Stephanie F. Stacy
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.3	5.1	5.3	5.5	5.3	5.3
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.2	4.8	5.0	5.3	5.2	5.1
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.3	5.0	5.1	5.5	5.2	5.2
Clarity of Communication	Jason M. Bergevin	William B. Cassel	John R. Freudenberg	Jeffrey J. Funke	Jonathan J. Papik	Stephanie F. Stacy
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.4
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.2	5.0	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.1
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.5	5.3	5.4	5.6	5.5	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.6	5.5	5.4

Judicial Temperament	Jason M. Bergevin	William B. Cassel	John R. Freudenberg	Jeffrey J. Funke	Jonathan J. Papik	Stephanie F. Stacy
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.4	5.1	5.4	5.6	5.4	5.4
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.4	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.4
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.3
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.7	5.5	5.5

Administrative Capacity	Jason M. Bergevin	William B. Cassel	John R. Freudenberg	Jeffrey J. Funke	Jonathan J. Papik	Stephanie F. Stacy
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.6	5.4	5.4
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.1	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.3	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.3	5.6	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Jason M. Bergevin	94.64%	5.36%
William B. Cassel	83.33%	16.67%
John R. Freudenberg	84.71%	15.29%
Jeffrey J. Funke	93.75%	6.25%
Jonathan J. Papik	89.22%	10.78%
Stephanie F. Stacy	85.42%	14.58%

NEBRASKA COURT OF APPEALS

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Riko Bishop	*Michael W. Pirtle	Francie C. Riedmann	Lawrence E. Welch Jr.
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.3	4.8	5.2	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	4.9	5.2	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.4	5.0	5.2	5.2
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.4	4.9	5.4	5.0
Impartiality	Riko Bishop	*Michael W. Pirtle	Francie C. Riedmann	Lawrence E. Welch Jr.
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.6	5.1	5.6	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.5	5.2	5.3	5.3
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.6	5.2	5.5	5.4
Clarity of Communication	Riko Bishop	*Michael W. Pirtle	Francie C. Riedmann	Lawrence E. Welch Jr.
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.6	5.3	5.6	5.2
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.5	5.0	5.3	5.2
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.6	5.3	5.7	5.3
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.6	5.1	5.7	5.3

Judicial Temperament	Riko Bishop	*Michael W. Pirtle	Francie C. Riedmann	Lawrence E. Welch Jr.
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.7	5.4	5.6	5.6
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.6	5.6	5.8	5.6
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.5	5.2	5.4	5.4
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.5	5.3	5.4	5.6

Administrative Capacity	Riko Bishop	*Michael W. Pirtle	Francie C. Riedmann	Lawrence E. Welch Jr.
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.4
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	5.6	5.8	5.7
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.5

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Riko Bishop	89.83%	10.17%
*Michael W. Pirtle	83.33%	16.67%
Francie C. Riedmann	87.76%	12.24%
Lawrence E. Welch Jr.	88.37%	11.63%

NE DISTRICT COURT 1

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*David J. A. Bargaen	*Rick Schreiner	*Julie D. Smith
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.2	4.4	5.0
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.3	4.5	5.1
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.4	4.5	5.1
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	4.4	4.9

Impartiality	*David J. A. Bargaen	*Rick Schreiner	*Julie D. Smith
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of their background or the nature of the case.	5.5	4.3	5.3
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.3	4.3	5.1
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.4	4.3	5.2

Clarity of Communication	*David J. A. Bargaen	*Rick Schreiner	*Julie D. Smith
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.5	4.7	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.2	4.4	5.0
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.5	4.5	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.5	4.6	5.4

Judicial Temperament

	*David J. A. Bargaen	*Rick Schreiner	*Julie D. Smith
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.6	4.2	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.6	4.9	5.4
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	4.7	5.5
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.6	4.9	5.5

Administrative Capacity

	*David J. A. Bargaen	*Rick Schreiner	*Julie D. Smith
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	4.8	4.9	5.3
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.3	4.8	5.4
Took steps to move the case forward.	4.8	4.9	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.1	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.6	4.9	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*David J. A. Bargaen	96.00%	4.00%
*Rick Schreiner	80.39%	19.61%
*Julie D. Smith	93.33%	6.67%

NE DISTRICT COURT 2

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Nathan B. Cox	*Stefanie A. Martinez	*Michael A. Smith	*George A. Thompson
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.7	5.1	5.0	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	4.9	5.1	5.1	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	4.9	5.1	5.1	5.4
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.6	4.9	4.9	5.1
Impartiality	Nathan B. Cox	*Stefanie A. Martinez	*Michael A. Smith	*George A. Thompson
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.1	4.9	5.3	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.3
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.4
Clarity of Communication	Nathan B. Cox	Stefanie *A. Martinez	*Michael A. Smith	*George A. Thompson
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.2
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.4

Judicial Temperament	Nathan B. Cox	*Stefanie A. Martinez	*Michael A. Smith	*George A. Thompson
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.2	5.1	5.3	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.5
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.6

Administrative Capacity	Nathan B. Cox	*Stefanie A. Martinez	*Michael A. Smith	*George A. Thompson
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	4.7	5.1	4.9	5.5
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.5	5.1	4.3	5.3
Took steps to move the case forward.	4.8	5.2	4.9	5.5
Began court proceedings on time.	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.2	5.6	5.3	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Nathan B. Cox	83.54%	16.46%
*Stefanie A. Martinez	86.67%	13.33%
*Michael A. Smith	89.74%	10.26%
*George A. Thompson	92.05%	7.95%

NE DISTRICT COURT 3

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Darla S. Ideus	*Andrew R. Jacobsen	Lori A. Maret	*Kevin R. McManaman	*Matthew O. Mellor	Ryan S. Post	Susan I. Strong
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.1	4.9	3.3	5.1	4.9	5.5	5.1
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.1	5.1	3.5	5.2	5.2	5.6	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.1	5.1	3.6	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.2
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.0	4.9	3.3	5.1	5.0	5.5	5.1
Impartiality	*Darla S. Ideus	*Andrew R. Jacobsen	Lori A. Maret	*Kevin R. McManaman	*Matthew O. Mellor	Ryan S. Post	Susan I. Strong
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	4.6	5.2	2.9	5.3	5.4	5.7	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.8	5.0	3.1	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.1
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.7	5.1	3.0	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.1
Clarity of Communication	*Darla S. Ideus	*Andrew R. Jacobsen	Lori A. Maret	*Kevin R. McManaman	*Matthew O. Mellor	Ryan S. Post	Susan I. Strong
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.1	5.2	3.8	5.1	5.3	5.6	5.4
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.1	5.0	3.3	5.1	5.0	5.5	5.1
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.9	5.2	3.4	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.3
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.0	5.2	3.7	5.2	5.4	5.6	5.3

Judicial Temperament	*Darla S. Ideus	*Andrew R. Jacobsen	Lori A. Maret	*Kevin R. McManaman	*Matthew O. Mellor	Ryan S. Post	Susan I. Strong
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.5	5.3	2.7	5.3	5.5	5.7	5.4
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.2	5.3	4.1	5.3	5.4	5.7	5.4
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.1	5.2	3.5	5.3	5.3	5.6	5.3
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.1	5.3	3.7	5.4	5.5	5.7	5.4

Administrative Capacity	*Darla S. Ideus	*Andrew R. Jacobsen	Lori A. Maret	*Kevin R. McManaman	*Matthew O. Mellor	Ryan S. Post	Susan I. Strong
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	4.9	5.1	3.9	4.9	5.3	5.5	5.3
The judge issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.9	4.9	3.7	4.8	5.2	5.5	5.2
The judge took steps to move the case forward.	5.0	5.1	4.1	5.0	5.3	5.6	5.2
The judge began court proceedings on time.	5.2	5.2	4.4	5.0	5.4	5.6	5.4
When it is used, the judge uses technology competently.	5.3	5.3	4.7	5.3	5.5	5.6	5.4

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*Darla S. Ideus	83.15%	16.85%
*Andrew R. Jacobsen	88.17%	11.83%
Lori A. Maret	34.02%	65.98%
*Kevin R. McManaman	91.75%	8.25%
*Matthew O. Mellor	88.00%	12.00%
Ryan S. Post	94.12%	5.88%
Susan I. Strong	91.40%	8.60%

NE DISTRICT COURT 4

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Tressa M. Alioth	Peter C. Bataillon	*Katie L. Benson	*Timothy P. Burns	J. Russell Derr	*Duane C. Dougherty	Todd O. Engleman
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.9	4.7	4.9	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.1	4.7	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.1	5.5
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.9	4.7	4.9	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.4
	*Molly B. Keane	Ryan M. Lindberg	Jeffrey J. Lux	James M. Masteller	Kimberly Miller Pankonin	*Marlon A. Polk	*LeAnne M. Srb
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.3	4.8	4.7	5.5	5.2	4.5	5.1
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	5.1	5.0	5.5	5.2	4.5	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.4	5.0	4.9	5.5	5.2	4.4	5.3
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.3	5.0	4.8	5.5	5.2	4.2	5.1
	Shelly R. Stratman		Horacio J. Wheelock				
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.3				5.7		
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.3				5.8		
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.4				5.7		
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.3				5.7		

Impartiality

	Tressa M. Alioth	Peter C. Bataillon	*Katie L. Benson	*Timothy P. Burns	J. Russell Derr	*Duane C. Dougherty
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.1	4.6	4.8	5.3	5.3	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.0	4.5	4.7	5.1	5.2	5.2
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.0	4.5	4.6	5.2	5.2	5.2

	Todd O. Engleman	*Molly B. Keane	Ryan M. Lindberg	Jeffrey J. Lux	James M. Masteller	Kimberly Miller Pankonin
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.5	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.1
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.4	5.4	5.0	5.0	5.4	5.0
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.4	5.4	5.0	5.1	5.3	5.0

	*Marlon A. Polk	*LeAnne M. Srb	Shelly R. Stratman	Horacio J. Wheelock
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.8
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.5	5.2	5.2	5.7
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.8	5.2	5.2	5.7

Clarity of Communication

	Tressa M. Alioth	Peter C. Bataillon	*Katie L. Benson	*Timothy P. Burns	J. Russell Derr	*Duane C. Dougherty
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.2.	4.9	5.0.	5.3	5.4	5.2
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.0.	4.6	5.0.	5.2	5.2	5.1
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.2.	4.7	5.0.	5.3	5.3	5.4
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.2.	4.9	5.0.	5.3	5.3	5.4

	Todd O. Engleman	*Molly B. Keane	Ryan M. Lindberg	Jeffrey J. Lux	James M. Masteller	Kimberly Miller Pankonin
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.1	5.6	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.4	5.4	5.1	4.9	5.5	5.2
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.5	5.5	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.3
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.2

	*Marlon A. Polk	*LeAnne M. Srb	Shelly R. Stratman	Horacio J. Wheelock
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	4.7	5.5	5.4	5.7
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	4.4	5.3	5.3	5.7
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.8	5.5	5.4	5.7
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	4.6	5.4	5.4	5.7

Judicial Temperament	Tressa M. Alioth	Peter C. Bataillon	*Katie L. Benson	*Timothy P. Burns	J. Russell Derr	*Duane C. Dougherty	
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.1	4.4	4.8	5.3	5.3	5.4	
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.3	5.0	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.4	
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.1	4.6	5.0	5.2	5.4	5.3	
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.3	4.8	5.1	5.3	5.5	5.4	
	Todd O. Engleman	*Molly B. Keane	Ryan M. Lindberg	Jeffrey J. Lux	James M. Masteller	Kimberly Miller Pankonin	
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.5	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.2	
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.5	5.1	5.3	5.6	5.4	
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	5.5	5.1	5.1	5.6	5.2	
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.5	5.6	5.4	5.3	5.7	5.4	
				*Marlon A. Polk	*LeAnne M. Srb	Shelly R. Stratman	Horacio J. Wheelock
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.				5.2	5.3	5.4	5.8
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.				4.9	5.4	5.5	5.8
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.				4.5	5.5	5.4	5.8
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.				4.7	5.5	5.5	5.8

Administrative Capacity	Tressa M. Alioth	Peter C. Bataillon	*Katie L. Benson	*Timothy P. Burns	J. Russell Derr	*Duane C. Dougherty
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.3	4.9	5.0	5.2	4.8	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.3	4.6	4.9	5.2	5.0	5.2
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4	4.7	5.1	5.2	4.8	5.2
Began court proceedings on time.	5.3	4.8	5.2	5.4	4.8	5.2
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.4	4.7	5.3	5.3	5.1	5.3
	Todd O. Engleman	*Molly B. Keane	Ryan M. Lindberg	Jeffrey J. Lux	James M. Masteller	Kimberly Miller Pankonin
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.5	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.6	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.4	5.3
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.5	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.5	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.1	5.5	5.3
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.3	5.6	5.3
			*Marlon A. Polk	*LeAnne M. Srb	Shelly R. Stratman	Horacio J. Wheelock
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.			3.9	5.5	5.4	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.			3.9	5.5	5.5	5.7
Took steps to move the case forward.			3.9	5.6	5.5	5.7
Began court proceedings on time.			4.6	5.5	5.4	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.			5.0	5.6	5.5	5.8

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Tressa M. Alioth	82.47%	17.53%
Peter C. Bataillon	70.09%	29.91%
*Katie L. Benson	83.75%	16.25%
*Timothy P. Burns	89.41%	10.59%
J. Russell Derr	82.11%	17.89%
*Duane C. Dougherty	93.26%	6.74%
Todd O. Engleman	93.51%	6.49%
*Molly B. Keane	91.67%	8.33%
Ryan M. Lindberg	86.67%	13.33%
Jeffrey J. Lux	84.34%	15.66%
James M. Masteller	98.70%	1.30%
Kimberly Miller Pankonin	86.67%	13.33%
*Marlon A. Polk	63.92%	36.08%
*LeAnne M. Srb	88.89%	11.11%
Shelly R. Stratman	89.77%	10.23%
Horacio J. Wheelock	99.12%	0.88%

NE DISTRICT COURT 5

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Rachel A. Daugherty	Christina M. Marroquin	James C. Stecker
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.1	5.5	5.1
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.2	5.6	5.1
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.2	5.6	5.1
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	5.6	5.0

Impartiality	Rachel A. Daugherty	Christina M. Marroquin	James C. Stecker
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.2	5.6	5.2
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.0	5.6	5.0
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.0	5.5	5.1

Clarity of Communication	Rachel A. Daugherty	Christina M. Marroquin	James C. Stecker
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.3	5.6	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.0	5.6	5.1
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.4	5.6	5.0
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.4	5.7	5.0

Judicial Temperament

	Rachel A. Daugherty	Christina M. Marroquin	James C. Stecker
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.2	5.6	5.1
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.7	5.3
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	5.7	5.3
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.4	5.7	5.3

Administrative Capacity

	Rachel A. Daugherty	Christina M. Marroquin	James C. Stecker
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.3	5.6	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.0	5.6	5.3
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.3	5.6	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.3	5.6	5.3
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.3	5.7	5.4

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Rachel A. Daugherty	90.00%	10.00%
Christina M. Marroquin	97.14%	2.86%
James C. Stecker	95.74%	4.26%

NE DISTRICT COURT 6

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence

	Zachary L. Blackman	*Geoffrey C. Hall	Bryan C. Meisner
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.5	5.1	5.6
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.8	5.0	5.8
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.8	5.0	5.8
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.6	4.9	5.8

Impartiality

	Zachary L. Blackman	*Geoffrey C. Hall	Bryan C. Meisner
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.8	4.9	5.9
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.7	4.8	5.8
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.7	4.8	5.9

Clarity of Communication

	Zachary L. Blackman	*Geoffrey C. Hall	Bryan C. Meisner
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.7	5.2	5.8
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.5	5.0	5.7
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.7	5.1	5.8
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.7	5.0	5.8

Judicial Temperament

	Zachary L. Blackman	*Geoffrey C. Hall	Bryan C. Meismer
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.8	4.9	5.9
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.7	5.3	5.9
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.7	5.0	5.9
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.8	5.2	5.9

Administrative Capacity

	Zachary L. Blackman	*Geoffrey C. Hall	Bryan C. Meismer
Effectively manage their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.7	5.1	5.8
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.7	5.1	5.8
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.8	5.3	5.8
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	4.9	5.8
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.8	5.2	5.8

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Zachary L. Blackman	100.00%	0.00%
*Geoffrey C. Hall	83.33%	16.67%
Bryan C. Meismer	100.00%	0.00%

NE DISTRICT COURT 8

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence

*Mark D. Kozisek

Karin L. Noakes

Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.2	4.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.3	4.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.3	4.4
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.3	4.3

Impartiality

*Mark D. Kozisek

Karin L. Noakes

Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	4.5	4.5
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.7	4.5
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.7	4.3

Clarity of Communication

*Mark D. Kozisek

Karin L. Noakes

Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.1	4.5
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.3	4.3
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.9	4.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.0	4.5

Judicial Temperament

*Mark D. Kozisek

Karin L. Noakes

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.2	4.3
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	4.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.5	4.2
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.4	4.5

Administrative Capacity

*Mark D. Kozisek

Karin L. Noakes

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.4	4.4
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.2	4.7
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4	4.7
Began court proceedings on time.	5.5	4.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.1	4.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

Yes

No

*Mark D. Kozisek	89.47%	10.53%
Karin L. Noakes	86.05%	13.95%

NE DISTRICT COURT 9

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Andrew C. Butler	*Patrick M. Lee	*John H. Marsh	Kane M. Ramsey
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.0	4.6	5.1	4.6
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.0
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.1
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.0	4.5	4.9	5.1

Impartiality	Andrew C. Butler	*Patrick M. Lee	*John H. Marsh	Kane M. Ramsey
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.0	5.0	5.6	4.9
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.0	4.7	5.3	4.8
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.0	4.7	5.5	4.8

Clarity of Communication	Andrew C. Butler	*Patrick M. Lee	*John H. Marsh	Kane M. Ramsey
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.4	5.2	4.9	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.1
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.2	5.1	5.0	5.1
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.2	5.1	5.0	5.3

Judicial Temperament	Andrew C. Butler	*Patrick M. Lee	*John H. Marsh	Kane M. Ramsey
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.0	5.0	5.6	5.2
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.3
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.4

Administrative Capacity	Andrew C. Butler	*Patrick M. Lee	*John H. Marsh	Kane M. Ramsey
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.0
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.1	5.2	5.4	4.9
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.2
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Andrew C. Butler	83.33%	16.67%
*Patrick M. Lee	75.00%	25.00%
*John H. Marsh	95.35%	4.65%
Kane M. Ramsey	86.11%	13.89%

NE DISTRICT COURT 10

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence

*Morgan R. Farquhar

Timothy E. Hoeft

Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.2	5.3
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	4.5	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	4.5	5.4
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.2	5.3

Impartiality

*Morgan R. Farquhar

Timothy E. Hoeft

Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	4.8	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.7	5.2
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.7	5.3

Clarity of Communication

*Morgan R. Farquhar

Timothy E. Hoeft

Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	4.8	5.6
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	4.2	5.2
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.8	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	4.8	5.5

Judicial Temperament

*Morgan R. Farquhar

Timothy E. Hoeft

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.8	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	4.8	5.6
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	4.6	5.6
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	4.8	5.6

Administrative Capacity

*Morgan R. Farquhar

Timothy E. Hoeft

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	4.2	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.2	4.8
Took steps to move the case forward.	4.4	5.2
Began court proceedings on time.	4.7	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.0	5.5

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

Yes

No

*Morgan R. Farquhar	66.10%	33.90%
Timothy E. Hoeft	92.86%	7.14%

NE DISTRICT COURT 11

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Patrick M. Heng	Michael E. Piccolo	*Cindy R. Volkmer
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.1	5.8	3.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.3	5.8	3.6
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.3	5.8	3.8
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	5.8	3.4

Impartiality	*Patrick M. Heng	Michael E. Piccolo	*Cindy R. Volkmer
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.4	5.8	4.5
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.3	5.8	4.0
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.3	5.7	4.4

Clarity of Communication	*Patrick M. Heng	Michael E. Piccolo	*Cindy R. Volkmer
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.3	5.8	4.0
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.2	5.7	3.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.3	5.9	4.3
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.3	5.8	4.3

Judicial Temperament

	*Patrick M. Heng	Michael E. Piccolo	*Cindy R. Volkmer
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.5	5.8	4.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.8	4.4
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	5.8	3.9
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.5	5.8	4.5

Administrative Capacity

	*Patrick M. Heng	Michael E. Piccolo	*Cindy R. Volkmer
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.3	5.6	4.1
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.2	5.6	3.9
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.2	5.6	4.4
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.8	4.4
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.4	5.7	5.0

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

	Yes	No
*Patrick M. Heng	90.48%	9.52%
Michael E. Piccolo	100.00%	0.00%
*Cindy R. Volkmer	38.46%	61.54%

NE DISTRICT COURT 12

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Lee P. Dobrovolny	*Andrea Miller	*Travis P. O'Gorman	Derek C. Weimer
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.2	5.0	5.5	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.6
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.6
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.2	5.0	5.4	5.6

Impartiality	Lee P. Dobrovolny	*Andrea Miller	*Travis P. O'Gorman	Derek C. Weimer
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	4.9	5.2	5.4	5.6
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.7
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.2	5.4	5.5	5.4

Clarity of Communication	Lee P. Dobrovolny	*Andrea Miller	*Travis P. O'Gorman	Derek C. Weimer
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.2	5.4	5.6	5.7
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.1	5.1	5.5	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.1	5.2	5.6	5.8
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.8

Judicial Temperament

Lee P. Dobrovolny

*Andrea Miller

*Travis P. O'Gorman

Derek C. Weimer

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.7	5.3	5.5	5.6
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.8
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	5.7	5.6	5.8
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.8

Administrative Capacity

Lee P. Dobrovolny

*Andrea Miller

*Travis P. O'Gorman

Derek C. Weimer

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.6	5.2	5.5	5.7
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.3	5.0	5.5	5.7
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.5	5.4	5.5	5.7
Began court proceedings on time.	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.7
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.4	5.8	5.5	5.8

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

Yes

No

Lee P. Dobrovolny	95.00%	5.00%
*Andrea Miller	100.00%	0.00%
*Travis P. O'Gorman	96.97%	3.03%
Derek C. Weimer	100.00%	0.00%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 1

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Linda A. Bauer	Jeffrey A. Gaertig	*Richard R. Smith
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.7	5.3	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.7	5.4	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.7	5.6	5.5
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.8	5.2	5.5

Impartiality	Linda A. Bauer	Jeffrey A. Gaertig	*Richard R. Smith
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.9	5.6	5.6
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.7	5.6	5.5
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.7	5.5	5.6

Clarity of Communication	Linda A. Bauer	Jeffrey A. Gaertig	*Richard R. Smith
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.8	5.3	5.5
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.8	5.3	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.8	5.5	5.7
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.8	5.5	5.6

Judicial Temperament

	Linda A. Bauer	Jeffrey A. Gaertig	*Richard R. Smith
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.9	5.6	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.8	5.4	5.6
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.8	5.3	5.7
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.9	5.6	5.7

Administrative Capacity

	Linda A. Bauer	Jeffrey A. Gaertig	*Richard R. Smith
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.8	4.8	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.9	5.1	5.6
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.8	5.3	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.8	4.9	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.8	5.0	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Linda A. Bauer	97.22%	2.78%
Jeffrey A. Gaertig	91.67%	8.33%
*Richard R. Smith	100.00%	0.00%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 2

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Todd J. Hutton	*S. Colin Palm	David J. Partsch
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.6	5.2	5.7
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.6	5.2	5.8
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.6	5.2	5.8
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.5	5.2	5.7
Impartiality	*Todd J. Hutton	*S. Colin Palm	David J. Partsch
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.6	5.3	5.7
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.3	5.2	5.7
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.5	5.2	5.7
Clarity of Communication	*Todd J. Hutton	*S. Colin Palm	David J. Partsch
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.5	5.3	5.7
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.6	5.3	5.7
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.7	5.3	5.7
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.7	5.4	5.7

Judicial Temperament

	*Todd J. Hutton	*S. Colin Palm	David J. Partsch
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.7	5.3	5.7
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.7	5.3	5.8
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.6	5.3	5.7
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.7	5.4	5.8

Administrative Capacity

	*Todd J. Hutton	*S. Colin Palm	David J. Partsch
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.4	5.1	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.4	5.2	5.4
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4	5.2	5.7
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.1	5.7
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.7	5.3	5.7

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*Todd J. Hutton	98.04%	1.96%
*S. Colin Palm	89.80%	10.20%
David J. Partsch	100.00%	0.00%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 3

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Matthew L. Acton	Joseph E. Dalton	Holly J. Parsley	Timothy C. Philips	*Rodney D. Reuter	Thomas E. Zimmerman
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.7	5.1	5.2	5.1	5.5	5.0
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.6	5.0	5.1	5.0	5.5	5.3
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.6	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.5	5.3
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.7	4.9	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.2
Impartiality	Matthew L. Acton	Joseph E. Dalton	Holly J. Parsley	Timothy C. Philips	*Rodney D. Reuter	Thomas E. Zimmerman
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.2	4.8	5.0	5.3	5.7	5.5
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.5	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.6	5.4
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.4	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.5	5.5
Clarity of Communication	Matthew L. Acton	Joseph E. Dalton	Holly J. Parsley	Timothy C. Philips	*Rodney D. Reuter	Thomas E. Zimmerman
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.6	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.4
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.7	5.3	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.3
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.5	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.6	5.4
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.6	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.5

Judicial Temperament	Matthew L. Acton	Joseph E. Dalton	Holly J. Parsley	Timothy C. Philips	*Rodney D. Reuter	Thomas E. Zimmerman
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.3	4.9	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.6
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.7	5.3	5.4	5.2	5.5	5.2
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.8	5.2	5.2	5.4	5.5	5.5
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.8	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.6	5.6

Administrative Capacity	Matthew L. Acton	Joseph E. Dalton	Holly J. Parsley	Timothy C. Philips	*Rodney D. Reuter	Thomas E. Zimmerman
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.7	5.3	5.3	5.1	5.5	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.7	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.4
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.7	5.3	5.4	5.0	5.6	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.5	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.7	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Matthew L. Acton	86.11%	13.89%
Joseph E. Dalton	81.82%	18.18%
Holly J. Parsley	82.09%	17.91%
Timothy C. Philips	84.62%	15.38%
*Rodney D. Reuter	92.59%	7.41%
Thomas E. Zimmerman	90.24%	9.76%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 4

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Beau G. Finley	Grant A. Forsberg	Stephanie R. Hansen	Thomas K. Harmon	*Marcena M. Hendrix	*John E. Huber
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.4	4.8	5.3	5.1	4.7	4.8
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.7	4.8	5.4	5.4	4.7	4.9
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.6	4.9	5.4	5.4	4.8	4.9
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.6	4.9	5.4	5.2	4.7	4.9
	*Marcela A. Keim	Philip K. Kleine	*Sheryl L. Lohaus	*Craig Q. McDermott	Tamara T. Mosby	*Stephanie S. Shearer
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.2	4.3	4.8	5.4	5.4	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.1	4.5	4.8	5.5	5.6	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.2	4.5	4.8	5.5	5.6	5.5
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	4.6	4.8	5.5	5.7	5.4

Impartiality	Beau G. Finley	Grant A. Forsberg	Stephanie R. Hansen	Thomas K. Harmon	*Marcena M. Hendrix	*John E. Huber
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.6	4.8	5.3	5.4	5.1	4.6
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.6	4.7	5.2	5.3	4.8	4.7
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.5	4.7	5.3	5.3	4.8	4.7
	*Marcela A. Keim	Philip K. Kleine	*Sheryl L. Lohaus	*Craig Q. McDermott	Tamara T. Mosby	*Stephanie S. Shearer
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	4.6	4.3	4.8	5.4	5.7	5.7
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.7	4.4	4.7	5.4	5.7	5.6
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.7	4.4	4.8	5.4	5.7	5.6
Clarity of Communication	Beau G. Finley	Grant A. Forsberg	Stephanie R. Hansen	Thomas K. Harmon	*Marcena M. Hendrix	*John E. Huber
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.7	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.0	5.0
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.7	4.8	5.3	5.1	4.8	4.8
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.7	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.1	4.7
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.7	5.1	5.4	5.3	4.9	4.9

	*Marcela A. Keim	Philip K Kleine	*Sheryl L. Lohaus	*Craig Q. McDermott	Tamara T. Mosby	*Stephanie S. Shearer
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.2	5.0	5.0	5.5	5.6	5.6
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.2	4.9	5.1	5.5	5.7	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.5	5.7	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.1	4.9	4.9	5.6	5.8	5.5

Judicial Temperament

	Beau G. Finley	Grant A. Forsberg	Stephanie R. Hansen	Thomas K. Harmon	*Marcena M. Hendrix	*John E. Huber
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.8	5.0	5.3	5.4	5.0	4.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.7	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.1	5.0
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.7	5.1	5.5	5.4	4.9	4.9
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.8	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.0	5.0

	*Marcela A. Keim	Philip K Kleine	*Sheryl L. Lohaus	*Craig Q. McDermott	Tamara T. Mosby	*Stephanie S. Shearer
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.5	4.4	4.6	5.5	5.8	5.7
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.3	5.0	5.1	5.5	5.6	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.3	4.7	4.9	5.5	5.7	5.5
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.3	5.1	4.9	5.6	5.7	5.6

Administrative Capacity	Beau G. Finley	Grant A. Forsberg	Stephanie R. Hansen	Thomas K. Harmon	*Marcena M. Hendrix	*John E. Huber
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.7	5.0	5.5	5.3	4.9	5.0
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.8	5.1	5.5	5.3	5.0	5.1
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.8	5.1	5.5	5.4	5.0	5.0
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.0	5.1
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.8	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.1	5.1
	*Marcela A. Keim	Philip K. Kleine	*Sheryl L. Lohaus	*Craig Q. McDermott	Tamara T. Mosby	*Stephanie S. Shearer
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.3	5.0	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.4
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.4	5.7	5.3
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.4
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.4
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.7	5.7

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Beau G. Finley	96.55%	3.45%
Grant A. Forsberg	79.37%	20.63%
Stephanie R. Hansen	91.78%	8.22%
Thomas K. Harmon	88.24%	11.76%
*Marcena M. Hendrix	81.33%	18.67%
*John E. Huber	84.38%	15.63%
*Marcela A. Keim	78.48%	21.52%
Philip K. Kleine	60.87%	39.13%
*Sheryl L. Lohaus	81.25%	18.75%
*Craig Q. McDermott	93.85%	6.15%
Tamara T. Mosby	95.35%	4.65%
*Stephanie S. Shearer	95.71%	4.29%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 5

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Lynelle D. Homolka	*Denise J. Krael	Andrew R. Lange	Stephen R. Twiss
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.9	5.5	5.4	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.1	5.6	5.3	5.3
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.0	5.7	5.4	5.4
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.9	5.4	5.3	5.4

Impartiality	Lynelle D. Homolka	*Denise J. Krael	Andrew R. Lange	Stephen R. Twiss
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	5.1	5.7	5.3	5.2
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.8	5.7	5.2	5.3
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.9	5.7	5.4	5.2

Clarity of Communication	Lynelle D. Homolka	*Denise J. Krael	Andrew R. Lange	Stephen R. Twiss
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.2	5.7	5.6	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.3
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.2	5.7	5.3	4.9
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.1	5.6	5.3	5.2

Judicial Temperament

	Lynelle D. Homolka	*Denise J. Krael	Andrew R. Lange	Stephen R. Twiss
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.9	5.8	5.5	4.9
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.1	5.7	5.7	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.1	5.5	5.8	5.3
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.2	5.8	5.5	5.4

Administrative Capacity

	Lynelle D. Homolka	*Denise J. Krael	Andrew R. Lange	Stephen R. Twiss
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	4.9	5.2	5.8	5.4
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.6	5.1	5.7	5.4
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.2	5.4	5.8	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	4.7	5.3	5.8	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.2	5.7	5.8	5.4

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Lynelle D. Homolka	88.24%	11.76%
*Denise J. Krael	96.15%	3.85%
Andrew R. Lange	93.55%	6.45%
Stephen R. Twiss	92.50%	7.50%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 6

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Francis W. Barron III	*Sara E. Bauer	*Thomas J. Klein	Edward H. Matney
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.8	4.8	5.3	4.9
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	4.9	5.0	5.5	5.0
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.1	5.0	5.5	5.2
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.8	4.9	5.3	4.8

Impartiality	Francis W. Barron III	*Sara E. Bauer	*Thomas J. Klein	Edward H. Matney
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	4.4	5.7	5.6	5.0
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.6	5.5	5.4	5.1
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.5	5.5	5.4	4.8

Clarity of Communication	Francis W. Barron III	*Sara E. Bauer	*Thomas J. Klein	Edward H. Matney
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.0	5.4	5.3	4.9
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	4.9	5.2	5.1	4.9
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.7	5.6	5.4	4.9
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	4.9	5.3	5.4	4.9

Judicial Temperament

	Francis W. Barron III	*Sara E. Bauer	*Thomas J. Klein	Edward H. Matney
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.3	5.4	5.6	4.9
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.2
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	4.8	5.5	5.4	5.2
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.1	5.7	5.7	5.3

Administrative Capacity

	Francis W. Barron III	*Sara E. Bauer	*Thomas J. Klein	Edward H. Matney
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.0	5.3	5.0	5.3
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.1	5.5	5.5	5.3
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.2	5.5	5.4	5.1
Began court proceedings on time.	4.6	5.5	4.8	5.3
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.2	5.6	5.5	5.4

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Francis W. Barron III	74.19%	25.81%
*Sara E. Bauer	85.71%	14.29%
*Thomas J. Klein	100.00%	0.00%
Edward H. Matney	79.17%	20.83%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 7

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Patrick P. Carney	Ross A. Stoffer
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.1	5.3
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	5.3
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.7	5.3
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.3	5.1

Impartiality	Patrick P. Carney	Ross A. Stoffer
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.7	5.5
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.7	5.4
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.7	5.5

Clarity of Communication	Patrick P. Carney	Ross A. Stoffer
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.6	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.3	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.7	5.3
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.6	5.6

Judicial Temperament

Patrick P. Carney

Ross A. Stoffer

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.7	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.7	5.3
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.7	5.4
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.7	5.7

Administrative Capacity

Patrick P. Carney

Ross A. Stoffer

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.6	5.0
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.7	5.4
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.7	5.3
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	4.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.7	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

Yes

No

Patrick P. Carney	100.00%	0.00%
Ross A. Stoffer	90.00%	10.00%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 8

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Kale B. Burdick	James J. Orr	Tami K. Schendt
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.7	4.7	5.0
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.7	5.1	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.7	5.1	5.2
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.6	4.9	5.0

Impartiality	*Kale B. Burdick	James J. Orr	Tami K. Schendt
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.7	5.5	5.2
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.7	5.2	5.2
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.7	5.4	5.2

Clarity of Communication	*Kale B. Burdick	James J. Orr	Tami K. Schendt
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.7	5.4	5.3
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.7	5.1	5.0
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.6	5.4	5.3
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.6	5.2	5.3

Judicial Temperament

*Kale B. Burdick

James J. Orr

Tami K. Schendt

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.7	5.4	5.4
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.7	5.2	5.4
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.7	4.9	5.2
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.7	5.3	5.4

Administrative Capacity

*Kale B. Burdick

James J. Orr

Tami K. Schendt

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.5	5.0	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.7	5.1	5.2
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.5	4.9	5.2
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	5.2	5.3
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.8	5.3	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

Yes

No

*Kale B. Burdick	96.30%	3.70%
James J. Orr	90.00%	10.00%
Tami K. Schendt	83.33%	16.67%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 9

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Alfred E. Corey III	Gerald R. Jorgensen	*Bryan S. McQuay	John P. Rademacher
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.3	5.4	5.3	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	4.7	5.5	5.4	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	4.7	5.5	5.3	5.6
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.4	5.4	5.3	5.6
Impartiality	*Alfred E. Corey III	Gerald R. Jorgensen	*Bryan S. McQuay	John P. Rademacher
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.1	5.5	5.5	5.5
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.1	5.6	5.5	5.4
Clarity of Communication	*Alfred E. Corey III	Gerald R. Jorgensen	*Bryan S. McQuay	John P. Rademacher
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	4.5	5.5	5.5	5.6
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	4.4	5.4	5.3	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.5	5.5	5.6	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	4.4	5.5	5.5	5.5

Judicial Temperament	*Alfred E. Corey III	Gerald R. Jorgensen	*Bryan S. McQuay	John P. Rademacher
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.3
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	4.9	5.6	5.6	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.1	5.3	5.5	5.6
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.3	5.5	5.6	5.6

Administrative Capacity	*Alfred E. Corey III	Gerald R. Jorgensen	*Bryan S. McQuay	John P. Rademacher
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	4.9	5.1	5.4	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.0	5.1	5.4	5.6
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.0	5.3	5.4	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.1	4.4	5.5	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.7

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*Alfred E. Corey III	83.33%	16.67%
Gerald R. Jorgensen	97.62%	2.38%
*Bryan S. McQuay	100.00%	0.00%
John P. Rademacher	95.74%	4.26%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 10

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Michael P. Burns	Michael O. Mead	Natalie G. Nelsen-Pacey
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.3	4.7	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	5.1	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.4	5.0	5.6
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.2	4.9	5.5

Impartiality	*Michael P. Burns	Michael O. Mead	Natalie G. Nelsen-Pacey
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.1	5.5	5.5
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.1	5.3	5.5
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.0	5.3	5.4

Clarity of Communication	*Michael P. Burns	Michael O. Mead	Natalie G. Nelsen-Pacey
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.2	5.1	5.5
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.0	4.8	5.4
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.2	5.2	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.2	5.2	5.5

Judicial Temperament

	*Michael P. Burns	Michael O. Mead	Natalie G. Nelsen-Pacey
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.2	5.4	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.4	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.5	5.1	5.6
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.6	5.3	5.5

Administrative Capacity

	*Michael P. Burns	Michael O. Mead	Natalie G. Nelsen-Pacey
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.3	5.2	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.3	5.1	5.6
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.3	5.1	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.3	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.4	5.1	5.6

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*Michael P. Burns	90.70%	9.30%
Michael O. Mead	93.18%	6.82%
Natalie G. Nelsen-Pacey	100.00%	0.00%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 11

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Joel B. Jay	Anne M. Paine	*Tanya K. Roberts-Connick	Kortnei N. Smith	Jeffrey M. Wightman
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.3	5.4	5.0	4.9	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.5	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.6
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.4	5.4	5.0	5.2	5.6
Impartiality	Joel B. Jay	Anne M. Paine	*Tanya K. Roberts-Connick	Kortnei N. Smith	Jeffrey M. Wightman
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.3	5.4	4.9	5.4	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.4	5.3	4.8	5.2	5.4
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.4	5.3	4.9	5.2	5.6
Clarity of Communication	Joel B. Jay	Anne M. Paine	*Tanya K. Roberts-Connick	Kortnei N. Smith	Jeffrey M. Wightman
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.4	5.4	5.0	5.1	5.7
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.4	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.4
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.5	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.5

Judicial Temperament	Joel B. Jay	Anne M. Paine	*Tanya K. Roberts-Connick	Kortnei N. Smith	Jeffrey M. Wightman
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.6	5.4	4.9	5.6	5.6
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.5	5.2	5.1	5.3	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.6	5.4	5.2	5.1	5.6
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.6

Administrative Capacity	Joel B. Jay	Anne M. Paine	*Tanya K. Roberts-Connick	Kortnei N. Smith	Jeffrey M. Wightman
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.2	5.3
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.3	5.4	4.6	5.2	5.4
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.3	5.4
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	5.4	5.1	5.4	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.6	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.8

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Joel B. Jay	93.75%	6.25%
Anne M. Paine	96.77%	3.23%
*Tanya K. Roberts-Connick	88.57%	11.43%
Kortnei N. Smith	96.15%	3.85%
Jeffrey M. Wightman	96.00%	4.00%

NE COUNTY COURT DISTRICT 12

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Aaron J. Conn	*Kristen D. Mickey	Randin R. Roland	Paul G. Wess
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.0	5.4	5.5	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.3	5.1	5.4	5.7
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.6
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.7

Impartiality	*Aaron J. Conn	*Kristen D. Mickey	Randin R. Roland	Paul G. Wess
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.7	4.9	5.5	5.8
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.7	5.1	5.4	5.8
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.6	4.8	5.3	5.8

Clarity of Communication	*Aaron J. Conn	*Kristen D. Mickey	Randin R. Roland	Paul G. Wess
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.7
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.4	5.2	5.4	5.6
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.5	5.3	5.6	5.7
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.7

Judicial Temperament

	*Aaron J. Conn	*Kristen D. Mickey	Randin R. Roland	Paul G. Wess
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.6	5.0	5.3	5.8
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.8
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.8
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.8

Administrative Capacity

	*Aaron J. Conn	*Kristen D. Mickey	Randin R. Roland	Paul G. Wess
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.4	5.6	5.4	5.7
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.7
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4	5.6	5.4	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.8

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*Aaron J. Conn	100.00%	0.00%
*Kristen D. Mickey	90.00%	10.00%
Randin R. Roland	93.55%	6.45%
Paul G. Wess	96.15%	3.85%

SEPARATE JUVENILE COURT DISTRICT 2

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Jonathon D. Crosby	*Sarah M. Moore
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	4.4	4.9
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	4.6	4.9
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	4.8	4.8
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	4.7	4.9

Impartiality	Jonathon D. Crosby	*Sarah M. Moore
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of case.	4.7	5.1
Appeared to consider all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.6	4.9
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.8	4.8

Clarity of Communication	Jonathon D. Crosby	*Sarah M. Moore
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	4.8	5.1
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	4.6	5.2
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	4.7	5.1
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	4.9	5.1

Judicial Temperament

Jonathon D. Crosby

*Sarah M. Moore

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	4.8	5.1
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.0	5.1
Appeared prepared for the proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	4.7	5.3
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	4.9	5.3

Administrative Capacity

Jonathon D. Crosby

*Sarah M. Moore

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.1	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.1	5.3
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.0	5.2
Began court proceedings on time.	5.1	5.2
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.1	5.2

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

Yes

No

Jonathon D. Crosby	94.44%	5.56%
*Sarah M. Moore	88.89%	11.11%

SEPARATE JUVENILE COURT DISTRICT 3

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Roger J. Heideman	Reggie L. Ryder	Shellie D. Sabata	Elise M.W. White
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.6	5.2	4.6	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.6	5.2	4.6	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.6	5.2	4.8	5.4
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.6	5.1	4.8	5.3

Impartiality	Roger J. Heideman	Reggie L. Ryder	Shellie D. Sabata	Elise M.W. White
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.7	4.4	4.9	5.3
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.5	4.7	4.4	5.3
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.5	4.6	4.6	5.3

Clarity of Communication	Roger J. Heideman	Reggie L. Ryder	Shellie D. Sabata	Elise M.W. White
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.7	5.1	4.6	5.6
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.6	5.1	4.8	5.3
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.7	5.0	4.7	5.6

Judicial Temperament

	Roger J. Heideman	Reggie L. Ryder	Shellie D. Sabata	Elise M.W. White
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.8	4.6	4.8	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.8	5.0	4.9	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.7	5.2	4.6	5.5
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.6	5.1	5.0	5.7

Administrative Capacity

	Roger J. Heideman	Reggie L. Ryder	Shellie D. Sabata	Elise M.W. White
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.7	5.1	4.3	5.5
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.7	5.2	4.3	5.6
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.7	5.3	4.5	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.6	5.2	4.1	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.8	5.3	5.5	5.7

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges

	Yes	No
Roger J. Heideman	100.00%	0.00%
Reggie L. Ryder	95.24%	4.76%
Shellie D. Sabata	63.64%	36.36%
Elise M.W. White	100.00%	0.00%

SEPARATE JUVENILE COURT DISTRICT 4

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Chad M. Brown	*Matthew R. Kahler	Candice J. Novak	Amy N. Schuchman	Mary M.Z. Stevens
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.1	5.3	3.9	5.2	5.3
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.1	5.2	3.7	5.1	5.2
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.1	5.3	3.8	5.1	5.1
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.0	5.3	3.8	5.1	5.2
Impartiality	Chad M. Brown	*Matthew R. Kahler	Candice J. Novak	Amy N. Schuchman	Mary M.Z. Stevens
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.2	5.4	3.1	5.2	5.6
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	4.9	5.3	3.4	5.1	5.5
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.0	5.3	2.9	5.1	5.4
Clarity of Communication	Chad M. Brown	*Matthew R. Kahler	Candice J. Novak	Amy N. Schuchman	Mary M.Z. Stevens
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.3	5.4	4.2	5.3	5.4
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.1	5.4	3.9	5.2	5.4
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.4	5.5	3.7	5.3	5.4
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.4	5.4	3.8	5.2	5.4

Judicial Temperament	Chad M. Brown	*Matthew R. Kahler	Candice J. Novak	Amy N. Schuchman	Mary M.Z. Stevens
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.1	5.4	2.9	5.2	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.2	5.5	3.8	5.2	5.5
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.2	5.4	3.9	5.2	5.4
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.4	5.4	3.9	5.3	5.6

Administrative Capacity	Chad M. Brown	*Matthew R. Kahler	Candice J. Novak	Amy N. Schuchman	Mary M.Z. Stevens
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.4	5.5	3.2	5.3	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.3	5.5	3.1	5.3	5.5
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.3	5.5	3.8	5.3	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.5	2.7	5.3	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.4	5.5	4.4	5.3	5.7

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
Chad M. Brown	91.89%	8.11%
*Matthew R. Kahler	91.89%	8.11%
Candice J. Novak	30.56%	69.44%
Amy N. Schuchman	90.00%	10.00%
Mary M.Z. Stevens	91.43%	8.57%

WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT JUDGES

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	*Dirk V. Block	Daniel R. Fridrich	John R. Hoffert	Julie A. Martin	Brynne Holsten Puhl	*Thomas E. Stine
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.5	5.6
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.9	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.6
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.7	5.5
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.9	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.5
Impartiality	*Dirk V. Block	Daniel R. Fridrich	John R. Hoffert	Julie A. Martin	Brynne Holsten Puhl	*Thomas E. Stine
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.8	5.7	5.9	5.5	5.9	5.4
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.7	5.8	5.8	5.5	5.9	5.4
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.7	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.7	5.2
Clarity of Communication	*Dirk V. Block	Daniel R. Fridrich	John R. Hoffert	Julie A. Martin	Brynne Holsten Puhl	*Thomas E. Stine
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.9	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.5
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.4
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.9	6.0	5.9	5.8	5.9	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.6

Judicial Temperament	*Dirk V. Block	Daniel R. Fridrich	John R. Hoffert	Julie A. Martin	Brynne Holsten Puhl	*Thomas E. Stine
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.9	5.7	5.9	5.6	5.9	5.4
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.9	5.6	5.8	5.6	5.9	5.7
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.6	5.9	5.7
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.6	5.9	5.6

Administrative Capacity	*Dirk V. Block	Daniel R. Fridrich	John R. Hoffert	Julie A. Martin	Brynne Holsten Puhl	*Thomas E. Stine
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.7	5.9	5.7	5.5	5.7	5.7
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.6	5.8	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.5
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.7	5.9	5.8	5.4	5.7	5.7
Began court proceedings on time.	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.7
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.8	5.9

Retention Assessment

Should the judge be retained?

Judges	Yes	No
*Dirk V. Block	100.00%	0.00%
Daniel R. Fridrich	96.30%	3.70%
John R. Hoffert	91.30%	8.70%
Julie A. Martin	96.00%	4.00%
Brynne Holsten Puhl	94.12%	5.88%
*Thomas E. Stine	95.83%	4.17%

NE US DISTRICT COURT - CHIEF JUSTICE

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence

Robert F. Rossiter Jr.

Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.5
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.3

Impartiality

Robert F. Rossiter Jr.

Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.2
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.3
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.2

Clarity of Communication

Robert F. Rossiter Jr.

Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.4
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.3
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.6
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.5

Judicial Temperament

Robert F. Rossiter Jr.

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.4
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.6
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.5
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.6

Administrative Capacity

Robert F. Rossiter Jr.

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.2
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.2
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.4
Began court proceedings on time.	5.5
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.6

NE US DISTRICT COURT - LINCOLN

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Susan M. Bazis	Jaqueline M. DeLuca	John M. Gerrard
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.2	5.2	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.3	5.4	5.7
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.3	5.4	5.7
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	5.2	5.5

Impartiality	Susan M. Bazis	Jaqueline M. DeLuca	John M. Gerrard
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.4	5.5	5.7
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.3	5.4	5.5
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.3	5.5	5.6

Clarity of Communication	Susan M. Bazis	Jaqueline M. DeLuca	John M. Gerrard
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.5	5.5	5.7
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.1	5.3	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.5	5.5	5.7
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.5	5.5	5.7

Judicial Temperament

Susan M. Bazis

Jaqueline M. DeLuca

John M. Gerrard

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.4	5.5	5.8
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.6	5.5	5.9
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.5	5.6	5.8
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.6	5.6	5.9

Administrative Capacity

Susan M. Bazis

Jaqueline M. DeLuca

John M. Gerrard

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.0	5.5	5.6
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.7	5.5	5.5
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.0	5.5	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.6	5.6	5.7
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.6	5.6	5.6

NE US DISTRICT COURT - OMAHA

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Joseph F. Bataillon	Brian C. Buescher	Ryan C. Carson	F.A. Gossett III	Michael D. Nelson
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.0	4.3	5.3	5.4	5.4
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	4.9	4.5	5.4	5.6	5.5
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.1	4.4	5.4	5.3	5.5
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.1	4.5	5.4	5.3	5.4
Impartiality	Joseph F. Bataillon	Brian C. Buescher	Ryan C. Carson	F.A. Gossett III	Michael D. Nelson
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.1	4.0	5.5	5.4	5.7
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.1	4.0	5.4	5.4	5.6
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	4.8	4.0	5.3	5.6	5.6
Clarity of Communication	Joseph F. Bataillon	Brian C. Buescher	Ryan C. Carson	F.A. Gossett III	Michael D. Nelson
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.2	4.9	5.5	5.4	5.6
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.0	4.5	5.3	5.4	5.5
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.2	4.7	5.5	5.4	5.8
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.2	4.9	5.5	5.4	5.7

Judicial Temperament	Joseph F. Bataillon	Brian C. Buescher	Ryan C. Carson	F.A. Gossett III	Michael D. Nelson
Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.1	4.0	5.5	5.4	5.7
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.4	4.9	5.6	5.6	5.8
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.2	5.0	5.6	5.6	5.7
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.3	5.0	5.6	5.6	5.8

Administrative Capacity	Joseph F. Bataillon	Brian C. Buescher	Ryan C. Carson	F.A. Gossett III	Michael D. Nelson
Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.0	5.1	5.5	5.6	5.7
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	4.9	4.9	5.4	5.6	5.6
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.0	5.1	5.5	5.6	5.7
Began court proceedings on time.	5.4	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.8
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.2	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.8

NE US DISTRICT COURT - BANKRUPTCY

Evaluation Characteristics

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Judicial Competence	Brian S. Kruse	Thomas L. Saladino
Demonstrated a thorough understanding of relevant substantive law.	5.6	5.7
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of procedure.	5.4	5.7
Made a good faith effort to accurately apply the rules of evidence.	5.5	5.7
Written/verbal rulings gave clear legal reasoning & logical thought process.	5.5	5.7

Impartiality	Brian S. Kruse	Thomas L. Saladino
Treated all parties with dignity and respect regardless of background or nature of the case.	5.4	5.6
Considered all arguments presented by both sides before making a decision.	5.4	5.6
Actions/statements free from bias towards or against a litigant, attorney, or group.	5.4	5.5

Clarity of Communication	Brian S. Kruse	Thomas L. Saladino
Provided verbal instructions in court, they were clear and easy to understand.	5.7	5.6
Issued written opinions, they were well-organized and logically reasoned.	5.3	5.7
Adjusted communication style to ensure understanding for all participants.	5.6	5.5
Communicated procedures, processes, & policies in a clear & understandable manner.	5.6	5.6

Judicial Temperament

Brian S. Kruse

Thomas L. Saladino

Treated all court participants with courtesy, respect, dignity and fairness.	5.3	5.5
Maintained control over the courtroom proceedings.	5.3	5.6
Appeared prepared for proceedings, for example by having read relevant materials.	5.4	5.7
Appeared to be paying attention during the court proceedings.	5.4	5.7

Administrative Capacity

Brian S. Kruse

Thomas L. Saladino

Effectively managed their individual docket to avoid unnecessary case delays.	5.7	5.5
Issued rulings and orders in a timely manner.	5.7	5.6
Took steps to move the case forward.	5.7	5.6
Began court proceedings on time.	5.7	5.6
When it is used, uses technology competently.	5.8	5.6

INDEX

LEGEND:

S – Nebraska Supreme Court | **A** – Nebraska Court of Appeals | **D** – Nebraska District Court | **J** – Nebraska Separate Juvenile Court
C – Nebraska County Court | **W** – Workers' Compensation Court | **F** – Federal Judges | **B** – Bankruptcy Court

*Retention Date: November 3, 2026

JUDGE (COURT)	PAGE	JUDGE (COURT)	PAGE
Acton, Matthew L. (C)	39	Cox, Nathan B. (D)	11
Alioth, Tressa M. (D)	15	Crosby, Jonathon D. (J)	62
Bargen*, David J. A. (D)	9	Dalton, Joseph E. (C)	39
Barron III, Francis W. (C)	48	Daugherty, Rachel A. (D)	21
Bataillon, Joseph F. (F)	74	DeLuca, Jaqueline M. (F)	72
Bataillon, Peter C. (D)	15	Derr, J. Russell (D)	15
Bauer, Linda A. (C)	35	Dobrovolny, Lee P. (D)	33
Bauer*, Sara E. (C)	48	Dougherty*, Duane C. (D)	15
Bazis, Susan M. (F)	72	Engleman, Todd O. (D)	15
Benson*, Katie L. (D)	15	Farquhar*, Morgan R. (D)	29
Bergevin, Jason M. (S)	5	Finley, Beau G. (C)	41
Bishop, Riko (A)	7	Forsberg, Grant A. (C)	41
Blackman, Zachary L. (D)	23	Freudenberg, John R. (S)	5
Block*, Dirk V. (W)	68	Fridrich, Daniel R. (W)	68
Brown, Chad M. (J)	66	Funke, Jeffrey J. (S)	5
Buescher, Brian C. (F)	74	Gaertig, Jeffrey A. (C)	35
Burdick*, Kale B. (C)	52	Gerrard, John M. (F)	72
Burns*, Michael P. (C)	56	Gossett III, F.A. (F)	74
Burns*, Timothy P. (D)	15	Hall*, Geoffrey C. (D)	23
Butler, Andrew C. (D)	27	Hansen, Stephanie R. (C)	41
Carney, Patrick P. (C)	50	Harmon, Thomas K. (C)	41
Carson, Ryan C. (F)	74	Heideman, Roger J. (J)	64
Cassel, William B. (S)	5	Hendrix*, Marcena M. (C)	41
Conn*, Aaron J. (C)	60	Heng*, Patrick M. (D)	31
Corey III*, Alfred E. (C)	54		

LEGEND:

S – Nebraska Supreme Court | **A** – Nebraska Court of Appeals | **D** – Nebraska District Court | **J** – Nebraska Separate Juvenile Court
C – Nebraska County Court | **W** – Workers' Compensation Court | **F** – Federal Judges | **B** – Bankruptcy Court

*Retention Date: November 3, 2026

JUDGE (COURT)	PAGE	JUDGE (COURT)	PAGE
Hoef, Timothy E. (D)	29	Marsh*, John H. (D)	27
Hoffert, John R. (W)	68	Martin, Julie A. (W)	68
Holsten Puhl, Brynne (W)	68	Martinez*, Stefanie A. (D)	11
Homolka, Lynelle D. (C)	46	Masteller, James M. (D)	15
Huber*, John E. (C)	41	Matney, Edward H. (C)	48
Hutton*, Todd J. (C)	37	McDermott*, Craig Q. (C)	41
Ideus*, Darla S. (D)	13	McManaman*, Kevin R. (D)	13
Jacobsen*, Andrew R. (D)	13	McQuay*, Bryan S. (C)	54
Jay, Joel B. (C)	58	Mead, Michael O. (C)	56
Jorgensen, Gerald R. (C)	54	Meisner, Bryan C. (D)	23
Kahler*, Matthew R. (J)	66	Mellor*, Matthew O. (D)	13
Keane*, Molly B. (D)	15	Mickey*, Kristen D. (C)	60
Keim*, Marcela A. (C)	41	Miller Pankonin, Kimberly (D)	15
Klein*, Thomas J. (C)	48	Miller*, Andrea (D)	33
Kleine, Philip K. (C)	41	Moore*, Sarah M. (J)	52
Kozisek*, Mark D. (D)	25	Mosby, Tamara T. (C)	41
Kraci*, Denise J. (C)	46	Nelsen-Pacey, Natalie G. (C)	56
Kruse, Brian S. (B)	76	Nelson, Michael D. (F)	74
Lange, Andrew R. (C)	46	Noakes, Karin L. (D)	25
Lee*, Patrick M. (D)	27	Novak, Candice J. (J)	66
Lindberg, Ryan M. (D)	15	O'Gorman*, Travis P. (D)	33
Lohaus*, Sheryl L. (C)	41	Orr, James J. (C)	52
Lux, Jeffrey J. (D)	15	Paine, Anne M. (C)	58
Maret, Lori A. (D)	13	Palm*, S. Colin (C)	37
Marroquin, Christina M. (D)	21	Papik, Jonathan J. (S)	5

LEGEND:

S – Nebraska Supreme Court | **A** – Nebraska Court of Appeals | **D** – Nebraska District Court | **J** – Nebraska Separate Juvenile Court
C – Nebraska County Court | **W** – Workers' Compensation Court | **F** – Federal Judges | **B** – Bankruptcy Court

*Retention Date: November 3, 2026

JUDGE (COURT)	PAGE	JUDGE (COURT)	PAGE
Parsley, Holly J. (C)	39	Srb*, LeAnne M. (D)	15
Partsch, David J. (C)	37	Stacy, Stephanie F. (S)	5
Philips, Timothy C. (C)	39	Stecker, James C. (D)	21
Piccolo, Michael E. (D)	31	Stevens, Mary M.Z. (J)	66
Pirtle*, Michael W. (A)	7	Stine*, Thomas E. (W)	68
Polk*, Marlon A. (D)	15	Stoffer, Ross A. (C)	50
Post, Ryan S. (D)	13	Stratman, Shelly R. (D)	15
Rademacher, John P. (C)	54	Strong, Susan I. (D)	13
Ramsey, Kane M. (D)	27	Thompson*, George A. (D)	11
Reuter*, Rodney D. (C)	39	Twiss, Stephen R. (C)	46
Riedmann, Francie C. (A)	7	Volkmer*, Cindy R. (D)	31
Roberts-Connick*, Tanya K. (C)	58	Weimer, Derek C. (D)	33
Roland, Randin R. (C)	60	Welch Jr., Lawrence E. (A)	7
Rossiter Jr., Robert F. (F)	70	Wess, Paul G. (C)	60
Ryder, Reggie L. (J)	64	Wheelock, Horacio J. (D)	15
Sabata, Shellie D. (J)	64	White, Elise M.W. (J)	64
Saladino, Thomas L. (B)	76	Wightman, Jeffrey M. (C)	58
Schendt, Tami K. (C)	52	Zimmerman, Thomas E. (C)	39
Schreiner*, Rick (D)	9		
Schuchman, Amy N. (J)	66		
Shearer*, Stephanie S. (C)	41		
Smith*, Julie D. (D)	9		
Smith*, Michael A. (D)	11		
Smith*, Richard R. (C)	35		
Smith, Kortnei N. (C)	58		