


COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL NOMINEES EVALUATION
Statistical Report
2006-2008

Presented in this report are the ratings of the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation (JNE Commission) and the appointments by the Governor in response to those ratings for the years 2006 through 2008. The data for the years 2006 and 2007 are included for the purpose of comparison and to demonstrate a greater overview of ratings and appointments. Please be advised that the data comparing the three years may provide an inaccurate picture of appointments due to candidates who are evaluated in one year and may be appointed to the bench in a later year. The numbers also reflect persons appointed to the bench after election without formal JNE evaluation, pursuant to Rule 11, Section 13 (Appointment by Governor Following Election to Judicial Office). The numbers should be analyzed with that caveat in mind.

The JNE Commission rates candidates for judicial appointment as Exceptionally Well Qualified (EWQ), Well Qualified (WQ), Qualified (Q), and Not Qualified (NQ).

- Table 1: Total Judicial Evaluations for 2006-2008
- Table 2: Judicial Appointments by Rating (All Courts) for 2006-2008
- Table 3: Evaluations by County, 2006-2008
- Table 4: Evaluations by District, 2006-2008
- Table 5: Commissioner Workload, 2006-2008
- Table 6: Budget Statistics, 2006-2008


Total Judicial Evaluations - 2006-2008



Year	EWQ	%	WQ	%	Q	%	NQ	%	Not Rated	%	Withdrawn	%	Total
2006	8	4	75	33	104	46	29	13	5	2	4	2	225
2007	10	4	85	33	121	46	33	13	2	1	10	4	261
2008	15	6	72	28	145	56	16	6	0	0	11	47	259
Total	33	5%	232	31%	370	49%	78	11%	7	1%	25	4%	745

Table 1

Judicial Appointments by Rating (All Courts) 2006 - 2008



Year	EWQ	Percent	WQ	Percent	Q	Percent	NQ	Percent	Elected*	Percent	Total
2006	11	13	41	50	25	30	0	0	5	6	82
2007	7	7	40	42	45	47	1	1	2	2	95
2008	9	10	48	55	30	34	0	0	0	0	87
Total	27	10	129	49	100	37	1	0	7	3	264

*Appointed after election pursuant to Rule 11, Section 13, Rules and Procedures of the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation


Evaluations by County 2006 – 2008

County	District	2006*	2007*	2008	Total		County	District	2006*	2007*	2008	Total
Alameda	9	8	7	10	25		Placer	1	0	1	4	5
Alpine	2	0	0	0	0		Plumas	1	0	0	0	0
Amador	2	0	0	0	0		Riverside	6	5	20	14	39
Butte	1	1	4	1	6		Sacramento	2	1	23	10	34
Calveras	2	0	0	0	0		San Benito	5	0	0	0	0
Colusa	1	0	0	1	1		San Bernardino	6	18	26	10	54
Contra Costa	3	3	2	7	12		San Diego	9	34	14	20	68
Del Norte	1	0	0	0	0		San Francisco	4	1	3	13	17
El Dorado	2	0	3	6	9		San Joaquin	5	1	4	3	8
Fresno	5	4	7	6	17		San Luis Obispo	6	1	0	3	4
Glenn	1	0	0	0	0		San Mateo	3	0	0	0	0
Humboldt	1	0	0	0	0		Santa Clara	3	4	9	6	19
Imperial	9	2	0	0	2		Santa Barbara	6	1	3	5	9
Inyo	5	0	0	0	0		Santa Cruz	5	10	3	2	15
Kern	5	4	11	11	26		Shasta	1	0	4	5	9
Kings	5	0	0	0	0		Sierra	1	0	0	0	0
Lake	1	0	0	0	0		Siskiyou	1	0	0	1	1
Lassen	1	0	0	0	0		Solano	2	0	4	1	5
Los Angeles	7	82	51	58	191		Sonoma	2	2	4	1	7
Madera	5	1	3	0	4		Stanislaus	5	3	6	2	11
Marin	4	0	0	5	5		Sutter	1	0	0	2	2
Mariposa	5	0	0	0	0		Tehama	1	0	0	0	0
Mendocino	1	0	0	0	0		Trinity	1	0	0	0	0
Merced	5	2	1	2	5		Tulare	5	0	9	0	9
Modoc	1	0	0	1	1		Tuolumne	2	0	0	0	0
Mono	5	0	0	0	0		Ventura	6	2	8	4	14
Monterey	5	1	5	2	8		Yolo	2	0	5	1	6
Napa	2	3	0	0	3		Yuba	1	0	0	0	0
Nevada	1	0	2	0	2		Supreme Ct.	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	8	18	7	25	50		Court of Appeals	0	13	12	17	42
							TOTALS		225	261	259	745

* In 2006 five candidates and in 2007 two candidates were appointed after election pursuant to Rule 22, Section 13, Rules and Procedures of the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation

Table 3


Evaluations by District 2006 - 2008



	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008
	Evaluation #	%	Evaluation #	%	Evaluation #	%
<i>District 1</i>	1	0%	11	4%	15	6%
<i>District 2</i>	6	3%	39	15%	19	7%
<i>District 3</i>	15	7%	18	7%	23	9%
<i>District 4</i>	1	0%	3	1%	18	7%
<i>District 5</i>	26	12%	49	19%	28	11%
<i>District 6</i>	27	12%	57	22%	36	14%
<i>District 7</i>	82	36%	51	20%	58	22%
<i>District 8</i>	18	8%	7	3%	25	10%
<i>District 9</i>	36	16%	14	5%	20	8%
<i>Appellate</i>	13	6%	12	5%	17	7%
Total	225		261		259	

Table 4

Commissioner Workload 2006 - 2008



Meeting Days / Assignments







Table 5

Budget Statistics 2006 – 2008

Year	Budget	Commissioners	Meeting Days	Evaluations	Cost per Evaluation
2006	\$706,376	37	14	225	\$3,139
2007	\$824,875	36	15	261	\$3,160
2008	\$890,299	37	10	259	\$3,437



	Travel Expense	Postage/Supplies	Printing/Outside Services
2006	\$133,183	\$93,033	\$54,236
2007	\$169,116	\$108,136	\$46,518
2008	\$147,862	\$84,889	\$47,411