

2022 Judicial Candidates Poll Results

Number = number of respondents

Total % = percentage of total respondents in each category, including "Not Enough Information/Do Not Know" or "No Response"

Valid % = percentage of respondents who rated the judicial candidates as "Highly Qualified", "Qualified", and "Unqualified." These percentages do not include responses from respondents who selected "Not Enough Information/Do Not Know" or "No Response"

JEFFERSON CIR	CUIT COL	JRT, DIV	ISION 5							
Candidate	Tracy	/ Evette l	Davis	Chr	istine Mi	iller	Mary M. Shaw			
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	
Highly Qualified	45	8.4%	18.1%	11	2.1%	7.0%	226	42.4%	53.8%	
Qualified	88	16.5%	35.3%	53	9.9%	33.5%	159	29.8%	37.9%	
Unqualified	116	21.8%	46.6%	94	17.6	59.5%	35	6.6%	8.3%	
Not Enough Info/DNK	243	45.6%		335	62.9%		86	16.1%		
No Response	41	7.7%		40	7.5%		27	5.1%		
JEFFERSON CIR	CUIT COL	JRT, DIV	ISION 7		<u>'</u>					
Candidate	Melissa Logan Bellows			Critt	Cunning	ham	Theodore (Ted) Shouse			
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	
Highly Qualified	2	0.4%	4.1%	51	9.6%	21.8%	193	36.2%	53.8%	
Qualified	14	2.6%	28.6%	117	22.0%	50.0%	115	21.6	32.0%	
Unqualified	33	6.2%	67.3	66	12.4%	28.2%	51	9.6%	14.2%	
Not Enough Info/DNK	440	82.6%		263	49.3%		146	27.4%		
No Response	44	8.3%		36	6.8%		28	5.3%		
JEFFERSON CIR	CUIT COL	JRT, DIV	ISION 9							
Candidate	Tim Buckley			Sarah Clay			Nichole T. Compton			
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	
Highly Qualified	14	2.6%	18.2%	152	28.5%	56.3%	6	1.1%	4.2%	
Qualified	33	6.2%	42.9%	84	15.8%	31.1	32	6.0%	22.4%	
Unqualified	30	5.6%	39.0%	34	6.4%	12.6%	105	19.7%	73.4%	
Not Enough Info/DNK	410	76.9%		226	42.4%		347	65.1%		
No Response	46	8.6%		37	6.9%		43	8.1%		
Candidate	Blaine Grant			Alan L. Lani			F. Todd Lewis			
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	
Highly Qualified	21	3.9%	26.6%	1	0.2%	2.1%	99	18.6%	37.8%	
Qualified	28	5.3%	35.4%	11	2.1%	22.9%	114	21.4%	43.5%	
Unqualified	30	5.6%	38.0%	36	6.8%	75.0%	49	9.2%	18.7%	
Not Enough Info/DNK	414	77.7%		439	82.4%		230	43.2%		
No Response	40	7.5%		46	8.6%		41	7.7%		
JEFFERSON CIR	CUIT COL	JRT, DIV	ISION 10							
Candidate		islee Gill			y (Zack)	McKee	Patricia (Tish) Morris			
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	
Highly Qualified	112	21.0%	48.5%	34	6.4%	17.5%	75	14.1%	33.6%	
Qualified	81	15.2%	35.1%	60	11.3%	30.9%	89	16.7%	39.9%	
Unqualified	38	7.1%	16.5%	100	18.8%	51.5%	59	11.1%	26.5%	
Not Enough Info / DNK	258	48.4%		296	55.5%		274	51.4%		
						i .				

			Not Ki			1						
JEFFERSON DIS	TRICT CO	URT, DI	VISION 4									
Candidate	Yvette	De La G	uardia	Lora Chisholm Holman			Jennifer Murzyn Yancey					
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid			
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%			
Highly Qualified	114	21.4%	57.9%	14	2.6%	17.7%	47	8.8%	21.8%			
Qualified	64	12.0%	32.5%	32	6.0%	40.5%	120	22.5%	55.6%			
Unqualified	19	3.6%	9.6%	33	6.2%	41.8%	49	9.2%	22.7%			
Not Enough Info/DNK	294	55.2%		412	77.3%		275	51.6%				
No Response	42	7.9%		42	7.9%		42	7.9%				
IEFFERSON DISTRICT COURT, DIVISION 7												
Candidate	Jacob E. Elder			Shannon Renee Fauver			Megan McDonald					
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid			
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%			
Highly Qualified	25	4.7%	17.7%	77	14.4%	28.6%	32	6.0%	16.9%			
Qualified	75	14.1%	53.2%	112	21.0%	41.6%	49	9.2%	25.9%			
Unqualified	41	7.7%	29.1%	80	15.0%	29.7%	108	20.3%	57.1%			
Not Enough Info/DNK	350	65.7%		232	43.5%		301	56.5%				
No Response	42	7.9%		32	6.0%		43	8.1%				
JEFFERSON DIS	TRICT CO	URT, DI	VISION 8									
Candidate	Linds	Lindsay Volk Beets			Karen Faulkner			Jessica Stone				
	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid	Num-	Total	Valid			
	ber	%	%	ber	%	%	ber	%	%			
Highly Qualified	86	16.1%	44.3%	150	28.1%	44.8%	17	3.2%	9.7%			
Qualified	88	16.5%	45.4%	127	23.8%	37.9%	68	12.8%	38.6%			
Unqualified	20	3.8%	10.3%	58	10.9%	17.3%	91	17.1%	51.7%			
1 1												
Not Enough Info / DNK	300	56.3%		162	30.4%		315	59.1%				
Not Enough Info/DNK	300 39	56.3% 7.3%		162 36	30.4% 6.8%		315 42	59.1% 7.9%				
<u> </u>	39	7.3%	VISION 1	36								
Not Enough Info/DNK No Response	39 TRICT CO	7.3%		36 5		tton	42		lford			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS	39 TRICT CO	7.3% OURT, DIV I G. Hayw Total	vard, Jr. Valid	36 5	6.8% dette Pa Total	Valid	42	7.9% Jude Wo	Valid			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate	39 TRICT CO	7.3% OURT, DIV I G. Hayw	ard, Jr.	36 5 Cla u	6.8% dette Pa		42 Mary	7.9% Jude Wo				
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS	39 TRICT CO Samue Num-	7.3% OURT, DIV I G. Hayw Total	vard, Jr. Valid	36 5 Clau Num-	6.8% dette Pa Total	Valid	42 Mary Num-	7.9% Jude Wo	Valid			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate	39 TRICT CO Samue Num- ber	7.3% DURT, DIVIG. Hayw Total %	vard, Jr. Valid %	36 5 Clau Num- ber	6.8% dette Pa Total %	Valid % 26.5% 47.1%	Mary Num- ber	7.9% Jude Wo Total %	Valid %			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified	39 TRICT CC Samue Num- ber 16	7.3% OURT, DIVIDENT CONTROL OF C	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1%	36 Clau Num- ber 27	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1%	Valid % 26.5%	Mary Num- ber 88	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5%	Valid % 45.1%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK	39 TRICT CC Samue Num- ber 16 51	7.3% DURT, DIV G. Hayw Total % 3.0% 9.6%	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1%	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1%	Mary Num- ber 88 92	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified	39 TRICT CC Samue Num- ber 16 51 39	7.3% DURT, DIV I G. Hayw Total % 3.0% 9.6% 7.3%	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1%	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1%	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK	39 TRICT CO Samuel Number 16 51 39 384 43	7.3% DURT, DIV I G. Hayw Total % 3.0% 9.6% 7.3% 72.0% 8.1%	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8%	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27 390 41	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1%	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS' Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK No Response	39 TRICT CO Samue Num- ber 16 51 39 384 43 RT OF AF	7.3% DURT, DIV I G. Hayw Total % 3.0% 9.6% 7.3% 72.0% 8.1%	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8%	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27 390 41 CT 4, DIV	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1% 26.5%	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298 40	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2% 7.7%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK No Response KENTUCKY COU	39 TRICT CO Samue Num- ber 16 51 39 384 43 RT OF AF McKo Num-	7.3% DURT, DIVIG. Hayw Total % 3.0% 9.6% 7.3% 72.0% 8.1% PEALS — enzie Car Total	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8% DISTRICTED	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27 390 41 CT 4, DIV	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7% VISION 2 mette Kar Total	Valid % 26.5% 47.1% 26.5% eem Valid	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298 40 Sta	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9% 7.5% an Whetz	Valid % 45.1% 47.2% 7.7% zel Valid			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK No Response KENTUCKY COU	39 TRICT CC Samue Num- ber 16 51 39 384 43 RT OF AF	7.3% DURT, DIVIDENT, DIVI	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8% DISTRIC	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27 390 41 CT 4, DIV	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7% VISION 2 nette Kar	Valid % 26.5% 47.1% 26.5%	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298 40	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9% 7.5%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2% 7.7%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS' Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK No Response KENTUCKY COU Candidate Highly Qualified	39 TRICT CO Samue Num- ber 16 51 39 384 43 RT OF AF McKo Num-	7.3% DURT, DIVIGENTAL SERVICE CAPE TO	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8% DISTRIC ntrell Valid % 44.9%	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27 390 41 CT 4, DIV Ani Num-	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7% ISION 2 nette Kar Total % 21.2%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1% 26.5% em Valid % 29.3%	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298 40 Sta	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9% 7.5% an Whetz	Valid % 45.1% 47.2% 7.7% zel Valid % 29.9%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK No Response KENTUCKY COU Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Qualified	39 TRICT CC Samue Num- ber 16 51 39 384 43 RT OF AF McKe Num- ber 93 59	7.3% DURT, DIVIG. Hayw Total % 3.0% 9.6% 7.3% 72.0% 8.1% PPEALS— enzie Car Total % 17.4% 11.1%	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8% - DISTRIC ntrell Valid % 44.9% 28.5%	36 Clau Num- ber 27 48 27 390 41 CT 4, DIV Ani Num- ber 113 125	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7% VISION 2 nette Kar Total % 21.2% 23.5%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1% 26.5% em Valid % 29.3% 32.4%	42 Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298 40 Sta Num- ber 53 72	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9% 7.5% an Whetz Total % 9.9% 13.5%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2% 7.7% vel Valid % 29.9% 40.7%			
NotEnough Info/DNK No Response JEFFERSON DIS Candidate Highly Qualified Qualified Unqualified NotEnough Info/DNK No Response KENTUCKY COU	39 TRICT CO Samue Num- ber 16 51 39 384 43 RT OF AF McKe Num- ber 93	7.3% DURT, DIVIGENTAL SERVICE CAPE TO	vard, Jr. Valid % 15.1% 48.1% 36.8% DISTRIC ntrell Valid % 44.9%	36 Clau Number 27 48 27 390 41 CT 4, DIV Ann Number 113	6.8% dette Pa Total % 5.1% 9.0% 5.1% 73.2% 7.7% ISION 2 nette Kar Total % 21.2%	Valid % 26.5% 47.1% 26.5% em Valid % 29.3%	Mary Num- ber 88 92 15 298 40 Sta Num- ber 53	7.9% Jude Wo Total % 16.5% 17.3% 2.8% 55.9% 7.5% an Whetz Total % 9.9%	Valid % 45.1% 47.2% 7.7% Zel Valid % 29.9%			

32 6.0%