



# alaska judicial council

1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969  
<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us>

(907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046  
E-mail: [postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us](mailto:postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS  
William F. Clarke  
Kathleen Tompkins-Miller  
Christena Williams

ATTORNEY MEMBERS  
James H. Cannon  
Kevin Fitzgerald  
Louis James Menendez

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO  
Walter L. Carpeneti  
Chief Justice  
Supreme Court

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Judicial Council  
**FROM:** Staff  
**DATE:** March 26, 2010  
**RE:** Juror Survey Report

---

The Alaska Judicial Council surveyed all jurors who sat in 2008 and 2009 trials before the 26 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2010. A total of 2,091 jurors responded (see Table 1). The Council sent postcards to the judges to distribute to jurors at the end of each trial. Jurors were able to complete the survey on the business reply postcard and mail it to the Council.

Council staff entered data from the surveys and ran basic descriptive statistics. This memorandum summarizes the data from the survey and is distributed to Council members, judges and shared on the Council's website. Jurors reported whether they served on a criminal or civil trial, and how many days they served. They evaluated judicial performance and made comments. A sample juror survey postcard is included at the end of this memorandum.

Table 1 shows the distribution of jurors by type of trial reported for each judge.

<b>Table 1: Distribution of Jurors by Type of Trial, by Judge Alaska Judicial Council 2010 Retention Juror Survey</b>				
<b>Judge</b>	<b>Civil</b>	<b>Criminal</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
Aarseth, Eric A.	16	161	6	183
Bauman, Carl	10	42	3	55
Blankenship, Douglas L.	0	57	2	59
Clark, Brian K.	19	30	5	54
Easter, Catherine M.	18	37	2	57
Estelle, William L.	6	14	0	20
George, David V.	7	75	11	93
Gleason, Sharon L.	48	0	0	48
Hamilton III, Marvin Charles	15	21	1	37
Illsley, Sharon A.S.	7	42	6	55
Kauvar, Jane F.	5	31	2	38
Kristiansen, Kari	2	109	5	116
MacDonald, Michael A.	19	76	5	100
McKay, Patrick J.	22	276	6	304
Miller, Kevin G.	11	52	8	71
Moran, Anna M.	24	25	2	51
Motyka, Gregory J.	13	34	3	50
Pallenberg, Philip M.	8	30	5	43
Postma Jr., Richard W.	6	48	3	57
Rhoades, Stephanie	6	30	0	36
Rindner, Mark	32	0	0	32
Smith, Jack W.	30	62	1	93
Spaan, Michael	6	239	19	264
Stephens, Trevor	14	72	13	99
White, Vanessa	0	45	2	47
Wolfe, John	4	25	0	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>1,633</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>2,091</b>

Table 2 shows the distribution of number of days served, as reported by the jurors. More than half of the jurors served fewer than five days.

<b>Table 2: Distribution of Days Served</b>		
<b>Number of Days Served</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
1 - 2 Days	22%	460
3 - 4 Days	39%	809
5 - 7 Days	20%	424
8 - 10 Days	8%	163
11 - 20 Days	7%	135
21 or More Days	.3%	6
No Answer	5%	94
		2,091

## Individual Results

Table 3 shows the mean score for each judge for each question on the survey. Individual survey results are provided for each judge in separate tables. Jurors used a five-point scale, with *excellent* scored as five, and *poor* scored as one. The closer the jurors' scores were to five, the higher that judge's evaluation by the jurors.

<b>Table 3</b>							
<b>Mean Score for each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge</b>							
<b>Alaska Judicial Council 2010 Retention Juror Survey</b>							
	Fair and impartial to all sides	Respectful and courteous to parties	Attentive during proceedings	Exercised control over proceedings	Intelligence and skill as a judge	Overall performance	
						Mean	Total
Aarseth, Eric A.	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	183
Bauman, Carl	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	55
Blankenship, Douglas L.	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	59
Clark, Brian K.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	54
Easter, Catherine M.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	57
Estelle, William L.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	20
George, David V.	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	93
Gleason, Sharon L.	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	48
Hamilton III, Marvin Charles	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	37
Illsley, Sharon A.S.	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	55
Kauvar, Jane F.	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	38
Kristiansen, Kari	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	116
MacDonald, Michael A.	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	100
McKay, Patrick J.	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	304
Miller, Kevin G.	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	71
Moran, Anna M.	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	51
Motyka, Gregory J.	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	50
Pallenberg, Philip M.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	43
Postma Jr., Richard W.	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	57
Rhoades, Stephanie	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	36
Rindner, Mark	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	32
Smith, Jack W.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	93
Spaan, Michael	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	263
Stephens, Trevor	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	99
White, Vanessa	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	47
Wolfe, John	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Eric A. Aarseth</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	92% 168	7% 12	2% 3	0% 0	0% 0	183			
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	96% 175	4% 7	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	183			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	85% 156	13% 24	2% 3	0% 0	0% 0	183			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	95% 173	3% 6	2% 4	0% 0	0% 0	183			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	93% 170	6% 11	1% 2	0% 0	0% 0	183			
Overall Evaluation	4.9	93% 171	6% 10	1% 2	0% 0	0% 0	183			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Carl Bauman</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	71% 39	29% 16	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	78% 43	22% 12	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	75% 41	24% 13	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Control over Proceedings	4.7	73% 40	26% 14	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	71% 39	27% 15	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Overall Evaluation	4.7	69% 38	31% 17	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	55			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Douglas L. Blankenship</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.6	65% 38	31% 18	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0	58			
Respectful/Courteous	4.6	68% 40	29% 17	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0	59			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.6	64% 38	34% 20	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	59			
Control over Proceedings	4.7	66% 39	34% 20	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	59			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.6	59% 35	37% 22	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0	59			
Overall Evaluation	4.6	61% 36	37% 22	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	59			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Brian K. Clark</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	91% 49	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	54			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	94% 51	6% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	54			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	85% 46	15% 8	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	54			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	89% 48	11% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	54			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	87% 47	13% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	54			
Overall Evaluation	4.9	87% 47	13% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	54			



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Catherine M. Easter</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mean</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Total Responses</b></p>			
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>88% 50</p>	<p>12% 7</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">57</p>			
<p><b>Respectful/Courteous</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>90% 51</p>	<p>11% 6</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">57</p>			
<p><b>Attentive during Proceedings</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>90% 51</p>	<p>11% 6</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">57</p>			
<p><b>Control over Proceedings</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>86% 49</p>	<p>14% 8</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">57</p>			
<p><b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>90% 51</p>	<p>11% 6</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">57</p>			
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>88% 50</p>	<p>12% 7</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">57</p>			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation William L. Estelle</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	90% 18	10% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 18	10% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	85% 17	15% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	90% 18	10% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	85% 17	15% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20			
Overall Evaluation	4.9	85% 17	15% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation David V. George</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.8</b>	83%	77	16%	15	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	93
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>4.9</b>	91%	85	9%	8	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	93
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	83%	77	17%	16	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	93
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	81%	75	17%	16	2%	2	0%	0	0%	0	93
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.8</b>	80%	74	19%	17	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	92
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.9</b>	86%	80	13%	12	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	93

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Sharon L. Gleason</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.8</b>	83%	40	17%	8	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	48
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>5.0</b>	98%	47	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	48
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	85%	41	13%	6	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	48
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.9</b>	85%	41	15%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	48
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.9</b>	90%	43	10%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	48
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.9</b>	88%	42	13%	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	48

<b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Marvin Charles Hamilton III</b>									
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>							
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>		
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.6</b>	62% 23	32% 12	5% 2	0% 0	0% 0	37		
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>4.8</b>	87% 32	5% 2	8% 3	0% 0	0% 0	37		
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.4</b>	57% 21	30% 11	11% 4	3% 1	0% 0	37		
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.6</b>	65% 24	27% 10	8% 3	0% 0	0% 0	37		
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.6</b>	70% 26	22% 8	8% 3	0% 0	0% 0	37		
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.6</b>	65% 24	27% 10	8% 3	0% 0	0% 0	37		

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Sharon A.S. Illsley</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.5	60% 33	33% 18	7% 4	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Respectful/Courteous	4.7	76% 42	20% 11	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	71% 39	27% 15	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Control over Proceedings	4.6	64% 35	33% 18	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	69% 38	31% 17	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	55			
Overall Evaluation	4.7	67% 37	31% 17	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	55			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Jane F. Kauvar</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	82% 31	16% 6	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	38			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 34	8% 3	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	38			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	82% 31	16% 6	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	38			
Control over Proceedings	4.8	82% 31	13% 5	5% 2	0% 0	0% 0	38			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	84% 32	13% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	38			
Overall Evaluation	4.8	84% 32	13% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	38			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Kari Kristiansen</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	85% 99	12% 14	3% 3	0% 0	0% 0	116			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 104	9% 10	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	116			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	84% 97	13% 15	3% 4	0% 0	0% 0	116			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	86% 100	13% 15	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	116			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	84% 97	15% 17	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	116			
Overall Evaluation	4.8	86% 100	12% 14	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	116			



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Michael A. MacDonald</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	74% 74	26% 26	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	100			
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	83% 83	17% 17	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	100			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	79% 79	21% 21	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	100			
Control over Proceedings	4.8	79% 79	20% 20	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	100			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	78% 78	20% 20	1% 1	1% 1	0% 0	100			
Overall Evaluation	4.8	80% 80	18% 18	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	100			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Patrick J. McKay</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	93% 282	6% 19	1% 2	0% 0	0% 0	303			
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	97% 295	3% 9	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	304			
Attentive during Proceedings	5.0	96% 291	4% 12	.3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	304			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	92% 280	8% 23	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	303			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	93% 284	6% 19	.3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	304			
Overall Evaluation	5.0	95% 290	5% 14	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	304			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Kevin G. Miller</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.7</b>	73%	52	27%	19	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	71
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>4.9</b>	86%	61	13%	9	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	71
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	80%	57	18%	13	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	71
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	78%	55	23%	16	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	71
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.7</b>	75%	53	23%	16	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	70
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.8</b>	76%	54	24%	17	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	71

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Anna M. Moran</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.9</b>	86%	44	14%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	51
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>4.9</b>	92%	47	8%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	51
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.7</b>	75%	38	24%	12	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	51
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	82%	42	16%	8	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	51
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.8</b>	82%	42	14%	7	4%	2	0%	0	0%	0	51
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.9</b>	88%	45	12%	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	51

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Gregory J. Motyka</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	74% 37	26% 13	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	50			
Respectful/Courteous	4.7	78% 39	18% 9	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	50			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.6	64% 32	28% 14	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	50			
Control over Proceedings	4.6	70% 35	20% 10	8% 4	2% 1	0% 0	50			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.6	66% 33	28% 14	6% 3	0% 0	0% 0	50			
Overall Evaluation	4.6	68% 34	24% 12	6% 3	2% 1	0% 0	50			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Philip M. Pallenberg</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mean</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Total Responses</b></p>			
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>88% 38</p>	<p>12% 5</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">43</p>			
<p><b>Respectful/Courteous</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>93% 40</p>	<p>7% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">43</p>			
<p><b>Attentive during Proceedings</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>93% 40</p>	<p>7% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">43</p>			
<p><b>Control over Proceedings</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>88% 38</p>	<p>12% 5</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">43</p>			
<p><b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>88% 37</p>	<p>12% 5</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">42</p>			
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>93% 40</p>	<p>7% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">43</p>			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Richard W. Postma, Jr.</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	90% 51	11% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57			
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	95% 54	5% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	91% 52	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	91% 52	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	90% 51	11% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57			
Overall Evaluation	4.9	93% 53	7% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	92% 33	3% 1	3% 1	3% 1	0% 0	36			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	92% 33	3% 1	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	36			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	83% 30	11% 4	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	36			
Control over Proceedings	4.8	89% 32	6% 2	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	36			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	89% 32	6% 2	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	36			
Overall Evaluation	4.8	89% 32	6% 2	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	36			



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Mark Rindner</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	94% 30	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	32			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	94% 30	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	32			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	88% 28	13% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	32			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	91% 29	9% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	32			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	5.0	97% 31	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	32			
Overall Evaluation	5.0	97% 31	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	32			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results</b>  <b>2010 Retention Evaluation</b>  <b>Jack W. Smith</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	88% 82	11% 10	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	93			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	94% 87	5% 5	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	93			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	88% 82	10% 9	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	93			
Control over Proceedings	4.9	86% 80	14% 13	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	93			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	87% 81	13% 12	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	93			
Overall Evaluation	4.9	94% 87	7% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	93			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Michael Spaan</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.8</b>	83%	220	16%	41	.4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	262
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>4.9</b>	90%	238	10%	25	.4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	264
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	83%	217	17%	44	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	263
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.9</b>	86%	228	13%	35	.4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	264
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.9</b>	88%	233	11%	30	.4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	264
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.9</b>	88%	233	11%	29	.4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	263

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Trevor Stephens</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.9</b>	86%	85	13%	13	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	99
<b>Respectful/Courteous</b>	<b>4.9</b>	93%	92	5%	5	2%	2	0%	0	0%	0	99
<b>Attentive during Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	84%	83	14%	14	2%	2	0%	0	0%	0	99
<b>Control over Proceedings</b>	<b>4.8</b>	83%	82	16%	16	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	99
<b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b>	<b>4.9</b>	86%	85	13%	13	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	99
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.8</b>	86%	85	13%	13	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	99

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Vanessa H. White</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mean</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Total Responses</b></p>			
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>94% 44</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">47</p>			
<p><b>Respectful/Courteous</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.0</b></p>	<p>98% 46</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">47</p>			
<p><b>Attentive during Proceedings</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.0</b></p>	<p>96% 45</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">47</p>			
<p><b>Control over Proceedings</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>94% 44</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">47</p>			
<p><b>Intelligence/Skill as a Judge</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>92% 43</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">47</p>			
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.0</b></p>	<p>96% 45</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">47</p>			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation John W. Wolfe</b></p>										
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>								
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Responses			
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	79% 23	14% 4	7% 2	0% 0	0% 0	29			
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 26	10% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	29			
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	76% 22	17% 5	3% 1	3% 1	0% 0	29			
Control over Proceedings	4.8	79% 23	21% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	29			
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	79% 23	17% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	29			
Overall Evaluation	4.8	83% 24	10% 3	7% 2	0% 0	0% 0	29			

## Juror Survey - Superior Court Judge Eric A. Aarseth

In Alaska, judges must appear periodically on the ballot to allow voters the opportunity to decide whether they should be retained in office. The Alaska Judicial Council is a citizens' commission that must evaluate judges standing for retention and make recommendations to Alaska voters. The Council collects information from many sources, including jurors. The Council's evaluations, including the results of its juror surveys appear in the election pamphlet sent to every Alaskan household.

Type of Proceedings:    ( ) Civil  
  ( ) Criminal

Approximately how many days, including deliberations, did you serve as a juror for this judge? \_\_\_\_\_ **day(s)**

Please complete this questionnaire to help the Council evaluate the judge who presided over your case. The Council and the public value your perspective. Thanks.

Please check the most appropriate response to each question.	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor
1. Was the judge fair and impartial to all sides in the case?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Was the judge respectful and courteous?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the judge attentive during the proceedings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Did the judge exercise appropriate control over the proceedings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. How would you evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. How would you evaluate the judge overall?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have any suggestions about how the judge could improve upon his or her performance? \_\_\_\_\_

-----  
-----  
-----

Alaska Judicial Council ♦ 1029 West Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, AK 99501 ♦ Phone: 279-2526 ♦ E-mail: lcohn@ajc.state.ak.us