

alaska judicial council

510 L Street, Suite 450, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1295 (907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046 http://www.ajc.state.ak.us E-mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council Members

FROM: Staff

DATE: March 26, 2014

RE: Court Employee Survey Report

The court employee survey was mailed to all court system employees excluding those who were identified by the court as attorneys. Of 637 surveys distributed, 300 were returned for a return rate of 47%. Of the 300 returned surveys, 49 had no ratings or comment on any judge and were not included in the analysis. Council staff entered data, ran descriptive statistics, and transcribed comments from the surveys. A sample survey page is included at the end of this memorandum.

Table 1 shows the basis for evaluation of each judge.

		Table 1			
	Basis	for Evalua	tion		
	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts	Rated Judge but No Basis Checked	Total Responses
Jo-Ann M. Chung	43	11	5	1	60
Brian K. Clark	52	13	4	3	72
William L. Estelle	17	2	1	2	22
Andrew Guidi	38	8	2	1	49
Sharon A.S. Illsley	16	1	0	1	18
Louis James Menendez	34	3	1	1	39
Gregory Miller	34	15	1	1	51
Kevin G. Miller	31	3	3	2	39
Gregory Motyka	44	11	4	4	63
Stephanie Rhoades	54	19	5	7	85
Paul A. Roetman	15	2	2	0	19
Ben Seekins	38	6	1	2	47
Craig F. Stowers	54	9	9	2	74
John W. Wolfe	19	3	2	2	26

Individual Results

Table 2 shows the mean score for each judge for each question on the survey. Individual survey results are provided for each judge in separate tables. Court employees used a five-point scale, with *excellent* scored as five, and *poor* scored as one. The first column shows the total number of court employees who evaluated the judge on at least one variable.

Ratin	ıgs Based d	Table on Direct P		al Experienc	e	
	Number of Responses	Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
Jo-Ann M. Chung	43	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6
Brian K. Clark	52	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
William L. Estelle	17	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3
Andrew Guidi	38	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Sharon A.S. Illsley	16	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5
Louis James Menendez	34	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Gregory Miller	34	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Kevin G. Miller	31	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.8	5.0
Gregory Motyka	44	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Stephanie Rhoades	54	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
Paul A. Roetman	15	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.9
Ben Seekins	38	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Craig F. Stowers	54	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.4
John W. Wolfe	19	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4

Jo-Ann M. Chung

		Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean				
Impartiality/Fairness	41	28	12	1	0	0	4.7				
Integrity	42	33	8	1	0	0	4.8				
Judicial Temperament	42	28	12	2	0	0	4.6				
Diligence	40	25	12	3	0	0	4.6				
Overall Evaluation	43	28	14	1	0	0	4.6				

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Brian K. Clark

		Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean				
Impartiality/Fairness	48	40	8	0	0	0	4.8				
Integrity	50	44	6	0	0	0	4.9				
Judicial Temperament	51	44	7	0	0	0	4.9				
Diligence	47	38	9	0	0	0	4.8				
Overall Evaluation	49	42	7	0	0	0	4.9				

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

William L. Estelle

		Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean				
Impartiality/Fairness	17	11	4	1	0	1	4.4				
Integrity	17	13	2	1	0	1	4.5				
Judicial Temperament	17	10	4	2	0	1	4.3				
Diligence	17	10	3	3	0	1	4.2				
Overall Evaluation	17	10	4	2	0	1	4.3				

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Andrew Guidi

		Number of Responses										
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean					
Impartiality/Fairness	33	20	8	3	1	1	4.4					
Integrity	33	21	8	3	1	0	4.5					
Judicial Temperament	35	23	8	3	0	1	4.5					
Diligence	34	19	10	4	1	0	4.4					
Overall Evaluation	34	21	9	2	1	1	4.4					

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Sharon A.S. Illsley

		Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean				
Impartiality/Fairness	15	11	2	1	1	0	4.5				
Integrity	15	12	1	1	1	0	4.6				
Judicial Temperament	16	13	1	1	1	0	4.6				
Diligence	15	12	1	1	1	0	4.6				
Overall Evaluation	14	10	2	1	1	0	4.5				

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Louis James Menendez

		Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean				
Impartiality/Fairness	29	21	3	3	2	0	4.5				
Integrity	30	24	1	4	1	0	4.6				
Judicial Temperament	31	20	6	4	1	0	4.5				
Diligence	31	22	3	5	1	0	4.5				
Overall Evaluation	31	22	5	3	1	0	4.6				

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Gregory Miller

		Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean				
Impartiality/Fairness	30	18	8	2	2	0	4.4				
Integrity	31	19	8	2	1	1	4.4				
Judicial Temperament	31	18	7	3	2	1	4.3				
Diligence	33	22	7	2	2	0	4.5				
Overall Evaluation	31	18	9	2	1	1	4.4				

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Kevin G. Miller

		Number of Responses										
Survey Category	Total	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Mean					
Impartiality/Fairness	30	27	3	0	0	0	4.9					
Integrity	30	28	2	0	0	0	4.9					
Judicial Temperament	30	29	1	0	0	0	5.0					
Diligence	31	26	5	0	0	0	4.8					
Overall Evaluation	30	28	2	0	0	0	4.9					

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Gregory Motyka

		Number of Responses								
Survey Category	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean			
Impartiality/Fairness	42	26	12	4	0	0	4.5			
Integrity	42	26	12	4	0	0	4.5			
Judicial Temperament	43	22	14	7	0	0	4.4			
Diligence	41	25	10	6	0	0	4.5			
Overall Evaluation	42	25	11	6	0	0	4.5			

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Stephanie Rhoades

	Number of Responses									
Survey Category	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean			
Impartiality/Fairness	51	31	16	2	2	0	4.5			
Integrity	52	33	15	3	1	0	4.5			
Judicial Temperament	53	27	14	9	2	1	4.2			
Diligence	49	31	12	4	2	0	4.5			
Overall Evaluation	51	30	15	4	2	0	4.4			

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Paul A. Roetman

	Number of Responses								
Survey Category	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean		
Impartiality/Fairness	13	11	1	1	0	0	4.8		
Integrity	13	10	2	1	0	0	4.7		
Judicial Temperament	14	10	2	1	1	0	4.5		
Diligence	13	10	2	1	0	0	4.7		
Overall Evaluation	13	12	1	0	0	0	4.9		

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Ben Seekins

	Number of Responses							
Survey Category	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean	
Impartiality/Fairness	35	29	3	2	1	0	4.7	
Integrity	38	33	3	2	0	0	4.8	
Judicial Temperament	38	32	4	1	1	0	4.8	
Diligence	38	31	3	3	1	0	4.7	
Overall Evaluation	38	32	3	3	0	0	4.8	

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Craig F. Stowers

i									
	Number of Responses								
Survey Category	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean		
Impartiality/Fairness	48	31	11	5	1	0	4.5		
Integrity	51	35	9	4	3	0	4.5		
Judicial Temperament	50	27	13	8	1	1	4.3		
Diligence	50	35	8	5	2	0	4.5		
Overall Evaluation	51	33	9	7	2	0	4.4		

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

John W. Wolfe

	Number of Responses							
Survey Category	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean	
Impartiality/Fairness	17	11	3	2	1	0	4.4	
Integrity	18	12	3	3	0	0	4.5	
Judicial Temperament	18	10	5	3	0	0	4.4	
Diligence	18	11	5	2	0	0	4.5	
Overall Evaluation	18	11	4	3	0	0	4.4	

^{*} Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Sample Court Employee Survey

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT		ANCHO	RAGE SUPE	RIOR COURT	JUDGE Jo-Ann M. Chung						
			Basis for	Evaluation	-						
1.	Which of the following best describes the basis for your evaluation of this judge? Direct professional experience is limited to direct contact with the judge's work as a judge. (Check one.)										
	☐ Direct professional experience	t professional □ Professional			eva	Insufficient knowledge to aluate this judge (Go to next dge.)					
2 .	If you checked direct profession	onal experi	ence:								
	a. Does your expe the last five year	this judge inclu	ıde experience with	in	□ Yes	□ No					
	b. Please describe with this judge.	nt of your exper	ience □ Subs	tantial	□ Moderate	□ Limited					
	rate this judge, circle one numberia, circle 9. (See Page ii for d					rate the judge fo	or any one of the				
Onto	7.1d, 5.15.15 5. (556 1 ago 11 161 a	Poor	Deficient	Acceptable Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Insufficient Knowledge				
1	Impartiality/Fairness	1	2	3	4	5	9				
2	Integrity	1	2	3	4	5	9				
3	Judicial Temperament	1	2	3	4	5	9				
4	Diligence	1	2	3	4	5	9				
5	Overall evaluation of judge	1	2	3	4	5	9				
Com	ments: See Introduction, page	i, about the	e types of comr	nents sought.							
	71 0	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,								
					_						
	ase use the pages at the end on nments.	another s	heet of paper fo	or additional		Print Name (Optional)				

Anonymity

To promote a candid response, your comments remain anonymous to the judge whether or not you sign your name. Providing your name is optional but does give your comments added credibility with Council members. The Council does not consider unsigned comments unless they are corroborated, independently substantiated, or acknowledged by the applicant. Your name will not be given to the judge. Survey comments will be shared with a judge only after the comments have been edited to remove information that might identify the respondent. Survey comments are not released publicly.