



alaska judicial council

510 L Street, Suite 450, Anchorage, Alaska 99501
<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us>

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council
FROM: Staff
DATE: April 2, 2014
RE: Juror Survey Report

The Alaska Judicial Council surveyed all jurors who sat in 2012 and 2013 trials before the 13 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2014. A total of 716 jurors responded on Council-provided postcards that judges distributed to jurors at the end of each trial. Jurors completed the surveys on the postage-paid cards and mailed them to the Council. A sample juror survey postcard is included at the end of this memorandum.

Council staff entered data from the surveys and ran basic descriptive statistics. This memorandum summarizes the findings. It is distributed to Council members and judges, and shared on the Council's website. Jurors rated judicial performance, made comments, reported the number of days served and stated whether they sat on a civil or criminal trial.

Table 1 shows the distribution of jurors by type of trial reported for each judge. Some jurors only wrote comments and did not rate the judge on the specific variables. Thus, there may be more respondents shown on Table 1 than appear on the judges' individual tables.

Table 1: Distribution of Jurors by Type of Trial, by Judge Alaska Judicial Council 2014 Retention Juror Survey				
Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total
Jo-Ann M. Chung	7	87	3	97
Brian K. Clark	6	77	1	84
William L. Estelle	8	25	0	33
Andrew Guidi	10	1	1	12
Sharon A.S. Illsley	2	66	3	71
Louis James Menendez	0	23	1	24
Gregory Miller	0	72	1	73
Kevin G. Miller	2	34	3	39
Gregory Motyka	4	23	0	27
Stephanie Rhoades	3	92	1	96
Paul A. Roetman	9	28	4	41
Ben Seekins	2	54	2	58
John W. Wolfe	5	52	4	61

Table 2 shows the distribution of number of days served, as reported by the jurors. Three-quarters of the jurors served fewer than five days.

Table 2: Distribution of Days Served		
Number of Days Served	%	N
1 - 2 Days	42%	297
3 - 4 Days	35%	253
5 - 7 Days	12%	86
8 - 10 Days	4%	31
11 - 20 Days	1%	5
21 or More Days	0.1%	1
No Answer	6%	43
Total		716

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. The last column shows the total number of jurors who evaluated the judge on at least one variable.

Table 3
Mean Score for each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge
 Alaska Judicial Council 2014 Retention Juror Survey

	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 evaluation	
						Mean	Total
Jo-Ann M. Chung	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	97
Brian K. Clark	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	84
William L. Estelle	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	33
Andrew Guidi	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.7	5.0	4.8	12
Sharon A.S. Illsley	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	71
Louis James Menendez	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	24
Gregory Miller	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	73
Kevin G. Miller	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	39
Gregory Motyka	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	27
Stephanie Rhoades	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	96
Paul A. Roetman	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.8	41
Ben Seekins	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	58
John W. Wolfe	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	61

**Juror Survey Results
2014 Retention Evaluation
Jo-Ann M. Chung**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	80	16	0	1	0	97
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	87	10	0	0	0	97
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	78	16	2	1	0	97
Control over Proceedings	4.8	79	17	1	0	0	97
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	76	20	0	1	0	97
Overall Evaluation	4.8	75	19	2	0	0	96

**Juror Survey Results
2014 Retention Evaluation
Brian K. Clark**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	79	4	0	1	0	84
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	81	2	1	0	0	84
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	79	4	1	0	0	84
Control over Proceedings	4.9	74	9	1	0	0	84
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	79	5	0	0	0	84
Overall Evaluation	4.9	78	6	0	0	0	84

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation William L. Estelle							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	28	5	0	0	0	33
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	30	3	0	0	0	33
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	24	8	1	0	0	33
Control over Proceedings	4.8	26	7	0	0	0	33
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	28	4	1	0	0	33
Overall Evaluation	4.7	25	7	1	0	0	33

**Juror Survey Results
2014 Retention Evaluation
Andrew Guidi**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	11	1	0	0	0	12
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	10	2	0	0	0	12
Control over Proceedings	4.7	9	2	1	0	0	12
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	5.0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Overall Evaluation	4.8	10	2	0	0	0	12

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation Sharon A.S. Iilsley							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	59	12	0	0	0	71
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	63	7	1	0	0	71
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	62	8	0	0	0	70
Control over Proceedings	4.9	61	10	0	0	0	71
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	60	10	0	0	0	70
Overall Evaluation	4.9	60	11	0	0	0	71

Juror Survey Results
2014 Retention Evaluation
Louis James Menendez

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	21	2	1	0	0	24
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	21	3	0	0	0	24
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	21	3	0	0	0	24
Control over Proceedings	4.8	19	5	0	0	0	24
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	20	4	0	0	0	24
Overall Evaluation	4.8	20	4	0	0	0	24

**Juror Survey Results
2014 Retention Evaluation
Gregory Miller**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	68	4	1	0	0	73
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	70	2	1	0	0	73
Attentive during Proceedings	5.0	70	2	1	0	0	73
Control over Proceedings	4.9	69	3	1	0	0	73
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	5.0	71	1	1	0	0	73
Overall Evaluation	5.0	71	1	1	0	0	73

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation Kevin G. Miller							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	35	3	1	0	0	39
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	36	3	0	0	0	39
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	36	3	0	0	0	39
Control over Proceedings	4.9	34	5	0	0	0	39
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	32	7	0	0	0	39
Overall Evaluation	4.9	34	5	0	0	0	39

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation Gregory Motyka							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	5.0	26	1	0	0	0	27
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	26	1	0	0	0	27
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	21	6	0	0	0	27
Control over Proceedings	4.9	23	4	0	0	0	27
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	23	4	0	0	0	27
Overall Evaluation	4.9	25	2	0	0	0	27

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	85	11	0	0	0	96
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	88	6	2	0	0	96
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	84	11	1	0	0	96
Control over Proceedings	4.9	84	12	0	0	0	96
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	87	9	0	0	0	96
Overall Evaluation	4.9	85	10	0	0	0	95

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation Paul A. Roetman							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	33	4	3	1	0	41
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	33	6	2	0	0	41
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	31	7	2	1	0	41
Control over Proceedings	4.6	32	4	4	1	0	41
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	34	5	2	0	0	41
Overall Evaluation	4.8	33	6	2	0	0	41

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation Ben Seekins							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	47	11	0	0	0	58
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	51	7	0	0	0	58
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	44	13	1	0	0	58
Control over Proceedings	4.7	45	11	2	0	0	58
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	45	13	0	0	0	58
Overall Evaluation	4.7	43	15	0	0	0	58

Juror Survey Results 2014 Retention Evaluation John W. Wolfe							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Acceptable (3)	Deficient (2)	Poor (1)	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	51	8	2	0	0	61
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	55	5	1	0	0	61
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	47	11	3	0	0	61
Control over Proceedings	4.8	49	11	1	0	0	61
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	51	8	2	0	0	61
Overall Evaluation	4.8	51	8	2	0	0	61

Juror Survey - Superior Court Judge Jo-Ann Chung

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? _____
