



# 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](mailto:postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us)

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Judicial Council  
**FROM:** Staff  
**DATE:** August 3, 2016  
**RE:** Juror Survey Report

---

The Alaska Judicial Council surveyed all jurors who sat in trials during 2014 and 2015. The jurors sat before the 30 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2016. A total of 1,837 jurors responded on Council-provided postcards that judges distributed to jurors at the end of each trial (see attached example). Jurors completed the surveys on the postage-paid cards and mailed them to the Council.

Council staff entered the data from the surveys and ran basic descriptive statistics. This memorandum summarizes the findings. It is distributed to Council members and judges, and posted on the Council's website.

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.

Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total
Eric A. Aarseth	20	20	2	42
Douglas L. Blankenship	0	4	1	5
Matthew Christian	14	32	4	50
Leslie N. Dickson	12	40	7	59
Catherine M. Easter	67	12	3	82
David V. George	17	88	12	117
Patrick S. Hammers	14	17	4	35
J. Patrick Hanley	4	9	0	13
Bethany S. Harbison	0	49	3	52
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	10	29	2	41
Jane F. Kauvar	30	16	0	46
Kari Kristiansen	8	63	3	74
Michael A. MacDonald	25	46	4	75
Erin B. Marston	56	13	4	73
Dwayne W. McConnell	1	51	9	61
Anna M. Moran	13	68	0	81
Margaret L. Murphy	0	35	1	36
Thomas G. Nave	11	22	5	38
Philip M. Pallenberg	1	12	1	14
Nathaniel Peters	3	58	11	72
Mark Rindner	21	21	3	45
Kevin Saxby	0	74	3	77
Daniel Schally	7	46	6	59
Jack W. Smith	4	198	3	205
Trevor Stephens	12	39	5	56
Alex M. Swiderski	7	62	5	74
David R. Wallace	2	76	2	80
Pamela Scott Washington	6	29	2	37
Vanessa H. White	0	67	7	74
David Zwink	2	59	3	64

Table 2 shows the distribution of number of days served, as reported by the jurors. Sixty-Eight percent 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	26%	481
3 - 4 Days	42%	770
5 - 7 Days	16%	287
8 - 10 Days	6%	104
11 - 20 Days	6%	111
21 or More Days	1%	22
No Answer	3%	62
Total		1837

**Individual Results**

Table 3 shows each judge’s mean rating for each question on the survey. Each judge’s individual survey results are provided in separate tables. Jurors used a five-point scale, with *excellent* rated as five, and *poor* rated as one. The closer the jurors' ratings 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.

	Impartiality & Fairness	Respectful & Courteous	Attentive During Proceedings	Control During Proceedings	Intelligence & Skill as a Judge	Overall Mean	Total Respon.
Eric A. Aarseth	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.9	42
Douglas L. Blankenship	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4
Matthew Christian	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	50
Leslie N. Dickson	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	58
Catherine M. Easter	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	82
David V. George	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	116
Patrick S. Hammers	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	35
J. Patrick Hanley	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	13
Bethany Spalding Harbison	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	52
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	41
Jane F. Kauvar	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	46
Kari Kristiansen	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	74
Michael A. MacDonald	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	75
Erin B. Marston	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	73
Dwayne W. McConnell	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	61
Anna M. Moran	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	81
Margaret L. Murphy	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	36
Thomas G. Nave	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	38
Philip M. Pallenberg	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	14
Nathaniel Peters	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	72
Mark Rindner	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	45
Kevin Saxby	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	77
Daniel Schally	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	59
Jack W. Smith	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	204
Trevor Stephens	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	56
Alex M. Swiderski	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	74
David R. Wallace	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	80
Pamela Scott Washington	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	37
Vanessa H. White	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	74
David Zwink	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.8	64

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Eric A. Aarseth**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	38	4	-	-	-	42
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	40	2	-	-	-	42
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	32	8	2	-	-	42
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	34	8	-	-	-	42
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	38	4	-	-	-	42
Overall Evaluation	4.9	36	6	-	-	-	42

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Douglas L. Blankenship**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	3	1	-	-	-	4
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	3	1	-	-	-	4
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	3	1	-	-	-	4
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	3	1	-	-	-	4
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	3	1	-	-	-	4
Overall Evaluation	4.8	3	1	-	-	-	4

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Matthew Christian**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	45	5	-	-	-	50
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	47	3	-	-	-	50
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	45	5	-	-	-	50
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	46	4	-	-	-	50
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	46	3	1	-	-	50
Overall Evaluation	4.9	44	5	1	-	-	50

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Leslie N. Dickson**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	49	8	1	-	-	58
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	53	5	-	-	-	58
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	47	7	3	1	-	58
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	44	13	1	-	-	58
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	51	5	2	-	-	58
Overall Evaluation	4.8	47	10	1	-	-	58



**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Catherine M. Easter**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	73	6	3	-	-	82
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	79	2	1	-	-	82
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	75	7	-	-	-	82
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	72	9	1	-	-	82
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	75	7	-	-	-	82
Overall Evaluation	4.9	75	6	1	-	-	82

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
David V. George**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	100	15	1	-	-	116
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	110	6	-	-	-	116
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	99	15	1	1	-	116
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	101	13	1	-	1	116
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	102	14	-	-	-	116
Overall Evaluation	4.9	102	14	-	-	-	116

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Patrick S. Hammers**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	32	3	-	-	-	35
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	32	3	-	-	-	35
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	31	4	-	-	-	35
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	32	3	-	-	-	35
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	31	4	-	-	-	35
Overall Evaluation	4.9	32	3	-	-	-	35

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
J. Patrick Hanley**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	11	2	-	-	-	13
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	12	1	-	-	-	13
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	11	2	-	-	-	13
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	10	3	-	-	-	13
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	10	3	-	-	-	13
Overall Evaluation	4.9	12	1	-	-	-	13

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Bethany S. Harbison**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	46	6	-	-	-	52
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	48	4	-	-	-	52
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	46	6	-	-	-	52
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	45	7	-	-	-	52
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	45	7	-	-	-	52
Overall Evaluation	4.8	44	8	-	-	-	52

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Jennifer Stuart Henderson**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	39	2	-	-	-	41
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	40	1	-	-	-	41
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	40	1	-	-	-	41
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	41	-	-	-	-	41
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	40	1	-	-	-	41
Overall Evaluation	5.0	40	1	-	-	-	41

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Jane F. Kauvar**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	38	8	-	-	-	46
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	39	5	2	-	-	46
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	37	8	1	-	-	46
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	38	7	1	-	-	46
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	38	8	-	-	-	46
Overall Evaluation	4.8	39	7	-	-	-	46

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Kari Kristiansen**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	62	11	1	-	-	74
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	62	10	1	1	-	74
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	60	13	1	-	-	74
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	62	11	1	-	-	74
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	58	14	2	-	-	74
Overall Evaluation	4.8	60	12	2	-	-	74



**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Michael A. MacDonald**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	65	10	-	-	-	75
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	68	7	-	-	-	75
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	66	9	-	-	-	75
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	68	7	-	-	-	75
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	69	6	-	-	-	75
Overall Evaluation	4.9	69	6	-	-	-	75

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Erin B. Marston**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	70	3	-	-	-	73
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	72	1	-	-	-	73
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	70	2	1	-	-	73
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	72	1	-	-	-	73
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	70	3	-	-	-	73
Overall Evaluation	4.9	69	4	-	-	-	73

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Dwayne W. McConnell**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.6	40	19	2	-	-	61
Respectful / Courteous	4.7	44	15	2	-	-	61
Attentive During Proceedings	4.6	40	17	4	-	-	61
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	44	14	3	-	-	61
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.7	43	16	2	-	-	61
Overall Evaluation	4.7	43	17	1	-	-	61

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Anna M. Moran**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.7	61	14	5	1	-	81
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	72	7	2	-	-	81
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	65	14	2	-	-	81
Control Over Proceedings	4.6	56	21	3	1	-	81
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	64	15	2	-	-	81
Overall Evaluation	4.8	67	11	3	-	-	81

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Margaret L. Murphy**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	33	3	-	-	-	36
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	35	1	-	-	-	36
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	32	4	-	-	-	36
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	34	2	-	-	-	36
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	30	6	-	-	-	36
Overall Evaluation	4.9	34	2	-	-	-	36

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Thomas G. Nave**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	34	4	-	-	-	38
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	34	4	-	-	-	38
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	33	4	1	-	-	38
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	32	5	1	-	-	38
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	35	3	-	-	-	38
Overall Evaluation	4.9	33	5	-	-	-	38

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Philip M. Pallenberg**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	12	2	-	-	-	14
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	14	-	-	-	-	14
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	12	2	-	-	-	14
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	11	2	1	-	-	14
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	13	1	-	-	-	14
Overall Evaluation	4.9	12	2	-	-	-	

**Juror Survey Results**  
**2016 Retention Evaluation**  
**Nathaniel Peters**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.5	45	21	6	-	-	72
Respectful / Courteous	4.7	55	14	3	-	-	72
Attentive During Proceedings	4.6	47	21	4	-	-	72
Control Over Proceedings	4.6	47	21	4	-	-	72
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.6	48	21	3	-	-	72
Overall Evaluation	4.7	54	13	5	-	-	72



Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation

**Mark Rindner**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	43	2	-	-	-	45
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	44	1	-	-	-	45
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	38	7	-	-	-	45
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	41	4	-	-	-	45
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	44	1	-	-	-	45
Overall Evaluation	5.0	43	2	-	-	-	45

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Kevin Saxby**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	71	6	-	-	-	77
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	74	3	-	-	-	77
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	58	17	2	-	-	77
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	70	6	-	-	-	76
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	72	5	-	-	-	77
Overall Evaluation	4.9	71	6	-	-	-	77

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Daniel Schally**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	47	12	-	-	-	59
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	49	10	-	-	-	59
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	46	13	-	-	-	59
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	48	10	1	-	-	59
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	47	11	1	-	-	59
Overall Evaluation	4.8	46	12	1	-	-	59

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Jack W. Smith**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	189	14	2	-	-	205
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	192	13	-	-	-	205
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	192	13	-	-	-	205
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	189	14	2	-	-	205
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	189	14	2	-	-	205
Overall Evaluation	4.9	190	14	-	-	-	204

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Trevor Stephens**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	53	3	-	-	-	56
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	55	1	-	-	-	56
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	48	8	-	-	-	56
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	55	1	-	-	-	56
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	55	1	-	-	-	56
Overall Evaluation	5.0	54	2	-	-	-	56

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Alex M. Swiderski**

<b>Survey Category</b>		<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	68	6	-	-	-	74
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	70	4	-	-	-	74
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	64	10	-	-	-	74
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	63	11	-	-	-	74
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	64	9	-	-	-	73
Overall Evaluation	4.9	64	10	-	-	-	74

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**David R. Wallace**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	73	7	-	-	-	80
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	78	2	-	-	-	80
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	74	6	-	-	-	80
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	71	9	-	-	-	80
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	74	6	-	-	-	80
Overall Evaluation	4.9	75	5	-	-	-	80

Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
**Pamela Scott Washington**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	34	3	-	-	-	37
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	34	3	-	-	-	37
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	32	5	-	-	-	37
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	34	3	-	-	-	37
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	32	5	-	-	-	37
Overall Evaluation	4.9	33	4	-	-	-	37



**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
Vanessa H. White**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	67	6	1	-	-	74
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	67	6	1	-	-	74
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	61	11	2	-	-	74
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	63	10	1	-	-	74
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	64	9	1	-	-	74
Overall Evaluation	4.9	65	8	1	-	-	74

**Juror Survey Results  
2016 Retention Evaluation  
David Zwink**

<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Acceptable (3)</b>	<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	57	7	-	-	-	64
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	56	8	-	-	-	64
Attentive During Proceedings	4.6	47	11	5	1	-	64
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	51	12	1	-	-	64
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	57	7	-	-	-	64
Overall Evaluation	4.8	54	10	-	-	-	64

## 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? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---