



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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Bill Gordon
Charles M. Kopp
Christena Williams

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
James H. Cannon
Kevin Fitzgerald
Louis James Menendez

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO
Dana Fabe
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council
FROM: Staff
DATE: February 7, 2008
RE: Juror Survey Report

The Alaska Judicial Council surveyed all jurors who sat in 2006 and 2007 trials before the ten trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2008. A total of 702 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.

Table 1: Distribution of Jurors by Type of Trial, by Judge Alaska Judicial Council 2008 Retention Juror Survey				
Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total
Collins, Patricia A	14	74	6	94
Cummings, Dennis P.	1	50	5	56
Downes, Robert B.	2	95	5	102
Funk, Raymond	2	83	7	92
Hanley, J. Patrick	20	41	5	66
Levy, Keith B.	19	83	4	106
Murphy, Margaret L.	3	48	1	52
Schally, Daniel	20	29	2	51
Stowers, Craig F.	27	0	1	28
Swiderski, Alex M.	17	37	1	55
Total	125	540	37	702

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.

Table 2: Distribution of Days Served		
Number of Days Served	%	N
1 - 2 Days	48%	334
3 - 4 Days	27%	192
5 - 7 Days	13%	91
8 - 10 Days	2%	15
11 - 20 Days	4%	26
21 or More Days	1%	6
No Answer	5%	38
	100%	702

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 mean score and number of responses appear for each variable.

Table 3 Mean Score for each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge Alaska Judicial Council 2008 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 performance Mean	Total
Collins, Patricia A	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	94
Cummings, Dennis P.	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	56
Downes, Robert B.	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.6	102
Funk, Raymond	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	92
Hanley, J. Patrick	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	65
Levy, Keith B.	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	106
Murphy, Margaret L.	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	52
Schally, Daniel	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.8	51
Stowers, Craig F.	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	28
Swiderski, Alex M.	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	55

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Patricia A. Collins</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 94
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	85%	80	12%	11	3%	3	0%	0	0%	0	94
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	86%	80	14%	13	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	93
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	80%	75	20%	19	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	94
Control over Proceedings	4.8	82%	77	15%	14	3%	3	0%	0	0%	0	94
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	82%	77	18%	17	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	94
Overall Evaluation	4.8	83%	78	16%	15	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	94

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Dennis P. Cummings</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 56
Impartiality/Fairness	4.2	43%	24	39%	22	16%	9	2%	1	0%	0	56
Respectful/Courteous	4.4	52%	29	34%	19	14%	8	0%	0	0%	0	56
Attentive during Proceedings	4.3	51%	28	31%	17	16%	9	2%	1	0%	0	55
Control over Proceedings	4.4	57%	32	29%	16	13%	7	2%	1	0%	0	56
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.4	51%	28	38%	21	11%	6	0%	0	0%	0	55
Overall Evaluation	4.3	46%	26	39%	22	13%	7	2%	1	0%	0	56

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Robert B. Downes</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 102				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	71% 72	27% 27	2% 2	1% 1	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	75% 76	26% 26	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.5	61% 62	32% 33	6% 6	1% 1	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.7	71% 72	28% 28	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	67% 68	32% 33	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.6	64% 65	36% 37	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Raymond Funk</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 92
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	83%	76	16%	15	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	92
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	85%	78	13%	12	2%	2	0%	0	0%	0	92
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	78%	72	21%	19	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	92
Control over Proceedings	4.8	80%	74	20%	18	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	92
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	79%	73	20%	18	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	92
Overall Evaluation	4.8	85%	78	13%	12	2%	2	0%	0	0%	0	92

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation J. Patrick Hanley</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 66
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	89%	57	11%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	64
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	94%	61	6%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	65
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	75%	49	23%	15	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	65
Control over Proceedings	4.8	84%	54	16%	10	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	64
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	86%	56	11%	7	3%	2	0%	0	0%	0	65
Overall Evaluation	4.8	83%	54	15%	10	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	65

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Keith B. Levy</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 106
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	85%	90	15%	16	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	106
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	91%	96	9%	10	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	106
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	84%	89	16%	17	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	106
Control over Proceedings	4.8	83%	88	16%	17	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	106
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	87%	92	13%	14	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	106
Overall Evaluation	4.8	84%	89	15%	16	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	106

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Margaret L. Murphy</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 52
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	77%	40	21%	11	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	52
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	87%	45	14%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	52
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	79%	41	19%	10	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	52
Control over Proceedings	4.8	75%	39	25%	13	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	52
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	67%	35	33%	17	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	52
Overall Evaluation	4.7	71%	37	29%	15	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	52

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Daniel Schally</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total Returned = 51
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	80%	41	18%	9	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	51
Respectful/Courteous	4.7	80%	41	14%	7	4%	2	2%	1	0%	0	51
Attentive during Proceedings	4.6	73%	37	20%	10	6%	3	2%	1	0%	0	51
Control over Proceedings	4.8	83%	42	16%	8	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	51
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	77%	39	20%	10	4%	2	0%	0	0%	0	51
Overall Evaluation	4.8	75%	38	26%	13	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	51

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Craig F. Stowers</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 28
Impartiality/Fairness	5.0	100%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	28
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	100%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	28
Attentive during Proceedings	5.0	100%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	28
Control over Proceedings	5.0	100%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	28
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	5.0	100%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	28
Overall Evaluation	5.0	100%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	28

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2008 Retention Evaluation Alex M. Swiderski</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 55
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	80%	44	18%	10	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	55
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	87%	48	13%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	55
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	80%	44	16%	9	4%	2	0%	0	0%	0	55
Control over Proceedings	4.8	84%	46	15%	8	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	55
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	80%	43	19%	10	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	54
Overall Evaluation	4.8	80%	44	20%	11	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	55

Juror Survey - Superior Court Judge Joel H. Bolger

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