

**Alaska Judicial Council
2010 Judicial Retention Performance Evaluation Materials
Judge Stephanie Rhoades
Anchorage District Court**

The Judicial Council finds Judge Rhoades to be **Qualified** and recommends unanimously that the public vote **"YES"** to retain her as a district court judge.

Retention evaluation materials for this judge

1. Voter pamphlet page	2
This page will appear in the State of Alaska Election Pamphlet sent to each Alaskan household.	
2. Judge questionnaire	3
The judge's response to a Judicial Council questionnaire.	
3. Survey scores in 2010	
<i>(To view survey scores for all judges on the ballot go to main 2010 retention page.)</i>	
a. Attorney; Peace Officer; Social Worker/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA scores	20
b. Juror survey scores	27
c. Court employee survey scores	28
4. Survey scores in previous retention evaluations	29

Retention evaluation materials for all judges on the ballot

(To view these materials go to main 2010 retention page.)

- 1. Peremptory challenges**
Analysis of peremptory challenge rates for judges.
- 2. Recusals**
Evaluation of judge's record of self-disqualification from cases, or "recusals."
- 3. Appellate Affirmance Rates**
Analysis of appellate decisions involving each trial judge's cases.
- 4. Salary Warrant Withholdings**
Evaluation of judge's record of pay withholding for undecided or uncompleted decisions.

Alaska Judicial Council Recommendation

Judge Stephanie Rhoades, District Court, Anchorage

Judicial Council Recommendation 2010

The Alaska Judicial Council is a non-partisan citizens' commission established by the Alaska constitution. Alaskan law requires the Council to evaluate judges' performance and authorizes the Council to recommend to voters whether judges should be retained in office. The Judicial Council reviews judges' integrity, diligence, legal ability, fairness, demeanor, ability to manage their caseloads, and overall performance of their judicial responsibilities in and out of the courtroom. The Judicial Council finds Judge Rhoades to be **Qualified** and recommends unanimously that the public vote "YES" to retain her as a district court judge.

Judicial Council Evaluation

The Judicial Council surveyed thousands of Alaskans including peace and probation officers, court employees, attorneys, jurors, social workers/guardians ad litem, and child advocates about the judges on the ballot. Respondents were asked to rate judicial performance and to submit comments. The Council also reviewed the ratings and observations of the Alaska Judicial Observers, independent community-based volunteers. The Council reviewed the judge's preemptory challenge, recusals, and appellate affirmance and reversal rates; any civil or criminal litigation involving the judge; APOC and court system conflict-of-interest statements; any disciplinary files involving the judge; and whether a judge's pay was withheld for an untimely decision. The Council reviewed other court records and investigated judicial conduct in specific cases. The Council interviewed some judges, attorneys, and court staff, and held a statewide public hearing to obtain comments about judges.

	Attorney Survey	Peace Officer Survey	Juror Survey	Court Employee Survey	Social Workers Guardians ad Litem CASAs
Legal Ability	3.8	---	---	---	---
Impartiality	3.5	4.2	4.8	4.3	4.3
Integrity	3.9	4.4	---	4.3	4.3
Temperament	3.1	4.2	4.9	4.2	4.7
Diligence	3.9	4.2	---	4.3	4.7
Overall	3.6	4.2	4.8	4.3	4.7

Ratings are based on a one to five scale. Five is the best rating and three is "acceptable."

Rating Scale

5.0 = Excellent
 4.0 = Good
 3.0 = Acceptable
 2.0 = Deficient
 1.0 = Poor

Summary of Survey Information

Survey respondents rated Judge Rhoades on the categories summarized in the table above, using 5 as the highest rating possible. The attorney rating for Judge Rhoades on overall performance was 3.6. Peace and probation officers gave Judge Rhoades a rating of 4.2. Jurors rated her 4.8 overall, court employees gave her 4.3, and social workers, guardians ad litem and CASA volunteers rated her at 4.7. The Alaska Judicial Observers rated her 3.54.

Recommendation: Vote "YES" to retain Judge Stephanie Rhoades

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2009

ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Alaska Judicial Council Questionnaire

Trial Judge 2010 Candidates for Judicial Retention

October 23, 2010

Stephanie Rhoades
Name

District Court
Court

1. Please estimate your workload during your present term.

a) <u>54</u> % civil cases	b) _____ # of jury trials/year
<u>46</u> % criminal cases	<u> </u> # of non-jury trials/year
<u>*</u> % court administrative work	<u>0</u> # of administrative appeals/year
100 % Total	

* see attached

2. Please describe your participation on court/bar committees or other administrative activities during your current term of office.

See attached

ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE STEPHANIE RHOADES 2010 JUDICIAL RETENTION CANDIDATE

Attachment

Question 1:

In FY 09 filings in the Anchorage district court were approximately 54% civil cases to 46% criminal misdemeanor cases. The district court is master calendared, so each judge is randomly assigned cases numerically in those percentages. Many of the civil filings assigned are resolved by staff and do not require judicial attention. Bench time is devoted primarily to the criminal cases. Few trials are conducted except for Small Claims trials. Most formal civil cases settle, most criminal cases are resolved through plea negotiation and sentence. I try to minimize the amount of administrative time taken from the regular court calendar day. Meetings are sometimes scheduled during the calendar day. Generally, I try to accomplish most of my administrative duties during lunch hours and/or after work or on weekends.

Question 2:

1. Member, **Probate Rules Subcommittee: Involuntary Medications** – Appointed by Justice Fabe
2. Member, **Alaska Veteran’s Court Planning, Implementation and Stakeholders Committee** – sitting at request of Statewide Therapeutic Courts Coordinator – drafted initial written policies and procedures and facilitated Committee in finalizing these (see attachment A)
3. Member, **Anchorage District Court Calendaring Committee** – Appointed by Deputy Presiding Judge J. Patrick Hanley
4. **Advisory Committee on Therapeutic Courts** – Appointed by Chief Justice Bryner
5. Member, **Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority– Disabilities Justice Workgroup** – sitting at the request of the Administrative Director
6. Curriculum Developer, Coordinator, Presenter – **Six Series CLE on various aspects of Managing Cases Involving Persons with Mental Disorders** – Co-sponsored by the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (major funder), the Alaska Court System, the Alaska and Anchorage Bar Associations - January through June 2007
7. Co-author – **Alaska Judge’s Guide to Mental Health Disorders** – at request of Administrative Director, developed, organized and co-authored a bench book on mental health law and disorders for judges - funded by a grant from the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (see attachment C)
8. Faculty – **Alaska Judicial Conferences** - most years, various subjects
9. Faculty, **2007 3rd Judicial District Magistrate Conference**
10. In addition to the same civil and criminal assignment load carried my colleagues in the district court, I have performed and/or continue to perform the following duties since last retention:

COORDINATED RESOURCES PROJECT 1998-present

Creator, administrator, and presiding judge. This unique project focuses on preventing repeat offenses among a special population of offenders - those

with mental illness whose success in avoiding repeat offenses depends on the well-integrated efforts of the justice and mental health treatment systems.

This project requires that presiding judges be thoroughly familiar with the impact that mental illness and substance abuse of litigants has on the justice system, the lives of participants and their families, and the community at large. Judges must be knowledgeable of the nature of mental illness and addiction and co-occurring disorders, and of the principles and techniques of treatment, including relevant pharmacology, gender, age and cultural issues that may impact a participant's success. Judges apply that knowledge within the framework of Alaska's laws in developing and monitoring appropriate individualized sanctions and incentives, including therapeutic and supportive requirements and interventions to promote successful outcomes. Judicial actions are informed by involvement as a member of the mental health court team along with clinicians, case workers monitoring compliance and progress, and other resource providers to assure therapeutically and legally effective action in each case.

My role in this project is both as a judge presiding over these specialized CRP court hearings and administrator of the project. As presiding judge I:

- chair user group and operational meetings,
- maintain both a judicial and therapeutic relationship with participants while monitoring participant progress,
- implement appropriate incentives and necessary sanctions to address personal and ancillary issues of participants while maintaining the aura of judicial authority.

As program administrator I:

- Direct overall program design and policy and administration including development of written policies and procedures, program evaluation, and funding development.
- Administer the day to day project operations and supervision of the Project Manager and other staff.
- Develop and supervise Memoranda of Agreement with the State's Departments of Health and Social Services and Corrections regarding the role, function and participation of Case Coordinator positions for the CRP court.
- Coordinate with Alaska Court System administration and maintain relationships with key State and community stakeholders and partnership agencies (MOA, SOA, G&L, PDA, DOC, Alaska Native Medical Center, Southcentral Foundation, Partners for Progress, etc.) to resolve program issues, develop necessary resources, provide reports and input for grant requirements and other budget questions, attain sufficient treatment capacity to serve both courts.
- Act as spokesperson & liaison to the community and colleagues on the program; provide mentorship to developing courts statewide.

- Provide training to new or replacement judges.
- Provide on-going technical assistance to the Palmer Coordinated Resources Project.
- Provide technical assistance to other judges and problem solving court efforts in outlying areas.

The presiding and administrative duties of the CRP court are similar to those in the following specialty calendars.

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT COURT PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION (PTRP) ADJUDICATION/DISPOSITION CALENDAR 2006-present

Creator, administrator and presiding judge over this collaborative calendar.

This special calendar was created to achieve better outcomes with particular populations of offenders who had especially poor rates of compliance in completing court-ordered programs when participating in standard court proceedings. These populations include DUI and domestic violence offenders and offenders with orders for community work service. The poor outcomes in these cases created both increased risk to Alaskans and an extremely heavy demand on criminal justice resources. Lack of successful compliance in standard court proceedings resulted in repetitive filing of affidavits by program monitors and petitions to revoke probation by prosecutors, repeated court processing, judicial review, issuance of warrants, law enforcement service of warrants, jail stays, court-appointments of counsel and court hearings. Despite the repetitive court proceedings compliance with program probation conditions remained poor.

Operation of this specialized calendar involves a collaboration between the court, the State and Municipal prosecutors, defense, Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP), Domestic Violence Intervention Program (DVIP), and Community Work Service (CWS). ASAP, CWS and the DVIP monitoring staff are physically present in the courtroom to provide real time compliance reports to the judge.

Prosecutors agree that if a defendant enters an Admission to the Petition, the defendant will be reassigned on bail to complete their program requirements and the PTRP will be withdrawn upon proof of program completion. The court and lawyers utilize a more therapeutic and less adversarial approach with these cases by scheduling ongoing, judicially supervised compliance hearings.

The court streamlines case processing by handling all cases in which the defendant is on probation and coordinating treatment program requirements across several cases when needed to avoid non-compliances due to "over-programming".

Other processes are streamlined with ASAP and CWS providing direct and immediate linkage by processing reassignment paperwork with defendants in the courtroom, thus avoiding an additional trip to those offices by defendants.

Petitions are disposed of either by withdrawal or by disposition and program deletion, thus obviating the need for more than a first petition for the same program non-compliance.

As of June 2009 the Area Court Administrator informed noted, although misdemeanor filings increased in FY08 by almost 6% and more than 600 cases (11,115 to 11,751), PTRP filings dropped by 1111 cases or 18% from FY07 (after this new calendar began). The most notable decline in filings was in the fourth quarter of FY08, after operation of the new calendar had become solidified, when PTRP filings was down by nearly one-third (31.5%) from the previous year.

In addition, ASAP reports that defendants are more highly motivated to complete treatment when their cases are being heard on this calendar than others similarly situated who are not being actively monitored.

OPERATOR'S WITHOUT LICENSE CALENDAR-2007 to present

Creator, administrator and presiding judge over this collaborative court calendar which responds to resolve the very high percentage of all misdemeanor case filings in the Anchorage District Court for the charge of Driving While License Suspended, Cancelled or Revoked. As with the PTRP calendar this calendar focuses on achieving successful resolution early in the life of the case reducing the demand on justice system resources and achieving better outcomes.

This court project expedites case processing and provides incentives for license reinstatement for defendants. This special case processing calendar was modeled after the Iowa Rocket Docket and is entitled the OWL (Operators Without License) Court.

Eligible case types are those in which a defendant is charged with Driving While License Cancelled, Suspended or Revoked (DWLS) and Driving Without a Valid Operator's License (DVOL) with or without additional charges of Driving Without Insurance (DWOL) and/or Failure to Appear in Court and cases which are not eligible for the Municipal Pretrial Diversion program or the State Driver's Compliance program. The OWL calendar swiftly processes cases in which the prosecutor agrees that the DWLS charges will be reduced or dismissed if the defendant obtains a driver's license.

Driver's licenses can be suspended, cancelled or revoked for a myriad of reasons involving multiple systems and requirements. Many individuals without

licenses have license revocations for several reasons simultaneously - greatly complicating successful compliance and license reinstatement. For example, one individual may be in arrears with Child Support and have a previous DUI conviction, and a case involving an uninsured accident case in which alcohol or other drug treatment was ordered. This hypothetical individual would need to enter into an agreement with the CSED and the individual holding the civil judgment for the accident and begin alcohol and drug treatment to be eligible for reinstatement. Even then, however, the individual faces the further financial impediment of raising DMV licensing and reinstatement fees and SR-22 insurance fees to reinstate the license.

The main challenge is not just financial. While individuals are often unemployed due to the lack of a driver's license, they also experience multiple other socio-economic challenges, are disorganized, have literacy, language and test-taking problems and become easily frustrated when attempting to navigate the maze of CSED, treatment, civil lawsuit judgments, SR-22 insurers and the DMV requirements that stand between them and license reinstatement.

There are progressively more serious mandatory minimum penalties, which include jail and further license revocations and points accruals when an individual is convicted of DWLS making it especially important to resolve these cases early. Otherwise Alaskans face the sad phenomenon of a downward spiral for individuals who could otherwise be successful in achieving license reinstated and increasing both their legal compliance and productivity. It is costly to the community in terms of jail days and the number of unlicensed and uninsured drivers who continue to drive in a State where public transportation is an unrealistic alternative.

This is a collaborative project involving the State and Municipal prosecutors, the defense, the DMV, the ASAP program and the court system. I preside over this calendar and provide the administrative and hand-on judicial monitoring.

In 2009, with the assistance of funding by the National Highway Transportation Authority (NHTSA) through a successful grant application written by the Statewide Therapeutic Courts Coordinator and me, a case manager was hired through the ASAP office to assist court participants to become licensed.

The case manager interviews each participant, assesses what is required for each participant to reinstate their license, assists each participant to problem-solve how they will overcome the barriers to reinstatement, develop relationships with and contact agencies to trouble-shoot the various barriers to reinstatement in each individual case, link participants to resources to pass the written and road tests, report participant progress to the court and maintain data to determine whether this intervention results in better outcomes in the form of increased license reinstatements.

We anticipate half of the defendants participating in this project will require substance abuse treatment services. NHTSA has also funded limited treatment funds for assessment and treatment services (until participants are gainfully employed).

CENTRALIZED COMPETENCY CALENDAR 2008-present

Creator, administrator and presiding judge over this centralized competency calendar model in the Anchorage District Court. This calendar is modeled after the King County, Washington best practice. The proposal creating this calendar that was accepted by the Presiding Judge and a Standing Order creating the calendar issued in 2008. (see attachment C). The calendar is designed to provide active case management of all district court cases (misdemeanors and pre-indicted felonies) in which mental competence for legal proceedings must be determined. It provides for the CRP (mental health court) judges who have developed special expertise in the area of mental health and mental competency to hear those proceedings. Staff support is provided by the CRP Project Manager.

**ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE
STEPHANIE RHOADES 2010 JUDICIAL RETENTION CANDIDATE**

Attachment
Question 3:

The reasons I sought this job in 1992 remain the reasons that I love it. The position of district court judge is one of the best public service law jobs available.

My education was geared toward public service work. I grew up in a welfare class family that encountered legal entanglements typical to the poorer classes. My entire goal in pursuing a legal education was to become a vehicle to provide access to justice for people who otherwise would not be able to afford an advocate.

I sought a position in the district court because it is the court where most Alaskans who have contact with the justice system will have that contact. It is the court where pro per filings are highest, where the issues presented can be minimal, yet very emotionally charged – or complex, yet poorly understood, researched and presented by the proponent. It is the court where those who commit their first less serious crimes are theoretically more amenable to rehabilitation. It is the court where many criminal prosecutors and defense attorneys begin their practice, learn their professions, and hone their skills.

I find tremendous satisfaction with my role in that I believe I have been successful in providing access to justice for litigants who do not understand the legal system. My calendar involves many emotionally charged situations and litigants concerned that they will not find justice. I have learned to diffuse the emotional litigant and provide a positive venue for explanation of the law, for mediation, settlement or just adjudication with a clear explanation depending upon the needs and desires of the litigants.

The role of district court judge demands a high level of legal education and experience, research, reasoning and adjudicative skills. To be a successful district court judge, however, one must be contented that on most days on the district court bench, high level legal skills will take a back seat to high level basic communication, organization and problem-solving skills and good old fashioned empathy and patience. It is highly satisfying to me to utilize this combination of skills to the degree that each is needed.

The district court is a high volume court. Often the work is both voluminous and repetitive, but I am a focused person who likes to be productive. I manage my assignments in an organized fashion that allows me to feel productive and provide litigants with timely decisions on which they may act.

In the remainder of my application, I have addressed specific contributions to the court and case processing I have made since my last retention, increases in legal knowledge and judicial skills and other measures of my abilities to continue to serve in this position.

4. During your most recent term as a judge, have you:
- a) had a tax lien filed or other collection procedure instituted against you by federal, state, or local authorities? Yes _____ No X_____.
 - b) been involved in a non-judicial capacity in any legal proceeding whether as a party or otherwise? Yes _____ No X_____.
 - c) engaged in the practice of law (other than as a judge)? Yes _____ No X_____.
 - d) held office in any political party? Yes _____ No X_____.
 - e) held any other local state or federal office? Yes _____ No X_____.
 - f) had any complaints, charges or grievances filed against you with the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct, the Alaska Bar Association, or with the Alaska Court System that resulted in public proceedings or sanctions? Yes X_____ No _____.

5. If your answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please give full details, including dates, facts, case numbers and outcomes.

6. Please provide any other information which you believe would assist the Council in conducting its evaluations and in preparing its recommendations for the 2010 retention elections.

See attached

**ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE
STEPHANIE RHOADES 2010 JUDICIAL RETENTION CANDIDATE**

Attachment
Question 6:

In addition to regularly scheduled Alaska Court System judicial education, I have also participated in the following:

NATIONAL JUDICIAL COLLEGE
Managing Cases Involving Persons with Mental Disabilities
Faculty Member, Curriculum Development
2006, 2007 and 2008

ANCHORAGE POLICE DEPARTMENT
Crisis Intervention Team Training (Memphis Model)
Trainer

NATIONAL GAINS CENTER CONFERENCE
System Transformation at the Interface of the Criminal
Justice and Mental Health Systems
Presenter
April, 2006

**NADCP 12th ANNUAL DRUG COURT TRAINING
CONFERENCE**
Successful Partnering for Recovery
June 2006

**NADCP 15th ANNUAL DRUG COURT TRAINING
CONFERENCE**
Mental Health Courts-Co-Occurring Disorders Forum
Presenter
June 2009

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Since last retention

YWCA Anchorage
2008 Woman of Achievement Award

ASSETS, Inc.
2008 Chuck Melick Memorial Award for
Outstanding Advocacy for Individuals with Disabilities

HOPE COMMUNITY RESOURCES, INC.
2008 Visionary Award

LAWDRAGON
Leading 500 judges in America List
Spring, 2006 Issue

COMMUNITY SERVICE:

**MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
PROJECT HOMELESS CONNECT**

2007 to present.

Lead Food Coordinator - Volunteer

Project Homeless Connect is a bi-annual one-day event to provide linkage to housing and services, and hospitality in a convenient one-stop model directly to people experiencing homelessness in Anchorage.

**ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH
SERVICES COMPEER VOLUNTEER PROGRAM**

2002 to present

Volunteer

The program matches volunteers from the community with people who have serious mental disorders. Compeer volunteers agree to spend at least one hour per week with their individual match to help combat the isolation, loneliness and lack of self-esteem experienced by persons with serious mental disorders through peer companionship and friendship.

7. Please list your three most recent jury trials including case names and numbers. Please list the names, current addresses, including zip codes and suite numbers where applicable, and phone numbers of each attorney involved in these trials. (Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Case Number 1

Case Name: State of Alaska **Case Number:** 3AN-08-4700 Cr.
v. Robert Mills

Attorneys Involved:

Name: <u>Jason Gist - District Attorney</u>	Assistant	Name: <u>Phillip Edwards Defender</u>	Assistant Public
Address: <u>310 K Street, Suite 520</u>		Address: <u>900 W. 5th Ave, Suite 200</u>	
City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>		City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>	
Name: _____		Name: _____	
Address: _____		Address: _____	
City, State, Zip: _____		City, State, Zip: _____	

Case Number 2

Case Name: Municipality of Anchorage **Case Number:** 3AN-08-13738 Cr.
v. Lloyd Jenkins

Attorneys Involved:

Name: <u>Cynthia Dubell</u>	Name: <u>Jonathon Torres</u>
Address: <u>632 W. 6th Ave, Suite 210</u>	Address: <u>737 M Street</u>
City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>	City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>
Name: _____	Name: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____	City, State, Zip: _____

Case Number 3

Case Name: State of Alaska **Case Number:** 3AN-08-2723 Cr.
v. Joshua St. Clair

Attorneys Involved:

Name: <u>Talitha Birch</u>	Name: <u>Monica Elkinton</u>
Address: <u>310 K Street, Suite 520</u>	Address: <u>900 W. 5th, Suite 200</u>
City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>	City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>
Name: _____	Name: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____	City, State, Zip: _____

8. Please list your three most recent non-jury trials including case names and numbers. Please list the names, current addresses, including zip codes and suite numbers where applicable, and phone numbers of each attorney involved in your three most recent non-jury trials. (Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Case Number 1

Case
Name: Gary Donaldson **Case Number:** 3AN-08-12544 Ci
v. James Traxinger

Attorneys Involved:

Name: <u>Richard Crabtree</u>	Name: <u>James Traxinger pro se</u>
Address: <u>3000 A Street Suite 200</u>	Address: <u>8571 Brookridge Dr.</u>
City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage AK 99503</u>	City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99504</u>
Name: _____	Name: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____	City, State, Zip: _____

Case Number 2

Case
Name: Ohio Casualty Insurance Co. **Case Number:** 3AN-06-12990 Civil
v. Kelline Ladere, Sherri Sandidge
& Susitna Rose, Inc.

Attorneys Involved:

Name: <u>Charles Evans</u>	Name: <u>Sherri Sandidge pro se</u>
Address: <u>123 E. 11th Ave</u>	Address: <u>PO Box 873270</u>
City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>	City, State, Zip: <u>Wasilla AK 99687</u>
Name: _____	Name: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____	City, State, Zip: _____

Case Number 3

Case
Name: Eileen Zaiser **Case Number:** 3AN-09-9110 Civil
v. Sondra Graham

Attorneys Involved:

Name: <u>Robert Reiman</u>	Name: <u>Sondra Graham pro se</u>
Address: <u>619 E. Ship Creek Ave Suite 250</u>	Address: <u>7021 Carline Cir</u>
City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99501</u>	City, State, Zip: <u>Anchorage, AK 99502</u>
Name: _____	Name: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____	City, State, Zip: _____

Alaska Judicial Council
 Trial Judge Questionnaire
 2010 Retention

9. Please list your three most recent cases, including case names and numbers, which did not go to trial, but on which you did significant work (such as settlement conference, hearings, motion work, etc.). Please list the names, current addresses, including zip codes and suite numbers where applicable, and phone numbers of each attorney involved in these cases. (Attach additional pages if necessary.) See Attached

Example
 Case

Number 1 Operators Without License

Name: State of Alaska Case Number: 3AN-09-010417 Cr.

v. Manu Taoso

Attorneys Involved:

Name: Melissa Howard

Name: Kelly McHugh

Address: 310 K Street, Suite 520

Address: 900 W. 5th Suite 200

City, State, Zip: Anchorage, AK 99501

City, State, Zip: Anchorage, AK 99501

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Example
 Case

Number 2 Adjudication/Disposition

Name: Municipality of Anchorage Case Number: 3AN-05-5930 Cr.

v. Williams

Attorneys Involved:

Name: Al Patterson

Name: Michael Logue

Address: 632 W. 6th Ave, Suite 210

Address: 737 M Street

City, State, Zip: Anchorage, AK 99501

City, State, Zip: Anchorage, AK 99501

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Example
 Case

Number 3 CRP Court (Mental Health)

Name: State of Alaska Case Number: 3AN-08-9090 Cr.

v. Travis Riley

Attorneys Involved:

Name: Heather Norbrega

Name: George Davenport

Address: 310 K Street, Suite 520

Address: 900 W. 5th Suite 200

City, State, Zip: Anchorage, AK 99501

City, State, Zip: Anchorage, AK 99501

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

**ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE
STEPHANIE RHOADES 2010 JUDICIAL RETENTION CANDIDATE**

Attachment

Question 9

I have listed three cases, each of which are examples of cases heard on three different specialty calendars that I created and preside over in the district court. (See question 6 for details of these court calendars.)

The attorneys listed have appeared frequently in many cases on these calendars and are able to assess my performance in these specific cases as well as my performance in planning and implementing these special district court calendars.

10. *Optional:* If you deem it helpful to the Council, please list up to three other cases during your past term in which you believe your work was particularly noteworthy. Please list the names, current addresses, including zip codes and suite numbers where applicable, and phone numbers of each attorney involved in these cases. (Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Case Number 1

Case Name: _____ Case Number: _____

v. _____

Attorneys Involved:

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Case Number 2

Case Name: _____ Case Number: _____

v. _____

Attorneys Involved:

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Case Number 3

Case Name: _____ Case Number: _____

v. _____

Attorneys Involved:

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Name: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Third Judicial District Stephanie Rhoades - Anchorage District Court

Summary Sheet and Detailed Survey Scores

Summary of survey information

Judge Rhoades' detailed survey scores follow. Attorneys rated her 3.6 on overall performance. Peace and probation officers rated her 4.2 overall, and social workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA volunteers rated her 4.7 overall.

	Attorney Survey N=176	Peace Officer Survey N=46	Social Workers Guardians ad Litem CASAs N=3
Legal Ability	3.8	--	--
Impartiality	3.5	4.2	4.3
Integrity	3.9	4.4	4.3
Temperament	3.1	4.2	4.7
Diligence	3.9	4.2	4.7
Overall	3.6	4.2	4.7

The Judicial Council's Evaluation Process

State law requires the Judicial Council to evaluate each judge standing for retention, and to report its evaluations to the voters. The three surveys reported here are an important part of the Council's evaluations. The Council also considers survey ratings by jurors and court employees, public comments, and the ratings by the independent citizen volunteers at Alaska Judicial Observers. Along with the personal observations of the hundreds of people who had direct professional experience with the judge, the Council reviews any litigation involving the judge, conflict of interest records, public disciplinary files, and indicators of judicial performance such as appellate affirmances and reversals, and peremptory challenges and recusals. All of the evaluation information about the judge is on the Council's website at www.ajc.state.ak.us.

District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades**A. Alaska Bar Association****Demographic Description**

		N	%
Type of Practice			
	No Response	3	1.4%
	Private, Solo	52	24.5%
	Private, 2-5 Attorneys	33	15.6%
	Private, 6+ Attorneys	19	9.0%
	Private, Corporate Employee	8	3.8%
	Judge or Judicial Officer	43	20.3%
	Government	43	20.3%
	Public Service Agency or Organization (Not Govt)	3	1.4%
	Other	8	3.8%
Length of Alaska Practice			
	No Response	7	3.3%
	5 Years or fewer	20	9.4%
	6 to 10 years	14	6.6%
	11 to 15 years	24	11.3%
	16 to 20 years	22	10.4%
	21 years or more	125	59.0%
Gender			
	No Response	6	2.8%
	Male	147	69.3%
	Female	59	27.8%
Cases Handled			
	No Response	3	1.4%
	Prosecution	16	7.5%
	Mainly Criminal	23	10.8%
	Mixed Criminal & Civil	60	28.3%
	Mainly Civil	101	47.6%
	Other	9	4.2%
Location of Practice			
	No Response	2	.9%
	First District	5	2.4%
	Second District	3	1.4%
	Third District	190	89.6%
	Fourth District	9	4.2%
	Outside of Alaska	3	1.4%

Judge Stephanie Rhoades: Detailed Information Responses Alaska Bar Association Members

	Legal Ability		Impartiality/ Fairness		Integrity		Judicial Temperament		Diligence		Overall Evaluation	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Basis for Evaluation												
No Response		4		1		4		3		7		0
Direct Professional	3.8	172	3.5	175	3.9	172	3.1	173	3.9	169	3.6	176
Professional Reputation	3.9	22	3.8	21	4.2	22	3.8	23	4.1	21	3.8	23
Other Personal Contacts	4.1	12	4.2	11	4.6	11	4.0	11	4.4	11	4.1	11
Type of Practice												
No Response		0		0		0		2		0		0
Private, Solo	3.9	48	3.6	48	4.0	48	3.3	48	4.0	47	3.7	48
Private, 2-5 Attorneys	3.2	29	3.0	29	3.4	27	2.6	29	3.3	27	3.1	30
Private, 6+ Attorneys	3.5	14	3.3	15	3.7	15	3.2	15	3.7	15	3.5	15
Private, Corporate Employee	4.0	6	3.8	6	4.0	6	3.3	6	4.2	5	4.0	6
Judge or Judicial Officer	4.3	35	3.9	35	4.3	35	3.4	33	4.3	35	4.0	35
Government	3.7	33	3.3	35	3.7	34	2.9	35	3.9	33	3.4	35
Public Service Agency or Organization (Not Govt)	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	3.5	2	4.5	2	4.0	2
Other	4.3	4	4.0	4	4.5	4	3.3	4	4.5	4	4.0	4
Years of Practice in Alaska												
No Response		1		0		0		2		1		0
5 Years or fewer	3.6	20	3.1	19	3.8	19	2.8	19	4.1	19	3.3	20
6 to 10 years	3.5	10	2.7	11	3.1	8	2.2	11	3.8	8	2.8	11
11 to 15 years	3.8	20	3.3	21	3.6	21	2.7	21	3.8	21	3.4	21
16 to 20 years	4.0	18	3.8	19	4.1	19	3.5	19	4.1	18	3.9	19
21 years or more	3.8	99	3.7	100	4.0	100	3.3	98	3.9	99	3.7	100
Gender												
No Response		2		1		3		1		4		0
Male	3.7	126	3.5	127	3.8	125	3.0	127	3.8	124	3.5	128
Female	4.2	43	3.7	45	4.2	44	3.4	43	4.3	42	3.9	45
Cases Handled												
No Response		0		0		0		1		4		0
Prosecution	4.2	13	3.9	14	4.4	13	3.4	14	4.5	14	4.0	14
Mainly Criminal	3.6	21	3.1	22	3.7	21	2.4	22	4.0	20	3.1	22
Mixed Criminal & Civil	3.8	50	3.4	51	3.8	50	3.0	50	3.9	51	3.6	52
Mainly Civil	3.8	79	3.6	79	4.0	79	3.4	78	3.8	75	3.7	79
Other	3.7	7	3.7	7	3.6	7	3.3	7	3.7	7	3.7	7
Location of Practice												
No Response		4		1		4		3		7		0
First District	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	3.0	2	4.5	2	4.0	2
Second District	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2
Third District	3.8	158	3.5	161	3.9	158	3.1	159	3.9	155	3.6	162
Fourth District	3.8	6	3.7	6	4.3	6	3.8	6	4.0	6	3.8	6
Outside of Alaska	3.7	3	3.3	3	3.3	3	3.3	3	3.3	3	3.7	3

Note: Ratings for only those respondents who reported direct professional experience with the judge.

District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades**B. Peace and Probation Officers****Demographic Description**

		N	%
Type of Work			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	State Law Enforcement Officer	18	30.0%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	33	55.0%
	Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	--	0.0%
	Probation/Parole Officer	9	15.0%
	Other	--	0.0%
Length of Alaska Experience			
	No Response	1	1.7%
	5 Years or fewer	11	18.3%
	6 to 10 years	12	20.0%
	11 to 15 years	17	28.3%
	16 to 20 years	9	15.0%
	21 years or more	10	16.7%
Gender			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	Male	47	78.3%
	Female	13	21.7%
Location of Work			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	First District	--	0.0%
	Second District	--	0.0%
	Third District	59	98.3%
	Fourth District	1	1.7%
	Outside of Alaska	--	0.0%
Community Population			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	Under 2,000	--	0.0%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	5	8.3%
	Over 35,000	55	91.7%

**Judge Stephanie Rhoades
Peace and Probation Officers**

	Impartiality/ Fairness		Integrity		Judicial Temperament		Diligence		Overall Evaluation	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Basis for Evaluation										
No Response		0		0		1		2		0
Direct Professional	4.2	46	4.4	46	4.2	45	4.2	44	4.2	46
Professional Reputation	4.0	9	3.9	9	3.9	9	4.0	9	3.9	9
Other Personal Contacts	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	1
Type of Work										
No Response		0		0		0		1		0
State Law Enforcement Officer	3.9	13	4.1	13	3.8	13	3.9	12	3.9	13
Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	4.3	27	4.5	27	4.4	26	4.3	26	4.4	27
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Probation/Parole Officer	4.2	6	4.3	6	4.2	6	4.3	6	4.3	6
Other	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Length of Experience										
No Response		0		0		1		1		0
5 Years or fewer	4.0	7	4.3	7	4.0	7	4.3	7	4.1	7
6 to 10 years	4.2	10	4.3	10	3.9	10	4.0	9	4.1	10
11 to 15 years	4.4	14	4.6	14	4.5	13	4.3	13	4.5	14
16 to 20 years	4.3	6	4.7	6	4.2	6	4.2	6	4.3	6
21 years or more	3.9	8	3.9	8	4.0	8	4.0	8	3.9	8
Gender										
No Response		0		0		1		1		0
Male	4.2	36	4.4	36	4.2	35	4.2	35	4.3	36
Female	4.1	10	4.2	10	4.0	10	4.1	9	4.2	10
Location of Work										
No Response		0		0		1		2		0
First District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Second District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Third District	4.2	46	4.4	46	4.2	45	4.2	44	4.2	46
Fourth District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Outside of Alaska	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Community Population										
No Response		0		0		1		2		0
Under 2,000	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4.0	2	4.2	2	3.5	2	4.0	2	4.0	2
Over 35,000	4.2	44	4.4	44	4.2	43	4.2	42	4.3	44

Note: Ratings for only those respondents who reported direct professional experience with the judge.

District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades**C. Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers****Demographic Description**

		N	%
Type of Work			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	Social Worker	2	28.6%
	Guardian ad Litem	--	0.0%
	CASA Volunteer	5	71.4%
	Other	--	0.0%
Length of Alaska Experience			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	5 Years or fewer	3	42.9%
	6 to 10 years	3	42.9%
	11 to 15 years	1	14.3%
	16 to 20 years	--	0.0%
	21 years or more	--	0.0%
Gender			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	Male	1	14.3%
	Female	6	85.7%
Location of Work			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	First District	--	0.0%
	Second District	--	0.0%
	Third District	7	100%
	Fourth District	--	0.0%
	Outside of Alaska	--	0.0%
Community Population			
	No Response	--	0.0%
	Under 2,000	--	0.0%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	14.3%
	Over 35,000	6	85.7%

Judge Stephanie Rhoades
Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers

	Impartiality/ Fairness		Integrity		Judicial Temperament		Diligence		Overall Evaluation	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Basis for Evaluation										
No Response		0		0		0		0		0
Direct Professional	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.7	3	4.7	3	4.7	3
Professional Reputation	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.3	3
Other Personal Contacts	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
Type of Work										
No Response		0		0		0		0		0
Social Worker	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2
Guardian ad Litem	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
CASA Volunteer	4.0	1	4.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1
Length of Experience										
No Response		0		0		0		0		0
5 Years or fewer	4.0	1	4.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1
6 to 10 years	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2
11 to 15 years	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
16 to 20 years	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
21 years or more	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Gender										
No Response		0		0		0		0		0
Male	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Female	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.7	3	4.7	3	4.7	3
Location of Work										
No Response		0		0		0		0		0
First District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Second District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Third District	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.7	3	4.7	3	4.7	3
Fourth District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Outside of Alaska	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Community Population										
No Response		0		0		0		0		0
Under 2,000	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Over 35,000	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.7	3	4.7	3	4.7	3

Note: Ratings for only those respondents who reported direct professional experience with the judge.

Juror Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades										
		Distribution of Ratings								
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			

Court Employee Survey Results 2010 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades												
Question	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Mean	Total Responses
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Impartiality/Fairness	53%	40	27%	20	17%	13	1%	1	1%	1	4.3	75
Integrity	59%	44	21%	16	16%	12	3%	2	1%	1	4.3	75
Judicial Temperament	51%	38	21%	16	21%	16	5%	4	1%	1	4.2	75
Diligence	58%	43	23%	17	15%	11	3%	2	1%	1	4.3	74
Overall Evaluation	56%	42	23%	17	19%	14	1%	1	1%	1	4.3	75

Prior Retention Scores
Judge Stephanie Rhoades
Anchorage District Court: Retention 2010
 Appointed to Anchorage District Court 1992

Bar Survey						
2010 Retention	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.1	3.9	3.6
2006 Retention	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.6
2002 Retention	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.9	3.6
1998 Retention	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.6	3.2
1994 Retention	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.7	3.2
	Legal Ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall Performance
Peace & Probation Officer Survey						
2010 Retention	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
2006 Retention	4.0	4.2	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.0
2002 Retention	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3
1998 Retention	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9
1994 Retention	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9
	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall Performance	