



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council
FROM: Staff
DATE: February 17, 2012
RE: Juror Survey Report

The Alaska Judicial Council surveyed all jurors who sat in 2010 and 2011 trials before the 24 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2012. A total of 1,585 jurors responded. The Council sent postcards to the judges to distribute to jurors at the end of each trial. Jurors completed the surveys on the business reply postcards and mailed them 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. 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 2012 Retention Juror Survey				
Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total
William Barker Carey	5	56	7	68
Steve Cole	13	42	3	58
Patrick S. Hammers	7	47	1	55
J. Patrick Hanley	11	68	2	81
Gregory Louis Heath	0	48	2	50
Charles Huguelet	18	15	0	33
Michael I. Jeffery	2	12	0	14
Keith B. Levy	15	92	3	110
Paul Lyle	10	78	14	102
Michael P. McConahy	2	36	3	41
William F. Morse	44	0	3	47
Margaret L. Murphy	2	63	1	66
Thomas G. Nave	1	7	0	8
Frank A. Pfiffner	99	2	1	102
Daniel Schally	3	35	2	40
Eric Smith	13	36	3	52
John Suddock	27	0	1	28
Alex M. Swiderski	18	24	2	44
Sen K. Tan	<i>No cards returned during this two year period</i>			
Philip R. Volland	3	219	1	223
David R. Wallace	2	87	2	91
Pamela Scott Washington	6	34	0	40
Michael L. Wolverton	4	133	8	145
David Zwink	2	83	2	87

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	28%	437
3 - 4 Days	36%	572
5 - 7 Days	18%	280
8 - 10 Days	9%	139
11 - 20 Days	5%	73
21 or More Days	2%	27
No Answer	4%	57
		1,585

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 2012 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
William Barker Carey	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	68
Steve Cole	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	58
Patrick S. Hammers	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	55
J. Patrick Hanley	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	81
Gregory Louis Heath	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	50
Charles Huguélet	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	33
Michael I. Jeffery	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.1	14
Keith B. Levy	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	110
Paul Lyle	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	102
Michael P. McConahy	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	41
William F. Morse	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7	47
Margaret L. Murphy	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	66
Thomas G. Nave	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9	8
Frank A. Pfiffner	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.7	102
Daniel Schally	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	39
Eric Smith	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.8	52
John Suddock	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	27
Alex M. Swiderski	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	44
Sen K. Tan	<i>No cards returned during this two year period</i>						
Philip R. Volland	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	223
David R. Wallace	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	91
Pamela Scott Washington	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	40
Michael L. Wolverton	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	145
David Zwink	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	87

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
William Barker Carey**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	53	15	0	0	0	68
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	56	12	0	0	0	68
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	56	12	0	0	0	68
Control over Proceedings	4.8	57	10	0	1	0	68
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	56	11	1	0	0	68
Overall Evaluation	4.8	55	12	1	0	0	68

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Steve Cole**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	53	5	0	0	0	58
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	56	2	0	0	0	58
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	49	9	0	0	0	58
Control over Proceedings	4.9	53	5	0	0	0	58
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	51	7	0	0	0	58
Overall Evaluation	4.9	51	7	0	0	0	58

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Patrick S. Hammers**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	45	9	0	1	0	55
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	50	3	1	1	0	55
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	48	6	0	1	0	55
Control over Proceedings	4.9	47	8	0	0	0	55
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	45	9	0	1	0	55
Overall Evaluation	4.8	47	7	0	1	0	55

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
J. Patrick Hanley**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	75	6	0	0	0	81
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	76	5	0	0	0	81
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	72	8	1	0	0	81
Control over Proceedings	4.9	75	5	1	0	0	81
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	74	7	0	0	0	81
Overall Evaluation	5.0	77	4	0	0	0	81

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Gregory Louis Heath**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	44	6	0	0	0	50
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	46	4	0	0	0	50
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	45	5	0	0	0	50
Control over Proceedings	4.9	45	4	1	0	0	50
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	43	6	1	0	0	50
Overall Evaluation	4.9	45	5	0	0	0	50

Juror Survey Results 2012 Retention Evaluation Charles Huguelet							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	27	5	1	0	0	33
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	30	2	1	0	0	33
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	24	7	2	0	0	33
Control over Proceedings	4.8	27	5	1	0	0	33
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	27	6	0	0	0	33
Overall Evaluation	4.8	27	5	1	0	0	33

Juror Survey Results 2012 Retention Evaluation Michael I. Jeffery							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	3.9	5	5	3	0	1	14
Respectful/Courteous	4.4	8	4	1	1	0	14
Attentive during Proceedings	4.4	7	5	2	0	0	14
Control over Proceedings	4.2	7	4	2	1	0	14
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.4	6	7	1	0	0	14
Overall Evaluation	4.1	7	4	2	0	1	14

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Keith B. Levy**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	96	14	0	0	0	110
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	98	12	0	0	0	110
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	90	17	2	1	0	110
Control over Proceedings	4.8	91	16	2	0	1	110
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	94	15	1	0	0	110
Overall Evaluation	4.8	91	18	0	1	0	110

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Paul Lyle**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	75	23	2	1	0	101
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	84	14	4	0	0	102
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	76	24	2	0	0	102
Control over Proceedings	4.7	75	22	4	0	1	102
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.7	74	28	0	0	0	102
Overall Evaluation	4.7	74	25	3	0	0	102

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Michael P. McConahy**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	34	6	1	0	0	41
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	37	3	1	0	0	41
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	35	4	2	0	0	41
Control over Proceedings	4.8	34	6	1	0	0	41
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	36	4	1	0	0	41
Overall Evaluation	4.9	37	4	0	0	0	41

Juror Survey Results 2012 Retention Evaluation William F. Morse							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	37	10	0	0	0	47
Respectful/Courteous	4.7	35	10	2	0	0	47
Attentive during Proceedings	4.6	31	14	2	0	0	47
Control over Proceedings	4.8	39	8	0	0	0	47
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	37	10	0	0	0	47
Overall Evaluation	4.7	35	11	1	0	0	47

Juror Survey Results 2012 Retention Evaluation Margaret L. Murphy							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	52	13	1	0	0	66
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	53	10	3	0	0	66
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	49	14	3	0	0	66
Control over Proceedings	4.7	47	16	3	0	0	66
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.7	49	11	6	0	0	66
Overall Evaluation	4.7	46	14	6	0	0	66

Juror Survey Results 2012 Retention Evaluation Thomas G. Nave							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	7	1	0	0	0	8
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	7	1	0	0	0	8
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	6	2	0	0	0	8
Control over Proceedings	4.9	7	1	0	0	0	8
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	5.0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Overall Evaluation	4.9	7	1	0	0	0	8

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Frank A. Pfiffner**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	85	15	2	0	0	102
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	88	12	2	0	0	102
Attentive during Proceedings	4.4	62	23	16	1	0	102
Control over Proceedings	4.7	80	17	3	2	0	102
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.7	80	17	5	0	0	102
Overall Evaluation	4.7	77	20	5	0	0	102

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Daniel Schally**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	30	8	1	0	0	39
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	32	6	1	0	0	39
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	28	9	2	0	0	39
Control over Proceedings	4.8	32	7	0	0	0	39
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.7	29	10	0	0	0	39
Overall Evaluation	4.7	29	10	0	0	0	39

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Eric Smith**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	44	7	1	0	0	52
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	44	8	0	0	0	52
Attentive during Proceedings	4.6	35	13	3	0	0	51
Control over Proceedings	4.9	46	6	0	0	0	52
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	46	6	0	0	0	52
Overall Evaluation	4.8	43	9	0	0	0	52

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
John Suddock**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	23	3	1	0	0	27
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	24	2	1	0	0	27
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	22	3	2	0	0	27
Control over Proceedings	4.9	25	0	2	0	0	27
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	23	3	1	0	0	27
Overall Evaluation	4.8	23	3	1	0	0	27

Juror Survey Results 2012 Retention Evaluation Alex M. Swiderski							
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	39	5	0	0	0	44
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	41	3	0	0	0	44
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	39	5	0	0	0	44
Control over Proceedings	4.9	40	4	0	0	0	44
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	40	4	0	0	0	44
Overall Evaluation	4.9	40	4	0	0	0	44

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Philip R. Volland**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	209	14	0	0	0	223
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	213	9	1	0	0	223
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	179	34	10	0	0	223
Control over Proceedings	4.9	206	16	0	0	0	222
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	210	12	1	0	0	223
Overall Evaluation	4.9	209	12	2	0	0	223

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
David R. Wallace**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	84	7	0	0	0	91
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	90	1	0	0	0	91
Attentive during Proceedings	5.0	87	4	0	0	0	91
Control over Proceedings	5.0	88	3	0	0	0	91
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	5.0	88	3	0	0	0	91
Overall Evaluation	5.0	88	3	0	0	0	91

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Pamela Scott Washington**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	36	3	1	0	0	40
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	37	2	1	0	0	40
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	37	2	1	0	0	40
Control over Proceedings	4.8	34	5	1	0	0	40
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.8	35	3	2	0	0	40
Overall Evaluation	4.8	35	3	2	0	0	40

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
Michael L. Wolverton**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	130	14	1	0	0	145
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	137	7	1	0	0	145
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	134	9	2	0	0	145
Control over Proceedings	4.9	130	13	2	0	0	145
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	126	17	2	0	0	145
Overall Evaluation	4.9	129	14	2	0	0	145

**Juror Survey Results
2012 Retention Evaluation
David Zwink**

Survey Category	Mean	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Total Responses
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	80	6	1	0	0	87
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	85	1	1	0	0	87
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	81	5	1	0	0	87
Control over Proceedings	4.9	82	4	1	0	0	87
Intelligence/ Skill as a Judge	4.9	83	3	1	0	0	87
Overall Evaluation	4.9	83	3	1	0	0	87

Juror Survey - Superior Court Judge David R. Wallace

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? _____
