



alaska judicial council

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

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council
FROM: Staff
DATE: May 17, 2022
RE: Juror Survey Report

The Alaska Judicial Council collected surveys from jurors who sat in trials during 2020, 2021, and the first part of 2022. The jurors sat before 27 of the 28 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2022 (no jurors sat before Judge John C. Cagle). A total of 538 jurors responded on Council-provided postcards that judges distributed to jurors at the end of each trial (see attached Juror Survey Card 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.

Table 1: Distribution of Jurors by Type of Trial, by Judge Alaska Judicial Council 2022 Retention Juror Survey				
Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total
Bennett, Brent	0	23	1	24
Chung, Jo-Ann M.	16	44	1	61
Clark, Brian K.	5	7	0	12
Easter, Catherine	1	42	1	44
Fallon, Martin C.	0	24	0	24
Gandbhir, Una Sonia	3	0	0	3
Garton, Josie	0	14	0	14
Gist, Jason	1	42	4	47
Haas, Terrence	0	7	2	9
Jamgochian, Tom V.	2	12	0	14
Joanis, Lance	0	23	0	23
Kristiansen, Kari	0	13	0	13
Matthews, Thomas A.	0	3	1	4
Mead, Amy Gurton	3	23	0	26
Nesbett, David A.	1	22	1	24
Pate, Jude	2	22	5	29
Peterson, Andrew	0	32	0	32
Peterson, Earl	12	23	3	38
Ramgren, Peter	8	0	0	8
Saxby, Kevin	0	4	0	4
Schally, Daniel	3	9	1	13
Seekins, Ben	0	16	0	16
Stohler, Kristen C.	0	4	0	4
Swanson, Kirsten	0	4	1	5
Temple, Thomas I.	0	23	2	25
Traini, Shawn	6	4	1	11
Wallace, Stephen	1	9	1	11

Table 2 shows the distribution of number of days served, as reported by the jurors. Fifty-seven percent of the jurors served fewer than five days.

Table 2: Distribution of Days Served Alaska Judicial Council 2022 Retention Juror Survey		
Number of Days Served	%	N
1 - 2 Days	20.6	111
3 - 4 Days	36.2	195
5 - 7 Days	20.1	108
8 - 10 Days	12.1	65
11 - 20 Days	3.2	17
21 or More Days	5.4	29
No Answer	2.4	13
Total		538

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.

Table 3:
Mean Rating for each Variable and for “Overall Performance,” by Judge
 Alaska Judicial Council
 2022 Retention Juror Survey

	Impartiality and Fairness	Respectful and Courteous	Attentive During Proceedings	Control During Proceedings	Intelligence and Skill as a Judge	Overall Mean	Total Count
Bennett, Brent	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	24
Chung, Jo-Ann M.	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	61
Clark, Brian K.	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	12
Easter, Catherine	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	44
Fallon, Martin C.	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.9	24
Gandbhir, Una Sonia	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3
Garton, Josie	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	14
Gist, Jason	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	47
Haas, Terrence	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	9
Jamgochian, Tom V.	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	14
Joanis, Lance	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	23
Kristiansen, Kari	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.9	5.0	13
Matthews, Thomas A.	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4
Mead, Amy Gurton	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.8	4.8	26
Nesbett, David A.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	24
Pate, Jude	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	29
Peterson, Andrew	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	32
Peterson, Earl	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	38
Ramgren, Peter	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	8
Saxby, Kevin	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	4
Schally, Daniel	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	13
Seekins, Ben	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	16
Stohler, Kristen C.	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4
Swanson, Kirsten	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	5
Temple, Thomas I.	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	25
Traini, Shawn	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	11
Wallace, Stephen	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	11

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Bennett, Brent

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	4	20	24
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	23	24
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	22	24
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	0	2	3	19	24
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	0	4	20	24
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	5	19	24

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Chung, Jo-Ann M.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	13	47	60
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	6	54	60
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	3	8	49	60
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	4	5	50	59
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	1	7	51	59
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	1	7	51	59

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Clark, Brian K.

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

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Easter, Catherine

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	2	42	44
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	2	42	44
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	43	44
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	43	44
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	1	43	44
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	2	42	44

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Fallon, Martin C.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	1	23	24
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	23	24
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	1	2	21	24
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	23	24
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	3	21	24
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	2	22	24

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Gandbhir, Una Sonia

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	3	3

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Garton, Josie

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	2	12	14
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	2	12	14
Attentive During Proceedings	4.6	0	0	0	6	8	14
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	0	1	2	11	14
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	0	3	11	14
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	3	11	14

Juror Survey Results 2022

Retention Evaluation

Gist, Jason

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	5	42	47
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	4	43	47
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	4	43	47
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	5	42	47
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	6	41	47
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	4	43	47

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Haas, Terrence

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	2	7	9
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	1	8	9
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	8	9
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	8	9
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	1	8	9
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	1	8	9

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Jamgochian, Tom V.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	1	13	14
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	13	14
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	13	14
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	1	13	14
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	1	13	14

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Joanis, Lance

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	1	22	23
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	22	23
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	22	23
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	20	23
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	1	22	23
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	23	23

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Kristiansen, Kari

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	1	0	12	13
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	1	12	13
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Matthews, Thomas A.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	0	1	3	4
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	0	1	3	4
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Mead, Amy Gurton

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	1	0	3	22	26
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	25	26
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	25	26
Control Over Proceedings	4.5	1	0	2	4	19	26
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	1	0	3	22	26
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	1	0	3	22	26

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Nesbett, David A.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	3	21	24
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	2	22	24
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	22	24
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	22	24
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	3	21	24
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	2	22	24

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Pate, Jude

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	3	25	28
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	28	29
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	27	28
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	25	28
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	4	24	28
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	2	26	28

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Peterson, Andrew

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	1	31	32
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	2	29	32
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	1	31	32
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	1	31	32

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Peterson, Earl

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	3	35	38
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	4	34	38
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	2	35	38
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	36	38
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	0	38	38
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	3	35	38

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Ramgren, Peter

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	8

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Saxby, Kevin

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	1	3	4
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Schally, Daniel

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	1	12	13
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	2	11	13
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	12	13
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	13	13

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Seekins, Ben

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	2	14	16
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	2	14	16
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	4	12	16
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	15	16
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	1	15	16
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	3	13	16

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Stohler, Kristen C.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	4

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Swanson, Kirsten

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.6	0	0	1	0	4	5
Respectful / Courteous	4.6	0	0	1	0	4	5
Attentive During Proceedings	4.6	0	0	1	0	4	5
Control Over Proceedings	4.6	0	0	1	0	4	5
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.6	0	0	1	0	4	5
Overall Evaluation	4.6	0	0	1	0	4	5

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Temple, Thomas I.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	1	3	21	25
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	1	2	22	25
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	1	3	21	25
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	1	3	21	25
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	1	4	20	25
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	1	3	21	25

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Traini, Shawn

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

Juror Survey Results 2022
Retention Evaluation
Wallace, Stephen

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

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? _____

