



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
Eleanor Andrews
Bill Gordon
Christena Williams

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Douglas Baily
James H. Cannon
Susan Orlansky

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO
Alexander O. Bryner
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council
FROM: Staff
DATE: April 17, 2006
RE: Juror Survey Report

The 2006 juror survey included 2,495 jurors who sat on trials before 31 judges in 2004 and 2005. Council staff entered data from the surveys and ran basic descriptive statistics. The Council distributes postcards to the judges to distribute to jurors at the end of each trial. The business reply postcard can be dropped in the mail by the jurors.

This memorandum summarizes the data from the survey, reports the transcribed comments, 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. 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 2006 Retention Juror Survey				
Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total
Bolger	19	14	0	33
Brown	41	85	3	129
Burbank	13	256	13	282
Clark	5	44	3	52
Devaney	17	62	11	90
Erlich	2	29	4	35
Esch	2	24	5	31
Estelle	1	14	0	15
Heath	12	13	3	28
Huguelet	12	80	4	96
Kauvar	8	107	4	119
Landry	2	136	11	149
Lohff	7	41	1	49
Michalski	30	0	0	30
Miller	4	43	9	56
Morse	32	1	3	36
Motyka	5	40	2	47
Murphy, Sigurd	0	21	1	22
Olsen	16	164	6	186
Rhoades	6	35	1	42
Smith, Eric	11	100	4	115
Smith, Jack	6	51	2	59
Suddock	39	0	2	41
Tan	5	1	1	7
Torrisi	13	177	0	190
Volland	2	167	4	173
Weeks	14	32	2	48
Wolfe	2	47	2	51
Wolverton	3	117	4	124
Wood	12	89	2	103
Zervos	17	35	5	57
Total:	358	2,025	112	2,495

Table 2 shows the distribution of number of days served, as reported by the jurors. More than half of the jurors served less than five days.

Number of Days Served	%	N
1 - 2 Days	32%	785
3 - 4 Days	36%	906
5 - 7 Days	19%	467
8 - 10 Days	6%	140
11 - 20 Days	3%	80
21 or More Days	1%	19
No Answer	4%	98
	100%	2,495

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 2006 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
Bolger	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	33
Brown	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	129
Burbank	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	282
Clark	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	52
Devaney	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	90
Erlich	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7	35
Esch	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	31
Estelle	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.9	15
Heath	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	28
Huguelet	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	96
Kauvar	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	119
Landry	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	149
Lohff	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	49
Michalski	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.9	30
Miller	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	56
Morse	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	36
Motyka	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	47
Murphy, Sigurd	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	22
Olsen	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	16
Rhoades	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	42
Smith, Eric	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	115
Smith, Jack	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	59
Suddock	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.9	41
Tan	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7
Torrisi	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	190
Volland	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	173
Weeks	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	48
Wolfe	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	51
Wolverton	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	124
Wood	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.8	103
Zervos	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	57

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Joel H. Bolger</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 33				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	85% 28	15% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	94% 31	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	91% 30	9% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	88% 29	12% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	85% 28	12% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	94% 31	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Harold M. Brown</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 129				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	80% 103	17% 22	3% 4	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	88% 114	9% 12	2% 3	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	81% 104	16% 20	4% 5	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	85% 109	16% 20	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	83% 107	16% 20	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	81% 104	19% 24	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Winston S. Burbank</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total Returned = 282
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	86%	243	14%	38	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	282
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	91%	257	9%	25	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	282
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	85%	240	15%	42	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	282
Control over Proceedings	4.9	88%	247	12%	33	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	282
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	87%	244	13%	37	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	281
Overall Evaluation	4.9	86%	243	14%	39	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	282

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Brian K. Clark</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 52				
Impartiality/Fairness	5.0	98% 51	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	98% 51	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.9	92% 48	6% 3	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	94% 49	4% 2	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	5.0	96% 50	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	5.0	96% 50	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Leonard R. Devaney, III</p>												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 90
Impartiality/Fairness	4.3	46%	41	39%	35	16%	14	0%	0	0%	0	90
Respectful/Courteous	4.3	44%	40	46%	41	10%	9	0%	0	0%	0	90
Attentive during Proceedings	4.2	36%	32	52%	47	12%	11	0%	0	0%	0	90
Control over Proceedings	4.3	43%	39	46%	41	11%	10	0%	0	0%	0	90
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.4	43%	39	51%	46	6%	5	0%	0	0%	0	90
Overall Evaluation	4.5	51%	46	43%	39	6%	5	0%	0	0%	0	90

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Richard H. Erlich</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 35				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	71% 25	23% 8	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.7	74% 26	20% 7	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.5	63% 22	29% 10	9% 3	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.6	63% 22	26% 9	9% 3	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	74% 26	20% 7	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.7	74% 26	20% 7	6% 2	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Ben Esch											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 31				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	84% 26	16% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	31				
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 28	10% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	31				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	84% 26	16% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	31				
Control over Proceedings	4.8	84% 26	16% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	31				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	90% 28	10% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	31				
Overall Evaluation	4.9	90% 28	7% 2	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	31				

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation William L. Estelle</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 15				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	93% 14	7% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	93% 14	7% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	67% 10	33% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	93% 14	7% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	73% 11	27% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	87% 13	13% 2	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Gregory Louis Heath</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 28				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	86% 24	14% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	86% 24	14% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	86% 24	11% 3	4% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	86% 24	14% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	75% 21	25% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	82% 23	18% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Charles T. Huguelet</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 96				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	76% 73	20% 19	3% 3	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	81% 78	16% 15	3% 3	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	71% 68	28% 27	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.7	75% 72	24% 23	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	78% 75	21% 20	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.7	74% 71	25% 24	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Jane F. Kauvar</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 119				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	74% 88	25% 30	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	85% 101	15% 18	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.5	64% 76	28% 33	7% 8	2% 2	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	76% 90	24% 29	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	71% 84	29% 34	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.7	74% 88	26% 31	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation David S. Landry											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 149				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	83% 123	16% 24	1% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	89% 132	11% 16	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	77% 115	22% 33	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	85% 126	15% 23	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	84% 125	16% 24	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	82% 122	17% 25	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John R. Lohff											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 49				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	88% 43	10% 5	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	88% 43	12% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	84% 41	16% 8	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	86% 42	14% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	86% 42	14% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	86% 42	14% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Peter A. Michalski											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 30				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	93% 28	3% 1	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	30				
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	97% 29	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	30				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	73% 22	23% 7	0% 0	3% 1	0% 0	30				
Control over Proceedings	4.8	87% 26	10% 3	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	30				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	93% 28	0% 0	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	29				
Overall Evaluation	4.9	93% 28	3% 1	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	30				

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Kevin G. Miller</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 56				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	80% 45	20% 11	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	88% 49	13% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	82% 46	18% 10	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	80% 45	18% 10	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	77% 43	21% 12	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	80% 45	20% 11	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation William F. Morse</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 36				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	86% 31	11% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	86% 31	14% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	67% 24	28% 10	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	92% 33	6% 2	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	89% 32	8% 3	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	92% 33	6% 2	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Gregory Motyka</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 47				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	77% 36	21% 10	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	85% 40	15% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	70% 33	28% 13	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	85% 40	15% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	81% 38	17% 8	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	83% 39	17% 8	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Sigurd E. Murphy											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 22				
Impartiality/Fairness	5.0	100% 22	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	100% 22	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Attentive during Proceedings	5.0	100% 22	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Control over Proceedings	5.0	100% 22	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	5.0	100% 22	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Overall Evaluation	5.0	100% 22	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	22				

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Randy M. Olsen</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 186				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	83% 154	17% 32	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	91% 170	9% 16	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	84% 156	16% 30	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	82% 153	16% 30	2% 3	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	83% 154	16% 30	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	84% 156	16% 29	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 42				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	76% 32	19% 8	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	91% 38	7% 3	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	71% 30	26% 11	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.7	76% 32	19% 8	2% 1	0% 0	2% 1					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	79% 33	17% 7	2% 1	2% 1	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	83% 35	12% 5	5% 2	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Eric Smith											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 115				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	87% 100	13% 15	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	115				
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	92% 106	6% 7	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	115				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	71% 82	28% 32	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	115				
Control over Proceedings	4.9	88% 101	12% 14	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	115				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	92% 106	8% 9	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	115				
Overall Evaluation	4.9	90% 104	10% 11	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	115				

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Jack W. Smith											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 59				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	90% 53	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	58				
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 53	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	58				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	83% 49	15% 9	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	58				
Control over Proceedings	4.9	88% 52	10% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	58				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	88% 52	10% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	58				
Overall Evaluation	4.9	92% 54	7% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	58				

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John Suddock											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 41				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	90% 37	7% 3	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	92% 38	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.7	78% 32	17% 7	5% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	85% 35	12% 5	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	88% 36	10% 4	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	90% 37	7% 3	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Sen K. Tan											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 7				
Impartiality/Fairness	5.0	100% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7				
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	100% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7				
Attentive during Proceedings	5.0	100% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7				
Control over Proceedings	5.0	100% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	5.0	100% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7				
Overall Evaluation	5.0	100% 7	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7				

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Fred Torrisi											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 190				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	79% 150	18% 35	3% 5	0% 0	0% 0	190				
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	82% 155	16% 30	3% 5	0% 0	0% 0	190				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	83% 157	15% 29	2% 4	0% 0	0% 0	190				
Control over Proceedings	4.8	84% 159	15% 28	2% 3	0% 0	0% 0	190				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	81% 153	17% 33	2% 4	0% 0	0% 0	190				
Overall Evaluation	4.8	79% 150	19% 36	2% 4	0% 0	0% 0	190				

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Philip R. Volland											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 173				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	91% 157	8% 14	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	97% 168	2% 3	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	83% 144	16% 27	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	90% 155	9% 15	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	93% 161	6% 10	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	94% 162	5% 8	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Larry Weeks</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 48				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.9	92% 44	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	5.0	100% 48	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	81% 39	19% 9	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	94% 45	6% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	92% 44	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	94% 45	6% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John W. Wolfe											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 51				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	78% 40	20% 10	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	51				
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	80% 41	16% 8	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	51				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.5	61% 31	29% 15	10% 5	0% 0	0% 0	51				
Control over Proceedings	4.7	73% 37	26% 13	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	51				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.7	71% 36	24% 12	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	50				
Overall Evaluation	4.7	73% 37	26% 13	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	51				

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Michael L. Wolverton											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 124				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	86% 106	14% 17	0% 0	0% 0	1% 1					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	93% 115	6% 7	0% 0	0% 0	1% 1					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	88% 109	11% 13	1% 1	0% 0	1% 1					
Control over Proceedings	4.9	90% 112	9% 11	0% 0	0% 0	1% 1					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	90% 112	9 11	0% 0	0% 0	1% 1					
Overall Evaluation	4.9	90% 111	10% 12	0% 0	0% 0	1% 1					

Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Mark I. Wood											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 103				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	78% 80	20% 21	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	103				
Respectful/Courteous	4.8	85% 88	14% 14	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	103				
Attentive during Proceedings	4.6	67% 69	28% 29	5% 5	0% 0	0% 0	103				
Control over Proceedings	4.8	79% 81	20% 21	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	103				
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.9	86% 89	13% 13	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	102				
Overall Evaluation	4.8	81% 83	18% 19	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	103				

<p style="text-align: center;">Juror Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Larry C. Zervos</p>											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 57				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	84% 48	12% 7	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0					
Respectful/Courteous	4.9	90% 51	9% 5	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Attentive during Proceedings	4.8	81% 46	18% 10	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Control over Proceedings	4.8	79% 45	19% 11	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Intelligence/Skill as a Judge	4.8	84% 48	14% 8	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	83% 47	16% 9	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0					

Juror Survey - District Court Judge Kevin G. Miller

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.

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.

Type of Proceedings: () **Civil**
 () **Criminal**

Approximately how many days, including deliberations, did you serve as a juror for this judge? _____ **day(s)**

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?

.....

.....

.....