

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

<u>M E M O R A N D U M</u>

TO: Judicial Council

FROM: Staff

DATE: March 17, 2020

RE: Juror Survey Report

The Alaska Judicial Council surveyed all jurors who sat in trials during 2018 and 2019. The jurors sat before all of the 20 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2020. A total of 754 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 JudgeAlaska Judicial Council2020 Retention Juror Survey						
Judge	Civil	Criminal	No Answer	Total		
Christian, Matthew	0	34	0	34		
Crosby, Dani	19	0	1	20		
DiBenedetto, Romano D.	0	26	2	28		
Dickson, Leslie N.	3	72	5	80		
Franciosi, Michael	1	46	1	48		
Guidi, Andrew	25	29	7	61		
Hanley, J. Patrick	4	38	5	47		
Henderson, Jennifer	29	3	0	32		
Lamoureux, Yvonne	15	12	0	27		
Logue, Michael	0	30	1	31		
McCrea, Kari	0	28	3	31		
Miller, Gregory	1	0	0	1		
Montgomery, Will	3	64	14	81		
Peters, Nathaniel	1	21	12	34		
Reigh, Christina	0	43	3	46		
Roetman, Paul A.	4	5	0	9		
Wallace, David	1	35	2	38		
Washington, Pamela S.	1	37	3	41		
Wells, Jennifer	0	39	9	48		
Woodman, Jonathan	0	16	1	17		

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

Table 2:Distribution of Days ServedAlaska Judicial Council2020 Retention Juror Survey				
Number of Days Served	%	N		
1 - 2 Days	20	152		
3 - 4 Days	53	397		
5 - 7 Days	15	114		
8 - 10 Days	6	46		
11 - 20 Days	2	11		
21 or More Days	0	1		
No Answer	4	33		
Total		754		

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 2020 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
Christian, Matthew	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	34
Crosby, Dani	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	20
DiBenedetto, Romano D.	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	28
Dickson, Leslie N.	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	80
Franciosi, Michael	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	48
Guidi, Andrew	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	61
Hanley, J. Patrick	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	47
Henderson, Jennifer	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	32
Lamoureux, Yvonne	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	27
Logue, Michael	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	31
McCrea, Kari	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	31
Miller, Gregory	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	1
Montgomery, Will	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	81
Peters, Nathaniel	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	34
Reigh, Christina	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	46
Roetman, Paul A.	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	9
Wallace, David	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	38
Washington, Pamela S.	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	41
Wells, Jennifer	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.9	48
Woodman, Jonathan	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	17

Juror Survey Results 2020 Retention Evaluation Crosby, Dani							
Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	1	19	20
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	20	20