



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: 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 Judge Alaska Judicial Council 2020 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 Served Alaska Judicial Council 2020 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

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Christian, Matthew

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	1	2	31	34
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	1	0	0	2	31	34
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	2	31	34
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	1	4	29	34
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	1	3	30	34
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	1	3	30	34

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

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
DiBenedetto, Romano D.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	6	22	28
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	0	5	23	28
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	0	0	1	6	21	28
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	7	21	28
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.7	0	0	0	9	19	28
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	7	21	28

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Dickson, Leslie N.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	1	10	69	80
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	1	9	70	80
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	3	8	69	80
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	1	2	15	62	80
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.7	0	1	1	17	61	80
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	3	13	64	80

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Franciosi, Michael

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	6	41	47
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	2	46	48
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	4	43	48
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	4	44	48
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	4	43	47
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	2	46	48

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Guidi, Andrew

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	2	59	61
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	2	59	61
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	3	58	61
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	3	58	61
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	1	0	60	61
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	1	0	60	61

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Hanley, J. Patrick

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	3	44	47
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	46	47
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	44	47
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	6	41	47
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	4	43	47
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	5	42	47

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Henderson, Jennifer

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	1	31	32
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	31	32
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	31	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 2020
Retention Evaluation
Lamoureux, Yvonne

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	5	22	27
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	26	27
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	26	27
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	1	26	27

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Logue, Michael

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	1	4	26	31
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	1	1	29	31
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	2	28	31
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	2	1	28	31
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	1	2	28	31
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	1	2	28	31

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
McCrea, Kari

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	6	25	31
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	4	27	31
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	28	31
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	0	1	7	23	31
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	0	7	24	31
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	7	24	31

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Miller, Gregory

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

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Montgomery, Will

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.6	0	0	7	20	54	81
Respectful / Courteous	4.7	0	0	5	15	61	81
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	0	0	6	16	59	81
Control Over Proceedings	4.6	0	0	5	20	56	81
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.7	0	0	4	20	57	81
Overall Evaluation	4.6	0	0	5	19	57	81

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Peters, Nathaniel

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.5	0	0	5	7	22	34
Respectful / Courteous	4.5	0	0	3	12	18	33
Attentive During Proceedings	4.5	0	0	3	10	21	34
Control Over Proceedings	4.6	0	0	3	9	22	34
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.5	0	1	2	9	22	34
Overall Evaluation	4.5	0	1	2	8	21	32

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Reigh, Christina

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.7	0	0	1	13	32	46
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	0	8	38	46
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	0	0	1	10	35	46
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	0	2	12	32	46
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	0	9	37	46
Overall Evaluation	4.7	0	0	0	13	33	46

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Roetman, Paul A.

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	4.8	0	0	0	2	7	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	4.8	0	0	0	2	7	9
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	2	7	9

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Wallace, David

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	1	4	33	38
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	2	36	38
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	4	34	38
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	34	37
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	4	34	38
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	5	33	38

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Washington, Pamela S.

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	1	40	41
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	1	40	41
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	1	40	41
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	1	0	2	38	41
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	1	0	0	40	41
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	1	0	0	40	41

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Wells, Jennifer

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	5	43	48
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	2	45	47
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	45	48
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	8	40	48
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	2	46	48
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	3	45	48

Juror Survey Results 2020
Retention Evaluation
Woodman, Jonathan

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	2	15	17
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	1	16	17
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	15	17
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	16	17
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	2	15	17
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	2	15	17

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"/>				
2. Was the judge respectful and courteous?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3. Was the judge attentive during the proceedings?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4. Did the judge exercise appropriate control over the proceedings?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. How would you evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. How would you evaluate the judge overall?	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Do you have any suggestions about how the judge could improve upon his or her performance? _____

