Sample Memo



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 24, 2006

RE: Appellate Evaluation of Judges Eligible for Retention in 2006

I. Introduction

The Judicial Council staff has several ways of evaluating judges' performance in addition to the surveys it commissions. One way it evaluates judges is to compare how each judge's decisions withstand appellate review.

The review process begins with a staff member, usually the staff attorney, reviewing every published appellate decision and memorandum opinion and judgment after the appellate court releases it. Staff first determines how many issues were on appeal and then decides whether the appellate court "affirmed" each of the trial judge's decisions on appeal. Only decisions specifically "affirmed" are classified as such - decisions requiring reversal, remand or vacating of the trial court judge's ruling or judgment are not classified as "affirmed." Mooted issues and issues arising only upon appeal, which were not ruled on by the trial judge, are not taken into account. When the Supreme Court or Court of Appeals *clearly* overrules a prior statement of law upon which the trial court reasonably relied to decide an issue, that issue is not considered. These cases are very rare.

After deciding how many issues in a case were affirmed, the case is given a score. For instance, if two of ten issues are affirmed, the case is given a score of "20% affirmed." It should be noted that the scoring system is different than the court system's methodology, which notes only