



The Honorable Michael S. Junk

About the Report

In making its recommendation to voters about whether a judge should be retained, JPEC considers the judge's legal ability, integrity and judicial temperament, administrative skills, procedural fairness, public comment, and judicial discipline records as well as compliance with judicial education, fitness for office, and case-under-advisement time standards. If a judge meets minimum standards, there is a legal presumption that commissioners will vote to recommend the judge be retained. If a judge fails to meet minimum standards, there is a legal presumption that commissioners will vote not to recommend the judge for retention. Included below are the Survey Report and Report of Courtroom Observation. The Survey Report summarizes information collected from attorneys, court employees, jurors (district and some justice court judges only) and juvenile court professionals (juvenile court judges only). Surveys are anonymous and inclusion in the survey is based on court-appearance records. The Report of Courtroom Observation summarizes information reported by at least four trained, volunteer court observers per judge.

Content Links


- Survey Report
 - Survey Results
 - Survey Information
- Report of Courtroom Observation
 - Evaluative Criteria
 - Content Analysis
- How to Read the Results
- Voter Information Pamphlet

Survey Report


Survey Results

For Judge Michael S. Junk, 38 qualified survey respondents agreed they had worked with Judge Junk enough to evaluate the judge's performance. This report reflects these 38 responses. For more information on the survey, please see Survey Information. For more information about the evaluation process, please see How to Read the Results.

Retention Question



Statutory Category Scores



Survey Report

Procedural Fairness Results

The judge must demonstrate by the totality of the circumstances that the judge’s conduct in court promotes procedural fairness for court participants at a level commensurate with the other scored standards.

Table A. Overall Procedural Fairness Determination

Category	Judge Junk
Procedural Fairness	Pass

To determine whether the judge passes the procedural fairness standard, the Commission considers only data collected as part of the performance evaluation, which includes, but is not limited to:

- Courtroom Observation results
- The judge’s disciplinary record
- Survey results (below):

Category	Judge Junk	Justice Court
Procedural Fairness	4.8	4.4



Survey Report

Responses to Survey Questions

Category	Question	Judge Junk	Justice Court
Legal Ability	The judge follows the legal rules (e.g. civil procedure, criminal procedure, evidence, juvenile, appellate) that apply to the case at issue.	4.6	4.3
Legal Ability	The judge made adequate findings of fact and applied the law to those facts.	4.6	4.3
Legal Ability	The judge followed legal precedent or explained departures from precedent.	4.5	4.2
Legal Ability	The judge only considered evidence in the record.	4.5	4.3
Legal Ability	The judge based opinions/decisions on applicable legal principles and controlling law.	4.6	4.2
Legal Ability	The judge's opinions contained a readily understandable ruling.	4.7	4.4

Rated on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)



Survey Report

Responses to Survey Questions (continued)

Category	Question	Judge Junk	Justice Court
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge paid attention to what went on in court.	4.7	4.6
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge's personal life or beliefs did not impair his or her judicial performance.	4.6	4.3
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge conducted proceedings without favoritism.	4.6	4.3
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge considered arguments from all sides before ruling.	4.7	4.4
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge demonstrated diligent work habits.	4.4	4.5
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge maintained a professional demeanor in the courtroom.	4.7	4.5
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge worked to ensure that the participants understood the court proceedings.	4.7	4.6
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge demonstrated respect for the time and expense of those attending court.	4.5	4.4
Integrity & Judicial Temperament	The judge made sure that everyone's behavior in the courtroom was proper.	4.7	4.6

Rated on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)



Survey Report

Responses to Survey Questions (continued)

Category	Question	Judge Junk	Justice Court
Administrative Skills	The judge was prepared for court proceedings.	4.4	4.5
Administrative Skills	The judge's interactions with courtroom participants and staff were professional and constructive.	4.8	4.5
Administrative Skills	The judge ruled in a timely fashion.	4.7	4.6
Administrative Skills	The judge communicated clearly.	4.6	4.6
Administrative Skills	The judge managed the court calendar effectively.	4.5	4.5
Administrative Skills	The judge convened court without undue delay.	4.1	4.4
Category	Question	Judge Junk	Justice Court
Procedural Fairness	The judge treated all courtroom participants with equal respect.	4.8	4.5
Procedural Fairness	The judge performed his or her duties fairly and impartially.	4.7	4.4
Procedural Fairness	The judge promoted public trust and confidence in the courts through his or her conduct.	4.7	4.4
Procedural Fairness	The judge provided the court participants with a meaningful opportunity to be heard.	4.9	4.5

Rated on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)



Survey Report

Attribute Question Summary

Survey respondents rated how well a list of attributes describes the judge. A rating of 1 indicates the descriptor *does not describe the judge at all*, and a rating of 5 indicates the descriptor *describes the judge very well*. For the positive descriptors, a higher average score is better. For the negative descriptors, a lower average score is better.

Descriptor	Judge Junk	Justice Court	
Attentive	4.6	4.5	Positive Attributes HIGHER average score is better
Capable	4.7	4.4	
Ethical	4.8	4.5	
Knowledgeable	4.6	4.4	
Impartial	4.6	4.1	
Open-minded	4.4	4.1	
Disrespectful	1.2	1.7	Negative Attributes LOWER average score is better
Impatient	1.4	2.0	
Indecisive	1.7	1.8	
Unprepared	1.7	1.7	



Survey Information

This report presents the results from the 2019 survey process, conducted by Market Decisions, LLC. A detailed description of the survey methodology is available separately on the Utah Judicial Performance Evaluation website.

Description of Sample

The following groups are invited to participate in the survey process:

- Attorneys with appearances before the judge,
- Court staff who work with the judge,
- Juvenile court professionals who work in the judge's courtroom on a regular and continuing basis to provide substantive input to the judge (juvenile court judges only), and
- Jurors who participate in jury deliberation (district and justice court judges only).

With the exception of the attorney survey, the survey contractor attempts to survey all court staff and juvenile court professionals who work with the judge and all jurors who reach the point of jury deliberation. The lists of court staff and juvenile court professionals are provided by the courts and by the Division of Child and Family Services and Juvenile Justice Services. A list of jurors is created after each trial. All lists are forwarded to the surveyor, Market Decisions, LLC.

For the attorney survey, a representative sample of attorneys is drawn to evaluate each judge based on appearances over a designated time period. The sample is weighted to select those with the greatest experience before the judge, assuming that these people will have a better knowledge base about the judge than those with less experience. Attorneys are first stratified into three groups: those with one or more trial appearances, those with five or more non-trial appearances, and those with fewer than five non-trial appearances. Attorneys within each sample are then randomized prior to selection. Selection begins with attorneys who have trial experience, then those with a greater number of non-trial appearances (if needed), and finally those with fewer non-trial appearances (if needed).

Summary of Survey Methods

Surveys are conducted online, using web-based survey software. Each qualified respondent receives an initial email notification signed by the Chief Justice, the Utah State Bar President, and JPEC Chairperson. Next, an email invitation, signed by JPEC's Executive Director contains a link to access all the individual surveys each respondent is invited to complete. A reminder email is sent one week later to those who did not respond by completing and submitting a survey. This is followed by at least two additional reminder emails sent to respondents over the next three weeks. If a respondent completes only part of the survey, he or she is able to finish the survey at a later time.

The number of questions included in the survey varies, ranging from 9 (jurors) to 35 (attorneys with an appearance before an appellate court judge). Each question is evaluated on a sliding scale ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high).



Survey Information

Responses to individual questions are used to calculate averaged scores in three statutory categories: Legal Ability, Integrity & Judicial Temperament, and Administrative Skills. Judges also receive an average score in Procedural Fairness.

Evaluation Period

The retention evaluation period for judges standing for election in 2020 began on October 1, 2017 and ended on September 30, 2019.



Report of Courtroom Observations

Explanation of Courtroom Observation Summary

SECTION	DESCRIPTION
Overall assessment	<p>The first statement in this section is an overall summary of the entire set of observer comments.</p> <p>The second statement indicates the number of observers indicating that they would feel comfortable appearing before the judge.</p>
Widely agreed-upon themes	<p>Behaviors reported by all (or almost all) observers and thus well established. Deficits mentioned here were also widely reported and therefore merit attention.</p> <p>The subsequent statements are not intended to be a complete summary of the observers' comments, but rather highlight the most frequently noted and forcefully expressed themes, presented in the way that the observers expressed them, with the goal of evoking an overall sense of the entire set of observer comments.</p>
Minority Observations	<p>Behaviors noted by two (or possibly three) observers that would be worth building on (if desirable) or otherwise thinking about avoiding.</p> <p>Not every behavior reported by a minority of observers is summarized here, only those that reflect a notable or somewhat discrepant perspective that was not widely agreed upon.</p>
Anomalous comments	<p>Comments of one (or in rare cases two) observers that reflect a markedly different or decidedly contradictory perspective from all other observers. They are intended to stimulate reflection, such as: why were these observers affected by this behavior, or does this particular situation tend to lead to this uncharacteristic behavior?</p> <p>Not every anomalous comment in the observers' comments are included in this section, typically if they are too minor, or appear to reflect something about the observer rather than the judge.</p>

Paragraphs are introduced with the following terminology.

If the number of observers is specified, e.g. "All observers reported..." or "Three observers reported...", then every statement in the paragraph was mentioned or implied or alluded to by that number of observers.

If the word "variously" is added, e.g. "All observers variously reported..." or "Three observers variously reported...", then not every statement in the paragraph was directly mentioned or implied or alluded to by every one of those observers, but rather the sense of all the statements in the paragraph taken together was.



Report of Courtroom Observations

Evaluative Criteria for Courtroom Observation

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
RESPECT	
Listening & Focus	Listening refers to all indications of attention and engagement through active listening.
Well-prepared & efficient	Efficiency refers to the judge's behaviors. The court's efficiency appears below under "Courtroom tone & atmosphere".
Respect for other's time	This includes the starting time of sessions as well as all interactions with those in court that take into consideration the value of their time.
Courtesy, politeness, and general demeanor	This refers to respectful behaviors generally, as well as behaviors directed at specific individuals that indicate respect for a person's value or status.
Body language	This refers to eye contact and facial expressions, general body language, and engaged behavior.
Voice quality	This refers to both mechanical qualities such as pitch and volume, and emotional qualities such as inexpressive, sarcastic or exasperated tone.
Courtroom tone & atmosphere	This refers more generally to the tone and atmosphere of the courtroom.
NEUTRALITY	
Consistent and equal treatment	This refers to listening to all sides, and treating individuals in similar situations similarly.
Demonstrates concern for individual needs	This refers to concern for individual differences and giving due regard to the individual's specific situation.
Unhurried and careful	This refers to allowing sufficient time for the judge and those in court to conduct themselves in a thorough manner.
VOICE	
Considered voice	This refers both to allowing those in court to express themselves and to the judge's consideration of what was expressed in his/her statements or decision.
Formal voice	This refers to giving voice to participants based only on required procedure without apparent consideration by the judge of what was expressed.



Report of Courtroom Observations

COMMUNICATION

Communicates clearly	This refers both to clarity of speech and to the use of language appropriate to the listener.
Ensures information understood	This refers to active attention by the judge in ensuring those in court understand all information relevant to them, and includes translation and comprehension for non-native English speakers.
Provides adequate explanations	This refers to providing sufficient explanation of the basis of decisions and of legal procedure and terminology to ensure that those in court understand proceedings relevant to them.



Report of Courtroom Observations

Content Analysis

Overall Assessment

- All observers were positive about Judge Junk.
 - All observers reported confidence that if appearing before Judge Junk they would be treated fairly.
-

Widely Agreed-Upon Themes

- All observers variously reported that the courtroom ran on schedule and Judge Junk was efficient and mindful of each participants' time constraints, always asking for times that were best for the next court appearance, and always taking a moment to explain what was happening when he left the courtroom, saying for example, "the interpreter will be here in about fifteen minutes." His favorable demeanor was relaxed but professional, and he put people at ease. He treated everyone in the same calm manner no matter what they looked like or what they were charged with. He was friendly and calm, kind, patient, compassionate, sensitive and principled, but also firm in applying the law. He never displayed impatience or made anyone feel stupid for not understanding court jargon. In one case he continued to be patient towards a belligerent participant with "attitude," never raising his voice or lecturing the participant but providing direction regarding what she could do next. When defendants spoke through an interpreter he made eye contact and spoke to them as if they were speaking in the same language.
 - Judge Junk smiled a lot and made strong, direct eye contact, speaking slowly enough for everyone to understand in a soft but stern and deliberate voice. He never spoke differently to anyone because of their race, gender, or age, and he was consistent in applying his good knowledge of the law. But he was also considerate of defendants' circumstances and wanted them to succeed in meeting commitments to the court, and whenever it was within his power he found a way to accommodate defendants' requests and relieve their stress, including setting the amount of a fine to be paid each month.
 - Judge Junk was deliberate and unhurried when making decisions, and he gave every participant ample time to present their version of events without interrupting them, waiting until they were finished to ask questions or clarifications. He listened and took what they said seriously, distilling different points of view and using the information in his judgments. He spoke simply, directly, and clearly without using legal jargon. Many people were confused, and he was always willing to answer questions or explain a term or procedure, ensuring that everything was completely understood and that they explained any reservations they had. He ensured that participants had read and understood their rights, and in one case he spent several minutes explaining the court procedure to a defendant who had spoken with her lawyer but was still confused, explaining everything as many times as he had to for her to completely understand before pleading. He was methodical in walking through the cases and ensuring that everyone heard the information they needed to hear.
-

Minority Observations: None

Anomalous Comments: None



How to Read the Results

The results are shown in both graphs and tables. Each judge's scores are shown along with a comparison to other judges who serve at the same court level. The comparison group is called "Justice Court" on the charts.

The statutory category scores and the procedural fairness survey score represent average scores on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Responses from all survey respondent groups contribute to the average score shown for each category, with the exception of Legal Ability. Only attorneys answer the Legal Ability questions.

What does it take to "pass"?

The judge must score a minimum of 3.6 on Legal Ability, Integrity & Judicial Temperament, and Administrative Skills to earn a presumption of retention from the Commission. That is, if a judge scores an average of 3.6 in each of these categories, the Commission will vote to recommend retention unless it can articulate a substantial reason for overcoming the presumption in favor of retention. Similarly, if a judge fails to get a 3.6 in a category, the Commission will vote against retention unless it can articulate a substantial reason for overcoming the presumption against retention.

To determine whether the judge passes the Procedural Fairness standard, the Commission considers only data collected as part of the performance evaluation. Judges will receive either a Pass or Fail in procedural fairness, and this determination will be made by the Commission only during the retention cycle.

Respondents are asked whether or not they think the judge should be recommended for retention only during the retention cycle. For midterm evaluations, respondents are asked whether they think the judge would benefit from added training or education.



Justice Court – Full Evaluation*

Visit JUDGES.UTAH.GOV for more information about this judge




Honorable Michael S. Junk

- Serving Ogden Municipal Justice Court, Weber County
- Commission Recommendation: **Retain**
- Commission Vote Count: 13 - 0 (for retention)
- Performance Standards: Passed 8 of 8

Appointed in 2017, Judge Michael Junk’s scores are statistically above the average of his justice court peers on procedural fairness and consistent with his peers on all other scored minimum performance standards. Ninety-seven percent of survey respondents recommend him for retention. Respondents and courtroom observers applaud the judge’s professionalism and procedural fairness, chiefly his ability to provide participants with a meaningful opportunity to be heard. In particular, survey ratings of judicial attributes indicate Judge Junk is capable, ethical, and impartial. They further characterize him as notably respectful and patient. All court observers report confidence that they would be treated fairly if they were to appear in Judge Junk’s court. This judge meets discipline standards set by statute and has been certified by the Judicial Council as meeting all time standards, education requirements, and mental and physical competence standards.

Judge Michael S. Junk was appointed to the Ogden City Justice Court in January of 2017. Judge Junk received a Bachelor of Science in Economics from Weber State University in 1984. He was the outstanding graduate in Economics for 1984-1985. He then received his Juris Doctor from the University Of Utah College Of Law in 1987. Upon graduation, Judge Junk worked in the private practice of law for the law firm of Campbell & Neely. Following his private practice of law, Judge Junk prosecuted for Ogden and Riverdale cities. He also served as the Harrisville City Attorney. For more than twenty years, Judge Junk has also been an adjunct professor for Weber State University in the Business Administration Department. Judge Junk currently serves on the State Uniform Fine and Bail Committee and the Advisory Committee for the 24/7 Pilot Program.



Note: By statute, judges’ scores are compared to the average of their court level peers

*See Judges Section Introduction for Justice Court Information

