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Procedural-Fairness Interviews
Proceduralfairnessguide.org/interviews

The American Judges Association (AJA) conducted interviews about procedural fairness with nine national leaders on issues involving judges and the courts. The interviews, done by Kansas Court of Appeals Judge and past AJA president Steve Leben, cover the elements of procedural fairness for courts and judges, how judges can improve fairness skills, and how the public reacts to courts and judges.

In addition to the video interviews, in which you’ll watch separate interviews with each of the nine leaders we talked to, there are a series of podcasts that take clips from the other interviews and combine them into audio podcasts on three topics: (1) Improving Judicial Behavior, (2) Procedural Fairness in Judicial Training and Evaluation, and (3) Procedural Fairness as a Model for Modern Authority. These audio podcasts were put together by Justine Greve, a staff member with the Kansas Court of Appeals. They run eight to ten minutes apiece. Just click on the “Podcasts” tab to find them.

The interviews that are available are:

Professor Tom Tyler (15:48): Yale Law School Professor Tom Tyler is the leading scholar in the United States on procedural justice in both law-enforcement and court contexts. He provides an overview of all the basic concepts, along with practical advice for judges to use in the courtroom.

Emily Gold LaGratta (12:14): Emily Gold LaGratta, the Deputy Director of Training and Technical Assistance at the Center for Court Innovation (CCI), discusses CCI projects designed to help implement these principles in specific courts, as well as specific suggestions individual judges can implement.


Terry Maroney (18:14): Vanderbilt Law School Professor Terry Maroney suggests that all judges can get better at dealing with their own emotional reactions as well as those of others. We explore with her what emotions best enhance—or distract from—perceptions of fair treatment.

Dale Lefever (19:31): Now a consultant, Dale Lefever has trained judges and doctors for decades. He discusses how to build better skills, including how to use videotape to evaluate one’s own performance.

Daniel Becker (12:08): Utah State Court Administrator Daniel Becker heads up the administrative structure of a state-court system that has, for many years, regularly surveyed court users in each local judicial district to get data evaluating the procedural fairness of its courts—and then publicized the data and used it to improve court performance. He discusses how such data can be used and how it has been used in Utah.

Kent Wagner (9:16): Kent Wagner serves as the Executive Director of the Colorado Office of Judicial Performance Evaluation; he discusses the types of comments that are commonly made in surveys about judges, and common areas judges might focus on for improvement.

Bert Brandenburg (9:24): Bert Brandenburg was Executive Director of Justice at Stake at the time of this interview. He discussed the extensive work Justice at Stake has done on public opinion about the courts.

Carl Reynolds (5:00): Carl Reynolds, formerly (from 2005 to 2012) the Texas State Court Administrator, discusses the use of measurement tools to assess court performance in fairness, as well as how best to train judges about procedural-fairness concepts.

In addition to these interviews, we also have videotaped statements provided by two state supreme court chief justices about procedural fairness in the courts of their states:

Then-Alaska Chief Justice Dana Fabe (4:09): She tells about the decision to place a poster pledging fairness at the entrance to every courthouse in Alaska.

Utah Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrrant (2:40): He discusses the emphasis the state courts of Utah have placed on procedural fairness, along with specific steps taken by Utah courts and judges.

We hope you find these materials of interest. The project was supported by Grant No. 2010-DD-BX-K034 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance to the American Judges Association. Points of view or opinions expressed in the interviews are those of the speakers and do not represent the views of either AJA or the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.