

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT: SENTENCED 2021-2022

PRESUMPTIVE STAYED DISPOSITIONS			
Judicial District	Dispositional Departure		Total
	None	Aggravated	
1	3055	7	3062
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%
2	1408	3	1411
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%
3	1315	2	1317
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%
4	3029	8	3037
	99.7%	0.3%	100.0%
5	1341	4	1345
	99.7%	0.3%	100.0%
6	881	2	883
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%
7	2214	4	2218
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%
8	749	0	749
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
9	2114	3	2117
	99.9%	0.1%	100.0%
10	3086	5	3091
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%
Total	19192	38	19230
	99.8%	0.2%	100.0%

PRESUMPTIVE PRISON DISPOSITIONS			
Judicial District	Dispositional Departure		Total
	None	Mitigated	
1	780	591	1371
	56.9%	43.1%	100.0%
2	704	743	1447
	48.7%	51.3%	100.0%
3	470	366	836
	56.2%	43.8%	100.0%
4	1323	996	2319
	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
5	390	254	644
	60.6%	39.4%	100.0%
6	292	252	544
	53.7%	46.3%	100.0%
7	823	454	1277
	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%
8	205	92	297
	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%
9	725	350	1075
	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
10	903	745	1648
	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
Total	6615	4843	11458
	57.7%	42.3%	100.0%

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 19,230 (62.7%) cases sentenced statewide had a presumptive stayed disposition. 38 (0.2%) received an aggravated dispositional departure. Seven (18.4%) of the 38 people requested execution of their sentence. Aggravated dispositional departure rates are displayed by judicial district in columns A-D.

Effective for crimes committed on or after August 1, 2015, a sentence that is executed pursuant to an offender's right to demand execution is no longer considered an aggravated dispositional departure.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

From 2021-2022, 11,458 people sentenced statewide had a presumptive prison disposition. 4,843 (42.3%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 2,871 cases (59.3%). Columns F-I display the mitigated dispositional departure rate by judicial district.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

From 2021-2022, 7,263 (23.7%) people received prison. Of the 7,263 people who received prison, 186 (2.6%) received an aggravated durational departure and 1,425 (19.6%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns S-W display durational departure rates by judicial district.

RECEIVED PRISON				
Judicial District	Durational Departure			Total
	None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
1	674	40	163	877
	76.9%	4.6%	18.6%	100.0%
2	421	11	313	745
	56.5%	1.5%	42.0%	100.0%
3	478	14	39	531
	90.0%	2.6%	7.3%	100.0%
4	834	38	493	1365
	61.1%	2.8%	36.1%	100.0%
5	385	11	53	449
	85.7%	2.4%	11.8%	100.0%
6	284	3	26	313
	90.7%	1.0%	8.3%	100.0%
7	767	28	136	931
	82.4%	3.0%	14.6%	100.0%
8	220	7	11	238
	92.4%	2.9%	4.6%	100.0%
9	764	14	72	850
	89.9%	1.6%	8.5%	100.0%
10	825	20	119	964
	85.6%	2.1%	12.3%	100.0%
Total	5652	186	1425	7263
	77.8%	2.6%	19.6%	100.0%

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent offenders rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 1, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Abrams	Jerome B.	5	2	7
		71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Asphaug	Karen		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Bayley	Douglas C.	19	36	55
		34.5%	65.5%	100.0%
Biren	Patrick M.	15	26	41
		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
Braaten	Eric J.	21	12	33
		63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
Cain	Janet L. Barke	8	5	13
		61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
Carolan	Robert F.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Carter	Joseph T.	7	5	12
		58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
Clark	Lawrence F.	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Cork	Jamie L.	20	10	30
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Donley	Amber R.	16	15	31
		51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
Duncan	Karen R.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Edwards	Dannia L.	26	9	35
		74.3%	25.7%	100.0%
Ehrman	Bryce A.D.	7	3	10
		70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Eide	Kevin W.	4	2	6
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Engisch	Nicole A.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Fallon	Martin S.	15	2	17
		88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
Gearin	Kathleen R.	2	2	4
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Goggins	Patrick	6	13	19
		31.6%	68.4%	100.0%
King	Colleen G	31	17	48
		64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
Knutson	David L.	8	7	15
		53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
Landrum	Kathryn Iverson	1	3	4
		25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Lehmann	Christopher J.	34	35	69
		49.3%	50.7%	100.0%
Lennon	Caroline H.	44	25	69
		63.8%	36.2%	100.0%
Looby	Timothy J.	3	1	4
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Lutz	David N.	13	8	21
		61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
Maher	Jessica J.W.	8	17	25
		32.0%	68.0%	100.0%
Mark	Kevin F.	19	18	37
		51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
Mayer	Michael J.	17	16	33
		51.5%	48.5%	100.0%
McCollum	Cynthia L.	13	18	31
		41.9%	58.1%	100.0%
McManus	Timothy J.	42	37	79
		53.2%	46.8%	100.0%
Messerich	Kathryn Davis	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Metzen	Leslie M.	2	7	9
		22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
Moynihan	Shawn M.	15	17	32
		46.9%	53.1%	100.0%
Neisen	Christopher A.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
O'Brien	Tanya O.	56	26	82
		68.3%	31.7%	100.0%
Offermann	Ann M.	36	12	48
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Perkins	Richard C.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Perkkio	Arlene	22	31	53
		41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
Perzel	Tracy	9	7	16
		56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
Pugh	Thomas W.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Sorensen Green	Stacey E.	8	6	14
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Stacey	Rex D.	6	4	10
		60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Taylor	Vicki V.	41	27	68
		60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
Vandelist	Mark C.	28	16	44
		63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
Vraa	Paula D.	19	7	26
		73.1%	26.9%	100.0%
Wahi	Richelle M.		2	2
			100.0%	100.0%
Webber	Charles	21	5	26
		80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
Wentzell	Michael	25	15	40
		62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Wermager	Tim D.	31	22	53
		58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
Wilton	Christan S.	34	20	54
		63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
Winters	Jody L.	17	18	35
		48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 1 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		780	591	1371
		56.9%	43.1%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 3,062 people in the 1st District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Seven (0.2%) received an aggravated dispositional departure. One of the four people requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 1,371 people in the 1st District had a presumptive prison disposition. 591 (43.1%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 222 cases (37.6%). Columns A - E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

In 2021-2022, 877 people in the 1st District received prison. Of the 877 people who received prison, 40 (4.6%) received an aggravated durational departure and 163 (18.6%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O - T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent offenders rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total Prison
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Abrams	Jerome B.	3		2	5
		60.0%		40.0%	100.0%
Bayley	Douglas C.	17		3	20
		85.0%		15.0%	100.0%
Biren	Patrick M.	14	1	5	20
		70.0%	5.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Braaten	Eric J.	18	1	4	23
		78.3%	4.3%	17.4%	100.0%
Cain	Janet L.	7	1	2	10
		70.0%	10.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Carter	Joseph T.	4	2	3	9
		44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	100.0%
Clark	Lawrence F.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Cork	Jamie L.	14	1	7	22
		63.6%	4.5%	31.8%	100.0%
Donley	Amber R.	15	3	3	21
		71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
Duncan	Karen R.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Edwards	Dannia L.	19	4	8	31
		61.3%	12.9%	25.8%	100.0%
Ehrman	Bryce A.D.	7		4	11
		63.6%		36.4%	100.0%
Eide	Kevin W.	3		1	4
		75.0%		25.0%	100.0%
Fallon	Martin S.	14	1	2	17
		82.4%	5.9%	11.8%	100.0%
Gearin	Kathleen R.	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Goggins	Patrick	6	1	2	9
		66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	100.0%
King	Colleen G	27	1	5	33
		81.8%	3.0%	15.2%	100.0%
Knutson	David L.	7		1	8
		87.5%		12.5%	100.0%
Landrum	Kathryn	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Lehmann	Christopher	35	1	5	41
		85.4%	2.4%	12.2%	100.0%
Lennon	Caroline H.	42	4	7	53
		79.2%	7.5%	13.2%	100.0%
Looby	Timothy J.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
Lutz	David N.	8	1	6	15
		53.3%	6.7%	40.0%	100.0%
Maher	Jessica J.W.	7		2	9
		77.8%		22.2%	100.0%
Mark	Kevin F.	16		5	21
		76.2%		23.8%	100.0%
Mayer	Michael J.	14	2	4	20
		70.0%	10.0%	20.0%	100.0%
McCollum	Cynthia L.	10		4	14
		71.4%		28.6%	100.0%
McManus	Timothy J.	29	1	15	45
		64.4%	2.2%	33.3%	100.0%
Messerich	Kathryn	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Metzen	Leslie M.	2		1	3
		66.7%		33.3%	100.0%
Moynihan	Shawn M.	13	1	2	16
		81.3%	6.3%	12.5%	100.0%
Neisen	Christopher	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
O'Brien	Tanya O.	50	4	5	59
		84.7%	6.8%	8.5%	100.0%
Offermann	Ann M.	31		6	37
		83.8%		16.2%	100.0%
Perkins	Richard C.	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Perkkio	Arlene	21		4	25
		84.0%		16.0%	100.0%
Perzel	Tracy	9			9
		100.0%			100.0%
Pugh	Thomas W.	1	1		2
		50.0%	50.0%		100.0%
Sorensen	Stacey E.	4		5	9
		44.4%		55.6%	100.0%
Stacey	Rex D.	4		2	6
		66.7%		33.3%	100.0%
Taylor	Vicki V.	34	3	7	44
		77.3%	6.8%	15.9%	100.0%
Vandelist	Mark C.	28	2	2	32
		87.5%	6.3%	6.3%	100.0%
Vraa	Paula D.	18		4	22
		81.8%		18.2%	100.0%
Webber	Charles	18	1	4	23
		78.3%	4.3%	17.4%	100.0%
Wentzell	Michael	24		2	26
		92.3%		7.7%	100.0%
Wermager	Tim D.	20	1	12	33
		60.6%	3.0%	36.4%	100.0%
Wilton	Christian S.	32	2	4	38
		84.2%	5.3%	10.5%	100.0%
Winters	Jody L.	17		3	20
		85.0%		15.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 1 RECEIVED PRISON		674	40	163	877
		76.9%	4.6%	18.6%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 2, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Aligada, Jr.	Reynaldo A.	35	49	84
		41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
Awsumb	Robert	21	27	48
		43.8%	56.3%	100.0%
Barnette	Toddrick S.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Bartscher	Joy D.	60	68	128
		46.9%	53.1%	100.0%
Bartsh	Shawn M.	3	1	4
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Brown	David C.	35	31	66
		53.0%	47.0%	100.0%
Carey	Timothy P.	10	11	21
		47.6%	52.4%	100.0%
Castro	Leonardo	10	6	16
		62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Charles	Kellie M.	59	54	113
		52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
Diamond	Patrick	7	13	20
		35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
Gilligan, Jr.	Thomas A.	2	1	3
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Gordon	Andrew	26	20	46
		56.5%	43.5%	100.0%
Grewing	Sara R.	3		3
		100.0%		100.0%
Guthmann	John H.	28	21	49
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Harris	JaPaul J.	28	42	70
		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Hilgers	DeAnne	17	10	27
		63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
Ireland	Mark	4		4
		100.0%		100.0%
Kraus	Jacob R.	14	6	20
		70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Kyle, Jr.	Richard H.	47	52	99
		47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
Millenacker	Robyn A.	2	2	4
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Mitchell	Maria S.	4	5	9
		44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
Moore	James A.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Mulrooney	Timothy T.	4		4
		100.0%		100.0%
Nelson	Laura E.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Olmstead	Kelly	60	35	95
		63.2%	36.8%	100.0%
Ostby	Elena L.	20	31	51
		39.2%	60.8%	100.0%
Poston	Janet Nordell	6	2	8
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Reding	Jeannice M.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Rosas	Salvador M.	7		7
		100.0%		100.0%
Sheu	Edward P.	25	41	66
		37.9%	62.1%	100.0%
Smith	Joanne M.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Smith	Stephen L.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Starr	Nicole J.	32	54	86
		37.2%	62.8%	100.0%
Stephenson	George T.	27	59	86
		31.4%	68.6%	100.0%
Tiisen	Judith M.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Vuelo	Sophia Y.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Warner	Teresa R.	18	19	37
		48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
Yang	Adam C.	33	24	57
		57.9%	42.1%	100.0%
Yang	P. Paul	49	56	105
		46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 2 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		704	743	1447
		48.7%	51.3%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

From 2021-2022, 1,411 people in the 2nd District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Three received an aggravated dispositional departure. One of three people requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

From 2021-2022, 1,447 people in the 2nd District had a presumptive prison disposition. 743 (51.3%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 522 cases (70.3%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

From 2021-2022, 745 cases in the 2nd District received prison. Of the 745 people who received prison, 11 (1.5%) received an aggravated durational departure and 313 (42.0%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Aligada, Jr.	Reynaldo A.	19		17	36
		52.8%		47.2%	100.0%
Awsumb	Robert	10		11	21
		47.6%		52.4%	100.0%
Bartscher	Joy D.	30	1	30	61
		49.2%	1.6%	49.2%	100.0%
Bartsh	Shawn M.	1		2	3
		33.3%		66.7%	100.0%
Brown	David C.	21	1	17	39
		53.8%	2.6%	43.6%	100.0%
Carey	Timothy P.	7	1	3	11
		63.6%	9.1%	27.3%	100.0%
Castro	Leonardo	8	1	1	10
		80.0%	10.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Charles	Kellie M.	44		19	63
		69.8%		30.2%	100.0%
Diamond	Patrick	2		4	6
		33.3%		66.7%	100.0%
Gilligan, Jr.	Thomas A.	1		1	2
		50.0%		50.0%	100.0%
Gordon	Andrew	10		16	26
		38.5%		61.5%	100.0%
Grewing	Sara R.	2	1		3
		66.7%	33.3%		100.0%
Guthmann	John H.	20		10	30
		66.7%		33.3%	100.0%
Harris	JaPaul J.	13	1	17	31
		41.9%	3.2%	54.8%	100.0%
Hilgers	DeAnne	7		12	19
		36.8%		63.2%	100.0%
Ireland	Mark	4			4
		100.0%			100.0%
Kraus	Jacob R.	11		3	14
		78.6%		21.4%	100.0%
Kyle, Jr.	Richard H.	31	2	15	48
		64.6%	4.2%	31.3%	100.0%
Millenacker	Robyn A.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
Mitchell	Maria S.	3		2	5
		60.0%		40.0%	100.0%
Moore	James A.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Mulrooney	Timothy T.	2		2	4
		50.0%		50.0%	100.0%
Nelson	Laura E.	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Olmstead	Kelly	38		30	68
		55.9%		44.1%	100.0%
Ostby	Elena L.	10		11	21
		47.6%		52.4%	100.0%
Poston	Janet Nordell	3		4	7
		42.9%		57.1%	100.0%
Rosas	Salvador M.	2		6	8
		25.0%		75.0%	100.0%
Sheu	Edward P.	10		14	24
		41.7%		58.3%	100.0%
Smith	Joanne M.	0		1	1
		0.0%		100.0%	100.0%
Smith	Stephen L.	1		1	2
		50.0%		50.0%	100.0%
Starr	Nicole J.	22		13	35
		62.9%		37.1%	100.0%
Stephenson	George T.	17	1	12	30
		56.7%	3.3%	40.0%	100.0%
Vuelo	Sophia Y.	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Warner	Teresa R.	11		8	19
		57.9%		42.1%	100.0%
Yang	Adam C.	29	1	6	36
		80.6%	2.8%	16.7%	100.0%
Yang	P. Paul	24	1	25	50
		48.0%	2.0%	50.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 2 RECEIVED PRISON		421	11	313	745
		56.5%	1.5%	42.0%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 3, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Allen	Jacob C.	16	18	34
		47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
Anderson	Karie M.	14	20	34
		41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
Birnbaum	Robert	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Bueltel	Joseph A.	18	10	28
		64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
Buytendorp	Nancy L.	13	19	32
		40.6%	59.4%	100.0%
Cajacob	John T.	7	8	15
		46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
Chase	Joseph F.	35	30	65
		53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
Daily	Christa M.	24	10	34
		70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
Duncan	Karen R.	37	19	56
		66.1%	33.9%	100.0%
Hanks	Carol M.	12	21	33
		36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
Hayne	Lisa R.	28	23	51
		54.9%	45.1%	100.0%
Hormann	Christy	7	4	11
		63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
Jacobson	Debra A.	2	1	3
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Johnson	Jeffrey M.	8	8	16
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
King	Pamela A.W.	15	15	30
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Kritzer	Jeffrey M.	39	18	57
		68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
Lange	Steven Z.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Larson	Gary R.	3		3
		100.0%		100.0%
Leahy	Mary C.	10	15	25
		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Leuning	Ross L.	26	9	35
		74.3%	25.7%	100.0%
Long	Christine A.	14	7	21
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Lund	Kevin	5	2	7
		71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Martinez	Natalie S.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Neisen	Christopher A.	13	17	30
		43.3%	56.7%	100.0%
Opat	Matthew J.	11	17	28
		39.3%	60.7%	100.0%
Schwab	Steven	7	5	12
		58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
Siefken	Kevin H.	42	7	49
		85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Stevens	Christina Kilbo	16	12	28
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Sturino	Carmaine M.	7	7	14
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Wallace	Katherine M.	13	30	43
		30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
Walters	Terrence M.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Wernick	Mark S.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Wieners	Joseph F.	5	1	6
		83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Williamson	Jodi L.	14	13	27
		51.9%	48.1%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 3 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		470	366	836
		56.2%	43.8%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 1,317 people in the 3rd District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Two received an aggravated dispositional departure. Both people that received an aggravated dispositional departure requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 836 people in the 3rd District had a presumptive prison disposition. 366 (43.8%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 185 cases (50.5%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Offenders Receiving Prison

In 2021-2022, 531 people in the 3rd District received prison. Of the 531 people who received prison, 14 (2.6%) received an aggravated durational departure and 39 (7.3%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O - T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Allen	Jacob C.	14	1		15
		93.3%	6.7%		100.0%
Anderson	Karie M.	15	2	1	18
		83.3%	11.1%	5.6%	100.0%
Birnbaum	Robert	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Bueltel	Joseph A.	18		3	21
		85.7%		14.3%	100.0%
Buytendorp	Nancy L.	14		3	17
		82.4%		17.6%	100.0%
Cajacob	John T.	6		1	7
		85.7%		14.3%	100.0%
Chase	Joseph F.	31	2	3	36
		86.1%	5.6%	8.3%	100.0%
Daily	Christa M.	24		1	25
		96.0%		4.0%	100.0%
Duncan	Karen R.	41			41
		100.0%			100.0%
Hanks	Carol M.	12		1	13
		92.3%		7.7%	100.0%
Hayne	Lisa R.	25		4	29
		86.2%		13.8%	100.0%
Hormann	Christy	8			8
		100.0%			100.0%
Jacobson	Debra A.	1		1	2
		50.0%		50.0%	100.0%
Johnson	Jeffrey M.	11			11
		100.0%			100.0%
King	Pamela A.W.	17			17
		100.0%			100.0%
Kritzer	Jeffrey M.	41		1	42
		97.6%		2.4%	100.0%
Lange	Steven Z.	2	1		3
		66.7%	33.3%		100.0%
Larson	Gary R.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
Leahy	Mary C.	6	2	3	11
		54.5%	18.2%	27.3%	100.0%
Leuning	Ross L.	25		2	27
		92.6%		7.4%	100.0%
Long	Christine A.	17	1		18
		94.4%	5.6%		100.0%
Lund	Kevin	3	1	1	5
		60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Martinez	Natalie S.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
Neisen	Christopher	14	1	4	19
		73.7%	5.3%	21.1%	100.0%
Opat	Matthew J.	12		1	13
		92.3%		7.7%	100.0%
Schwab	Steven	11			11
		100.0%			100.0%
Siefken	Kevin H.	43		1	44
		97.7%		2.3%	100.0%
Stevens	Christina	16		1	17
		94.1%		5.9%	100.0%
Sturino	Carmaine M.	9	1		10
		90.0%	10.0%		100.0%
Wallace	Katherine M.	13		2	15
		86.7%		13.3%	100.0%
Walters	Terrence M.	2		1	3
		66.7%		33.3%	100.0%
Wernick	Mark S.		1		1
			100.0%		100.0%
Wieners	Joseph F.	3	1	2	6
		50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Williamson	Jodi L.	16		2	18
		88.9%		11.1%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 3 RECEIVED PRISON		478	14	39	531
		90.0%	2.6%	7.3%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 4, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Aligada, Jr.	Reynaldo A.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Allyn	Julie E.	55	43	98
		56.1%	43.9%	100.0%
Andow	Anna	22	23	45
		48.9%	51.1%	100.0%
Askalani	Shereen	30	13	43
		69.8%	30.2%	100.0%
Barnette	Toddrick S.	4	4	8
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Bartolomei	Luis	21	21	42
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Bartscher	Joy D.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Brandt	Gina M.	16	32	48
		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Bransford	Tanya M.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Burns	Michael E.	33	15	48
		68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
Cahill	Peter A.	67	26	93
		72.0%	28.0%	100.0%
Caligiuri	Hilary L.	81	35	116
		69.8%	30.2%	100.0%
Chou	Marta M.	38	57	95
		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Chu	Regina M.	55	26	81
		67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
Conley	Thomas J.	33	15	48
		68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
Conroy	Lois R.	11	4	15
		73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
Couri	Theresa	12	12	24
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Cutter	Elizabeth V.	7	4	11
		63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
Dawson	Amy E.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Dayton Klein	Julia	14	16	30
		46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
Engisch	Nicole A.	66	43	109
		60.6%	39.4%	100.0%
Fellman	Todd M.	9	16	25
		36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
Garcia	Tamara G.	82	27	109
		75.2%	24.8%	100.0%
Hatcher	Michelle A.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Holton Dimick	Martha A.	30	22	52
		57.7%	42.3%	100.0%
Hoyos	Juan G.	41	29	70
		58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
Hughey	Rachel	12	7	19
		63.2%	36.8%	100.0%
Janzen	Lisa K.		3	3
			100.0%	100.0%
Kappelhoff	Mark	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Koch	William H.	73	58	131
		55.7%	44.3%	100.0%
Lamas	Carolina A.	86	55	141
		61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
Logering	Nancy	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Magill	Frank J.	2	1	3
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Manning	Bruce D.	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Meyer	Kerry W.	120	117	237
		50.6%	49.4%	100.0%
Miller	Laurie J.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Moreno	Daniel C.	73	47	120
		60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
Norris	Lyonel		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Olmstead	Kelly	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Quaintance	Kathryn	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Quam	Jay M.	76	61	137
		55.5%	44.5%	100.0%
Reding	Jeannice M.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Routel	Colette	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Scoggin	Paul R.	91	64	155
		58.7%	41.3%	100.0%
Sheehy	Kathleen D.	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Thomas	Laura Marie	13	27	40
		32.5%	67.5%	100.0%
Utley	Maximillia	13	26	39
		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Warner	Teresa R.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
West	Sarah S.	18	30	48
		37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Willms	Angela J.	5	10	15
		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 4 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		1323	996	2319
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions
Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures
From 2021-2022, 3,037 people in the 4th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Eight received an aggravated dispositional departure. None of the cases indicated defendant requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures
From 2021-2022, 2,319 people in the 4th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 996 (42.9%) cases received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 729 cases (85.6%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison
From 2021-2022, 1,365 people in the 4th District received prison. Of the 1,365 prison cases, 38 (2.8%) received an aggravated durational departure and 493 (36.1%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Aligada, Jr.	Reynaldo A.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Allyn	Julie E.	29	1	25	55
		52.7%	1.8%	45.5%	100.0%
Andow	Anna	17		8	25
		68.0%		32.0%	100.0%
Askalani	Shereen	17		13	30
		56.7%		43.3%	100.0%
Barnette	Toddrick S.	2		2	4
		50.0%		50.0%	100.0%
Bartolomei	Luis	10		11	21
		47.6%		52.4%	100.0%
Bartscher	Joy D.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Brandt	Gina M.	11		7	18
		61.1%		38.9%	100.0%
Bransford	Tanya M.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Burns	Michael E.	22		12	34
		64.7%		35.3%	100.0%
Cahill	Peter A.	49	3	17	69
		71.0%	4.3%	24.6%	100.0%
Caligiuri	Hilary L.	58	1	26	85
		68.2%	1.2%	30.6%	100.0%
Chou	Marta M.	20	2	16	38
		52.6%	5.3%	42.1%	100.0%
Chu	Regina M.	36	2	22	60
		60.0%	3.3%	36.7%	100.0%
Conley	Thomas J.	22		12	34
		64.7%		35.3%	100.0%
Conroy	Lois R.	8		3	11
		72.7%		27.3%	100.0%
Couri	Theresa	9		5	14
		64.3%		35.7%	100.0%
Cutter	Elizabeth V.	3	1	3	7
		42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
Dawson	Amy E.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Dayton Klein	Julia	9		6	15
		60.0%		40.0%	100.0%
Engisch	Nicole A.	37	5	25	67
		55.2%	7.5%	37.3%	100.0%
Fellman	Todd M.	3	2	5	10
		30.0%	20.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Garcia	Tamara G.	47	3	32	82
		57.3%	3.7%	39.0%	100.0%
Holton Dimick	Martha A.	15	2	13	30
		50.0%	6.7%	43.3%	100.0%
Hoyos	Juan G.	34	1	8	43
		79.1%	2.3%	18.6%	100.0%
Hughey	Rachel	9		4	13
		69.2%		30.8%	100.0%
Kappelhoff	Mark			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Koch	William H.	48	3	26	77
		62.3%	3.9%	33.8%	100.0%
Lamas	Carolina A.	56	2	28	86
		65.1%	2.3%	32.6%	100.0%
Logering	Nancy	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Magill	Frank J.	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Manning	Bruce D.	1		1	2
		50.0%		50.0%	100.0%
Meyer	Kerry W.	60	2	62	124
		48.4%	1.6%	50.0%	100.0%
Moreno	Daniel C.	47	1	26	74
		63.5%	1.4%	35.1%	100.0%
Olmstead	Kelly		1		1
			100.0%		100.0%
Quaintance	Kathryn	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Quam	Jay M.	52	3	25	80
		65.0%	3.8%	31.3%	100.0%
Reding	Jeannice M.			2	2
				100.0%	100.0%
Routel	Colette			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Scoggin	Paul R.	66	2	26	94
		70.2%	2.1%	27.7%	100.0%
Sheehy	Kathleen D.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Thomas	Laura Marie	10	1	3	14
		71.4%	7.1%	21.4%	100.0%
Utley	Maximillia	8		5	13
		61.5%		38.5%	100.0%
West	Sarah S.	9		7	16
		56.3%		43.8%	100.0%
Willms	Angela J.	4		1	5
		80.0%		20.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 4 RECEIVED PRISON		834	38	493	1365
		61.1%	2.8%	36.1%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 5, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Anderson	Douglas P.	0	2	2
		0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Anderson	Gregory J.	31	11	42
		73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Bentz	Darci J.	11	14	25
		44.0%	56.0%	100.0%
Bettters	Mark E.	27	10	37
		73.0%	27.0%	100.0%
Dietrich	Michelle A.	25	12	37
		67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
Docherty	Robert A.	30	13	43
		69.8%	30.2%	100.0%
Ferrazzano	Stephen J.	10	15	25
		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Haley	Sherry	38	16	54
		70.4%	29.6%	100.0%
Jass	Krista J.	23	8	31
		74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
Johnson	Kurt D.	26	20	46
		56.5%	43.5%	100.0%
Krehbiel	Allison L.	19	15	34
		55.9%	44.1%	100.0%
Kundrat	Frank J.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Lieser	Andrea J.	11	2	13
		84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
Rohland	Patrick	38	10	48
		79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
Timmerman	Troy G.	11	6	17
		64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
Trushenski	Michael D.	26	22	48
		54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
Vajgrt	Terry S.	11	17	28
		39.3%	60.7%	100.0%
Walker	Bradley C.	3	1	4
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Westphal	Todd W.	16	8	24
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Wietzema	Christina M.	16	29	45
		35.6%	64.4%	100.0%
Zimmer	Tricia B.	18	22	40
		45.0%	55.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 5 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		390	254	644
		60.6%	39.4%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

From 2021-2022, 1,345 people in the 5th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Four received an aggravated dispositional departure. One of the four people requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

From 2021-2022, 644 people in the 5th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 254 (39.4%) cases received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 177 cases (86.8%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

From 2021-2022, 449 people in the 5th District received prison. Of the 232 people who received prison, 11 (2.4%) received an aggravated durational departure and 53 (11.8%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Anderson	Gregory J.	29	1	5	35
		82.9%	2.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Bentz	Darci J.	7			6
		53.8%		46.2%	100.0%
Bettters	Mark E.	27	1	3	31
		87.1%	3.2%	9.7%	100.0%
Clark	Lawrence F.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Dietrich	Michelle A.	20	3	2	25
		80.0%	12.0%	8.0%	100.0%
Docherty	Robert A.	32	1	1	34
		94.1%	2.9%	2.9%	100.0%
Ferrazzano	Stephen J.	12			4
		75.0%		25.0%	100.0%
Haley	Sherry	39	1	4	44
		88.6%	2.3%	9.1%	100.0%
Jass	Krista J.	24			1
		96.0%		4.0%	100.0%
Johnson	Kurt D.	22			5
		81.5%		18.5%	100.0%
Krehbiel	Allison L.	21			4
		84.0%		16.0%	100.0%
Lieser	Andrea J.	9			3
		75.0%		25.0%	100.0%
Rohland	Patrick	43	1	2	46
		93.5%	2.2%	4.3%	100.0%
Timmerman	Troy G.	12			12
		100.0%			100.0%
Trushenski	Michael D.	22	1	9	32
		68.8%	3.1%	28.1%	100.0%
Vajgrt	Terry S.	12			1
		92.3%		7.7%	100.0%
Walker	Bradley C.	3			1
		75.0%		25.0%	100.0%
Westphal	Todd W.	17			17
		100.0%			100.0%
Wietzema	Christina M.	17	1	1	19
		89.5%	5.3%	5.3%	100.0%
Zimmer	Tricia B.	16	1	1	18
		88.9%	5.6%	5.6%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 5 RECEIVED PRISON		385	11	53	449
		85.7%	2.4%	11.8%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 6, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Anderson	Michelle M.	16	13	29
		55.2%	44.8%	100.0%
Beiers	Leslie E.	13	20	33
		39.4%	60.6%	100.0%
Conkel	Terrence E.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Cuzzo	Michael J.	7	10	17
		41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
DeSanto	John E.		2	2
			100.0%	100.0%
Eichenwald	Jill A.	17	13	30
		56.7%	43.3%	100.0%
Friday	Robert C.	24	14	38
		63.2%	36.8%	100.0%
Harris	Dale O.	18	15	33
		54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
Hayes	Thomas	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Hylden	Eric	13	10	23
		56.5%	43.8%	100.0%
Johnson	David M.	37	32	69
		53.6%	46.4%	100.0%
Larson	Gary R.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Lukasavitz	Amy E.	14	5	19
		73.7%	26.3%	100.0%
Macaulay	Robert E.	5	9	14
		35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
Maturi	Jon		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Munger	Mark A.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Neo	Theresa M.	15	13	28
		53.6%	46.4%	100.0%
Pattni	Bhupesh	16	9	25
		64.0%	36.0%	100.0%
Pearson	Shawn L.	7	13	20
		35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
Peterson	Andrew R.	18	12	30
		60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Starr	Mark M.	3	1	4
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Stumme	Rebekka Lynn	16	15	31
		51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
Sullivan	Rachel C.	18	14	32
		56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
Tarnowski	Sally L.	23	27	50
		46.0%	54.0%	100.0%
Wolf	Dale A.	9	3	12
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 6		292	252	544
PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		53.7%	46.3%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 883 cases in the 6th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Two received an aggravated dispositional departure. Neither requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 544 cases in the 6th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 252 (46.3%) cases received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 153 cases (75.7%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

In 2021-2022, 313 cases in the 6th District received prison. Of the 171 people who received prison, 3 (1.0%) received an aggravated durational departure and 26 (8.3%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Anderson	Michelle M.	15		4	19
		78.9%		21.1%	100.0%
Beiers	Leslie E.	14		1	15
		93.3%		6.7%	100.0%
Conkel	Terrence E.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Cuzzo	Michael J.	7			7
		100.0%			100.0%
Eichenwald	Jill A.	17			17
		100.0%			100.0%
Friday	Robert C.	24		2	26
		92.3%		7.7%	100.0%
Harris	Dale O.	17		2	19
		89.5%		10.5%	100.0%
Hayes	Thomas	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Hylden	Eric	11	1	1	13
		84.6%	7.7%	7.7%	100.0%
Johnson	David M.	40		1	41
		97.6%		2.4%	100.0%
Larson	Gary R.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Lukasavitz	Amy E.	13		2	15
		86.7%		13.3%	100.0%
Macaulay	Robert E.	4		2	6
		66.7%		33.3%	100.0%
Neo	Theresa M.	14		1	15
		93.3%		6.7%	100.0%
Pattni	Bhupesh	18			18
		100.0%			100.0%
Pearson	Shawn L.	7		1	8
		87.5%		12.5%	100.0%
Peterson	Andrew R.	17	1	1	19
		89.5%	5.3%	5.3%	100.0%
Starr	Mark M.	2		1	3
		66.7%		33.3%	100.0%
Stumme	Rebekka Lynn	11		5	16
		68.8%		31.3%	100.0%
Sullivan	Rachel C.	18		1	19
		94.7%		5.3%	100.0%
Tarnowski	Sally L.	24	1		25
		96.0%	4.0%		100.0%
Wolf	Dale A.	9			9
		100.0%			100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 6 RECEIVED PRISON		284	3	26	313
		90.7%	1.0%	8.3%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 7, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Anderson	Douglas P.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Benson	Daniel A.	13	1	14
		92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
Benson	Sharon G.	18	33	51
		35.3%	64.7%	100.0%
Caligiuri	Hilary L.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Carlson	Jay D.	31	9	40
		77.5%	22.5%	100.0%
Cashman	William J.	27	15	42
		64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
Churchwell	Timothy M.	18	7	25
		72.0%	28.0%	100.0%
Clark	Douglas B.	30	15	45
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Clark	Michelle L.	14	10	24
		58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
Davick-Halfen	Kris	14	18	32
		43.8%	56.3%	100.0%
duCharme	Leah J.	2	1	3
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Engelking	Matthew E.	31	11	42
		73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Fritz	Michael D.	30	14	44
		68.2%	31.8%	100.0%
Grunke	Frederick L.	2		2
		100.0%		100.0%
Gustafson	Amber B.	13	4	17
		76.5%	23.5%	100.0%
Hennesy	Sarah E.	24	11	35
		68.6%	31.4%	100.0%
Herzing	Mark J.	22	20	42
		52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
Jesse	Michael S.	38	13	51
		74.5%	25.5%	100.0%
Judd	Johnathan R.	9	16	25
		36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
Kulick	Gail T.	11	11	22
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Lawson	Michelle W.	44	13	57
		77.2%	22.8%	100.0%
Mahler	Mary B.	49	20	69
		71.0%	29.0%	100.0%
Merkins	Tammy L.	46	11	57
		80.7%	19.3%	100.0%
Miller	Kevin M.	27	20	47
		57.4%	42.6%	100.0%
Moehrle	Laura A.	39	16	55
		70.9%	29.1%	100.0%
Pearson	Andrew B.	34	51	85
		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Quinn	Matthew M.	32	21	53
		60.4%	39.6%	100.0%
Rasmusson	Anne Marie	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Raupp	Robert	28	10	38
		73.7%	26.3%	100.0%
Rosenfeldt	Jade M.	42	11	53
		79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
Schultz	Heidi E.	13		13
		100.0%		100.0%
Smolnisky	Greta M.	10	2	12
		83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Thilmony	Gretchen D.	26	15	41
		63.4%	36.6%	100.0%
Thompson	Michael J.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Wang	Shan C.	9	4	13
		69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
Weiler	Leonard A.	15	16	31
		48.4%	51.6%	100.0%
Welte	Nathaniel D.	31	22	53
		58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
Wetzel	Antoinette C.	28	12	40
		70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 7 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		823	454	1277
		64.4%	35.6%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 2,218 cases in the 7th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Four received an aggravated dispositional departure. One of the four people requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 1,277 cases in the 7th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 454 (35.6%) cases received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 222 cases (65.3%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

In 2021-2022, 931 people in the 7th District received prison. Of the 498 people who received prison, 28 (3.0%) received an aggravated durational departure and 136 (14.6%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Beckman	Stephanie L.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Benson	Daniel A.	14		0	14
		100.0%		0.0%	100.0%
Benson	Sharon G.	20		1	21
		95.2%		4.8%	100.0%
Cahill	Steven J.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Caligiuri	Hilary L.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Carlson	Jay D.	33		1	34
		97.1%		2.9%	100.0%
Cashman	William J.	20	3	7	30
		66.7%	10.0%	23.3%	100.0%
Churchwell	Timothy M.	18		1	19
		94.7%		5.3%	100.0%
Clark	Douglas B.	28	0	4	32
		87.5%	0.0%	12.5%	100.0%
Clark	Michelle L.	17	1	2	20
		85.0%	5.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Davick-Halfen	Kris	11	2	2	15
		73.3%	13.3%	13.3%	100.0%
duCharme	Leah J.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
Engelking	Matthew E.	20	2	12	34
		58.8%	5.9%	35.3%	100.0%
Fritz	Michael D.	35		3	38
		92.1%		7.9%	100.0%
Grunke	Frederick L.			2	2
				100.0%	100.0%
Gustafson	Amber B.	14			14
		100.0%			100.0%
Harbott	Corey A.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Hennesy	Sarah E.	17	1	8	26
		65.4%	3.8%	30.8%	100.0%
Herzing	Mark J.	17	1	8	26
		65.4%	3.8%	30.8%	100.0%
Jesse	Michael S.	35	2	4	41
		85.4%	4.9%	9.8%	100.0%
Judd	Johnathan R.	10			10
		100.0%			100.0%
Kulick	Gail T.	11		4	15
		73.3%		26.7%	100.0%
Lawson	Michelle W.	42	3	4	49
		85.7%	6.1%	8.2%	100.0%
Mahler	Mary B.	34		19	53
		64.2%		35.8%	100.0%
Merkins	Tammy L.	50	1	1	52
		96.2%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0%
Miller	Kevin M.	27	1	2	30
		90.0%	3.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Moehrle	Laura A.	34	2	9	45
		75.6%	4.4%	20.0%	100.0%
Pearson	Andrew B.	22	3	12	37
		59.5%	8.1%	32.4%	100.0%
Quinn	Matthew M.	27	1	5	33
		81.8%	3.0%	15.2%	100.0%
Rasmusson	Anne Marie			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Raupp	Robert	29	1	3	33
		87.9%	3.0%	9.1%	100.0%
Rosenfeldt	Jade M.	45	1		46
		97.8%	2.2%		100.0%
Schultz	Heidi E.	8	1	5	14
		57.1%	7.1%	35.7%	100.0%
Smolnisky	Greta M.	9		1	10
		90.0%		10.0%	100.0%
Thilmony	Gretchen D.	30			30
		100.0%			100.0%
Thompson	Michael J.			1	1
				100.0%	100.0%
Wang	Shan C.	7	1	3	11
		63.6%	9.1%	27.3%	100.0%
Weiler	Leonard A.	19	1	3	23
		82.6%	4.3%	13.0%	100.0%
Welte	Nathaniel D.	31		4	35
		88.6%		11.4%	100.0%
Wetzel	Antoinette C.	27		3	30
		90.0%		10.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 7 RECEIVED PRISON		767	28	136	931
		82.4%	3.0%	14.6%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 8, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Beckman	Stephanie L.	24	9	33
		72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
Doll	Amy J.	19	15	34
		55.9%	44.1%	100.0%
Fischer	Jennifer F.	12	3	15
		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Glasrud	Charles	14	8	22
		63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
Hanson	Rodney C.		1	1
			100.0%	100.0%
Helgeson	Keith	8	2	10
		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Knutsen	Dwayne	9	1	10
		90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Listug	Melissa J.	15	4	19
		78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
Mennis	David L.	22	12	34
		64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
Stratton	Laurence J.	18	14	32
		56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
Thompson	Michael J.	1		1
		100.0%		100.0%
Van Hon	Thomas W.	35	9	44
		79.5%	20.5%	100.0%
Wentzell	Stephen J.	28	14	42
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 8 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		205	92	297
		69.0%	31.0%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 749 cases in the 8th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. None received an aggravated dispositional departure.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 297 cases in the 8th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 92 (31.0%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 34 cases (55.7%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

In 2021-2022, 238 cases in the 8th District received prison. Of the 238 people who received prison, 7 (2.9%) received an aggravated durational departure and 11 (4.6%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge First Name	Judge Last Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Beckman	Stephanie L.	23		2	25
		92.0%		8.0%	100.0%
Doll	Amy J.	19	2		21
		90.5%	9.5%		100.0%
Fischer	Jennifer F.	15			15
		100.0%			100.0%
Glasrud	Charles	17			17
		100.0%			100.0%
Helgeson	Keith	10			10
		100.0%			100.0%
Knutsen	Dwayne	10		1	11
		90.9%		9.1%	100.0%
Listug	Melissa J.	15	2	1	18
		83.3%	11.1%	5.6%	100.0%
Mennis	David L.	25			25
		100.0%			100.0%
Stratton	Laurence J.	16	2	4	22
		72.7%	9.1%	18.2%	100.0%
Thompson	Michael J.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Van Hon	Thomas W.	39		2	41
		95.1%		4.9%	100.0%
Wentzell	Stephen J.	30	1	1	32
		93.8%	3.1%	3.1%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 8 RECEIVED PRISON		220	7	11	238
		92.4%	2.9%	4.6%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCED DISTRICT 9, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Aanes	Patricia A.	16	16	32
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Anderson	Douglas P.	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Askegaard	Erik J.	27	24	51
		52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
Austad	Jana M.	37	4	41
		90.2%	9.8%	100.0%
Brand	Jeanine R.	25	4	29
		86.2%	13.8%	100.0%
Chandler	Heidi M.	18	33	51
		35.3%	64.7%	100.0%
Dehn	James E.	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
DeMay	Kristine R.	18	16	34
		52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
Dixon	Donna K.	4	10	14
		28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
Gearin	Kathleen R.	1	1	1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Halverson	Charles D.	21	16	37
		56.8%	43.2%	100.0%
Harbott	Corey A.	56	14	70
		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Hermerding	David F.	26	25	51
		51.0%	49.0%	100.0%
Huseby-Claesson	Annie P.	14	4	18
		77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
Larson	Gary R.	1	1	1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Lefler III	Herbert P.	2	2	2
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mallie	Matthew	17	19	36
		47.2%	52.8%	100.0%
Marben	Kurt J.	1	1	1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Maturi	Jon	7	3	10
		70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
McBroom	Sarah L.	19	26	45
		42.2%	57.8%	100.0%
Melbye	John G.	28	7	35
		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Metzen	Leslie M.	1	1	1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Rasmusson	Anne Marie	64	13	77
		83.1%	16.9%	100.0%
Remick	Jeffrey S.	69	10	79
		87.3%	12.7%	100.0%
Rivera Spalla	Darlene	44	23	67
		65.7%	34.3%	100.0%
Schieferdecker	Eric P.	33	4	37
		89.2%	10.8%	100.0%
Schluchter	Shari R.	33	10	43
		76.7%	23.3%	100.0%
Shermoen	Jerrold	12	6	18
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Smith	John P.	1	1	1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Starr	Mark M.	1	1	1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Strandlie	Christopher J.	34	10	44
		77.3%	22.7%	100.0%
Tiffany	Robert D.	29	2	31
		93.5%	6.5%	100.0%
Wahwassuck	Korey	30	27	57
		52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
Wernick	Mark S.	2	2	2
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yon	Tamara L.	31	19	50
		62.0%	38.0%	100.0%
Zimmerman	Richard A.	3	1	4
		75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 9 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		725	350	1075
		67.4%	32.6%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions

Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 2,117 cases in the 9th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Three received an aggravated dispositional departure. None of the three people who received an aggravated dispositional departure requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures

In 2021-2022, 479 cases in the 9th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 159 (33.2%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 264 cases (88.6%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison

In 2021-2022, 850 cases in the 9th District received prison. Of the 850 people who received prison, 14 (1.6%) received an aggravated durational departure and 72 (8.5%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison only)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Aanes	Patricia A.	15		4	19
		78.9%		21.1%	100.0%
Anderson	Douglas P.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Askegaard	Erik J.	21	2	4	27
		77.8%	7.4%	14.8%	100.0%
Austad	Jana M.	37		2	39
		94.9%		5.1%	100.0%
Brand	Jeanine R.	26	1	2	29
		89.7%	3.4%	6.9%	100.0%
Chandler	Heidi M.	23			23
		100.0%			100.0%
Dehn	James E.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
DeMay	Kristine R.	20		3	23
		87.0%		13.0%	100.0%
Dixon	Donna K.	7		1	8
		87.5%		12.5%	100.0%
Fritz	Michael D.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Halverson	Charles D.	26	1	1	28
		92.9%	3.6%	3.6%	100.0%
Harbott	Corey A.	69	1	6	76
		90.8%	1.3%	7.9%	100.0%
Hermerding	David F.	24	1	4	29
		82.8%	3.4%	13.8%	100.0%
Huseby-Claesson	Annie P.	15		1	16
		93.8%		6.3%	100.0%
Larson	Gary R.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Lefler III	Herbert P.	4			4
		100.0%			100.0%
Mallie	Matthew	18		1	19
		94.7%		5.3%	100.0%
Marben	Kurt J.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Maturi	Jon	8			8
		100.0%			100.0%
McBroom	Sarah L.	19			19
		100.0%			100.0%
Melbye	John G.	29			29
		100.0%			100.0%
Metzen	Leslie M.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
Rasmusson	Anne Marie	74		6	80
		92.5%		7.5%	100.0%
Remick	Jeffrey S.	79	2	9	90
		87.8%	2.2%	10.0%	100.0%
Rivera Spalla	Darlene	40		6	46
		87.0%		13.0%	100.0%
Schieferdecker	Eric P.	35		2	37
		94.6%		5.4%	100.0%
Schluchter	Shari R.	33	1	1	35
		94.3%	2.9%	2.9%	100.0%
Shermoen	Jerrold	14		1	15
		93.3%		6.7%	100.0%
Smith	John P.	1			1
		100.0%			100.0%
Strandlie	Christopher J.	28	5	7	40
		70.0%	12.5%	17.5%	100.0%
Tiffany	Robert D.	30		1	31
		96.8%		3.2%	100.0%
Wahwassuck	Korey	31		1	32
		96.9%		3.1%	100.0%
Wernick	Mark S.	2			2
		100.0%			100.0%
Yon	Tamara L.	25		9	34
		73.5%		26.5%	100.0%
Zimmerman	Richard A.	3			3
		100.0%			100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 9 RECEIVED PRISON		764	14	72	850
		89.9%	1.6%	8.5%	100.0%

DEPARTURE RATES BY JUDGE: SENTENCING DISTRICT 10, 2021-2022

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Dispositional Departure (presumptive commits)		Total
		None	Mitigated	
Birnbaum	Robert	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Bollman	Suzanne	23	7	30
		76.7%	23.3%	100.0%
Brosnahan	Amy R.	18	14	32
		56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
Brosnahan	Helen R.	5	3	8
		62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Brown	Suzanne M.	31	24	55
		56.4%	43.6%	100.0%
Buccicone	Brianne J.	27	12	39
		69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
Cunningham	James A.	17	34	51
		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Cutter	Elizabeth V.	3	3	6
		100.0%		100.0%
Davis	Michele A.	17	16	33
		51.5%	48.5%	100.0%
Dehen	John	5	3	8
		62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Dehn	James E.	2	1	3
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
DeSanto	John E.	1	1	2
		100.0%		100.0%
Dowdal	Bridgid E.	12	13	25
		48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
Ekstrum	B. William	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Fitzpatrick	Thomas M.	12	8	20
		60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Flanagan	Patrick W.	18	29	47
		38.3%	61.7%	100.0%
Fountain	Bethany A.	23	23	46
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Freeman	Juanita C.	24	23	47
		51.1%	48.9%	100.0%
Galler	Gregory G.	20	21	41
		64.5%	35.5%	100.0%
Gearin	Kathleen R.	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%
Gibbs	Sean C.	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%
Green, III	Francis	11	21	32
		45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
Hall	Sharon L.	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%
Halsey	Stephen M.	3	17	20
		15.0%	85.0%	100.0%
Hawley	Sheridan	23	15	38
		60.3%	39.5%	100.0%
Hayes	Thomas	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%
Hiljus	Stoney L.	16	15	31
		51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
Hoffman	John C.	10	9	19
		52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
Ilkka	Richard C.	15	14	29
		51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
Jasper	Jenny Walker	60	64	124
		48.4%	51.6%	100.0%
Jasper	Jonathan N.	15	8	23
		65.2%	34.8%	100.0%
Johnson	Lawrence R.	1	1	2
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Jude	Tad	12	9	21
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Kaminsky	Walter	28	18	46
		60.9%	39.1%	100.0%
Klossner	John D.	16	11	27
		59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
Larson	Kristin C.	20	15	35
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Lehmann	Thomas R.	12	23	35
		34.3%	65.7%	100.0%
Logering	Nancy	8	1	9
		88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
Maas	Ellen L.	9	8	17
		52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
Martin	Krista K.	32	24	56
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
McBride	John R.	2	1	3
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
McCarthy	Karin L.	9	13	22
		40.9%	59.1%	100.0%
McPherson	Catherine	24	14	38
		63.2%	36.8%	100.0%
Meslow	Douglas B.	41	50	91
		45.1%	54.9%	100.0%
Miles	Susan R.	1	1	2
		100.0%		100.0%
Mjanger	Siv	16	8	24
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Mottl	Kathleen A.	6	3	9
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Mueller	Kevin J.	5	3	8
		62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Pietan	Laura A.	17	21	38
		44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
Saterbak	Melissa M.	17	19	36
		47.2%	52.8%	100.0%
Schoffelman	Todd R.	18	11	29
		62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
Schommer	Karen B.	14	9	23
		60.9%	39.1%	100.0%
Seabrooks II	Jesse	12	10	22
		54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
Stanfield	Jennifer L.	7	6	13
		53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
Strand	Elizabeth	21	18	39
		53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
Street	Dyanna L.	24	23	47
		51.1%	48.9%	100.0%
Sullivan	Barry A.	5	2	7
		71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Tenney	Geoffrey W.	24	11	35
		68.6%	31.4%	100.0%
Trevino	Catherine A.	19	6	25
		76.0%	24.0%	100.0%
Willis	Kari	11	1	12
		100.0%		100.0%
Wynn	Heather	21	11	32
		65.6%	34.4%	100.0%
Yunker	Mary	32	16	48
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
TOTAL DISTRICT 10 PRESUMPTIVE COMMITS		903	745	1648
		54.8%	45.2%	100.0%

A word of caution about departure rates by judge: departure rates can be affected by how many cases a judge sentences, the type of cases sentenced, and the criminal history score of the cases sentenced. When performing data analysis, it is important to consider the number of offenders represented in the population. For example, if we only have four cases, and two of those cases received a dispositional departure, the departure rate is high at 50 percent, but only reflects two cases. Small sample sizes may cause low statistical power and inflated false discovery rates. The type of cases can also affect departure rates. For example, a judge may have more cases with offense types more likely to receive a departure.

Definitions
Definitions for Guidelines terminology can be found at <https://mn.gov/sentencing-guidelines/training/definitions/>

Aggravated Dispositional Departures
In 2021-2022, 3,091 cases in the 10th District had a presumptive stayed disposition. Five received an aggravated dispositional departure. One of the five people who received an aggravated dispositional departure requested execution of their sentence.

Mitigated Dispositional Departures
In 2021-2022, 1,648 cases in the 10th District had a presumptive prison disposition. 745 (45.2%) people received a mitigated dispositional departure. The Court cited plea negotiation on the sentence in 363 cases (64.9%). Columns A-E display the mitigated departure rate by judge.

Durational Departures for Cases Receiving Prison
In 2021-2022, 964 cases in the 10th District received prison. Of the 964 people who received prison, 20 (2.1%) received an aggravated durational departure and 119 (12.3%) received a mitigated durational departure. Columns O-T display durational departure rates by judge.

Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) monitoring data are person-based, meaning cases represent persons rather than individual charges. A person sentenced within the same county in a one-month period is generally counted only once, based on their most serious offense. This data request was prepared by the research staff of MSGC in fulfillment of the Commission's statutory role as a clearinghouse and information center for information on sentencing practices. This is not a policy document. Nothing in this request should be construed as a statement of existing policy or recommendation of future policy on behalf of the Commission itself, or as an authoritative interpretation of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, Minnesota statutes, or case law.

Judge Last Name	Judge First Name	Durational Departure (prison)			Total
		None	Aggravated	Mitigated	
Birnbaum	Robert	1	1	1	100.0%
		88.5%	7.7%	3.8%	100.0%
Bollman	Suzanne	23	2	1	26
		88.5%	7.7%	3.8%	100.0%
Brosnahan	Amy R.	17	1	2	20
		85.0%	5.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Brosnahan	Helen R.	4	0	2	6
		66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Brown	Suzanne M.	27	8	3	33
		81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	
Buccicone	Brianne J.	27	1	1	28
		96.4%	3.6%	100.0%	
Cunningham	James A.	18	2	2	20
		90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	
Cutter	Elizabeth V.	3	1	3	6
		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Davis	Michele A.	15	3	3	18
		83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	
Dehen	John	3	2	5	8
		60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
Dehn	James E.	2	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%	
DeSanto	John E.	1	1	1	2
		100.0%		100.0%	
Dowdal	Bridgid E.	15	2	17	25
		88.2%	11.8%	100.0%	
Ekstrum	B. William	1	1	1	100.0%
		100.0%		100.0%	
Fitzpatrick	Thomas M.	11	1	12	20
		91.7%	8.3%	100.0%	
Flanagan	Patrick W.	18	3	18	100.0%
		100.0%		100.0%	
Fountain	Bethany A.	20	3	23	46
		87.0%	13.0%	100.0%	
Freeman	Juanita C.	19	4	24	47
		79.2%	4.2%	16.7%	100.0%
Galler	Gregory G.	20	2	22	41
		90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	
Gearin	Kathleen R.	2	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%	
Green, III	Francis	11	1	12	32
		91.7%	8.3%	100.0%	
Hall	Sharon L.	2	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%	
Halsey	Stephen M.	2	1	3	20
		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Hawley	Sheridan	20	3	24	38
		83.3%	4.2%	12.5%	100.0%
Hayes	Thomas	1	1	2	4
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
Hiljus	Stoney L.	14	2	16	31
		87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
Hoffman	John C.	7	2	9	19
		77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	
Ilkka	Richard C.	13	2	15	29
		86.7%	13.3%	100.0%	
Jasper	Jenny Walker	49	2	60	124
		81.7%	3.3%	15.0%	100.0%
Jasper	Jonathan N.	13	0	15	23
		86.7%	0.0%	13.3%	100.0%
Johnson	Lawrence R.	2	2	2	4
		100.0%		100.0%	
Jude	Tad	10	2	12	21
		83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	
Kaminsky	Walter	29	3	32	46
		90.6%	9.4%	100.0%	
Klossner	John D.	20	2	20	27
		100.0%		100.0%	
Lange	Steven Z.	1	1	1	2
		100.0%		100.0%	
Larson	Kristin C.	18	2	20	35
		90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	
Lehmann	Thomas R.	8	2	12	35
		66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
Logering	Nancy	9	1	10	9
		90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	
Maas	Ellen L.	2	1	10	17
		70.0%	10.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Martin	Krista K.	30	1	5	36
		83.3%	2.8%	13.9%	100.0%
McBride	John R.	2	2	2	3
		100.0%		100.0%	
McCarthy	Karin L.	9	1	9	22
		88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	
McPherson	Catherine	21	3	25	38
		84.0%	4.0%	12.0%	100.0%
Meslow	Douglas B.	35	8	43	91
		81.4%	18.6%	100.0%	
Miles	Susan R.	1	1	1	2
		100.0%		100.0%	
Mjanger	Siv	13	3	16	24
		81.3%	18.8%	100.0%	
Mottl	Kathleen A.	6	6	6	9
		100.0%		100.0%	
Mueller	Kevin J.	5	5	5	8
		100.0%		100.0%	
Pietan	Laura A.	14	3	17	38
		82.4%	17.6%	100.0%	
Saterbak	Melissa M.	15	2	11	36
		83.3%	11.1%	5.6%	100.0%
Schoffelman	Todd R.	15	4	19	29
		78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	
Schommer	Karen B.	12	3	4	19
		63.2%	15.8%	21.1%	100.0%
Seabrooks II	Jesse	14	1	14	22
		100.0%		100.0%	
Stanfield	Jennifer L.	7	1	8	13
		87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
Strand	Elizabeth	18	4	22	39
		81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	
Street	Dyanna L.	21	4	25	47
		84.0%	16.0%	100.0%	
Sullivan	Barry A.	4	3	7	13
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	
Tenney	Geoffrey W.	23	2	25	35
		92.0%	8.0%	100.0%	
Trevino	Catherine A.	19	1	20	25
		95.0%	5.0%	100.0%	
Willis	Kari	11	1	12	12
		91.7%	8.3%	100.0%	
Wynn	Heather	20	1	22	32
		90.9%	4.5%	4.5%	100.0%
Yunker	Mary	33	1	34	48
		97.1%	2.9%	100.0%	
TOTAL DISTRICT 10 RECEIVED PRISON		825	20	119	964
		85.6%	2.1%	12.3%	100.0%